ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, September 12, 2011
CNS 200
3:30 – 5:00 PM

0. Select a recording secretary. Election of Executive Secretary. Election of Chair.

1. Presidential courtesy

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
   a. Approval of minutes
      i. Minutes of AC meeting of 5/2/11 (attachment)
      ii. Minutes of AC meeting of 5/9/11; reconvened from 5/2/11 meeting (attachment)
   b. Correspondence
      i. Memo from ACEC with roster and meeting dates (attachment)
      ii. Memo from ACEC on taking AC minutes (attachment)
      iii. Memo of 6/7/11, AC Executive Secretary to SVPAA re approval of JOR entry on
           Student Evaluation of Teaching (attachment)
      iv. Email of 6/8/11, SVPAA to AC Executive Secretary with administrative approval
           of JOR entry on Student Evaluation of Teaching (attachment)
      v. Memo of 6/7/11, AC Executive Secretary to SVPAA re JOR language on closing
           Master in Taxation program (attachment)
      vi. Email of 6/8/11, SVPAA to AC Executive Secretary with approval of JOR
           language on closing Masters in Taxation program (attachment)
      vii. Memo dated 8/28/11 from Hugh Humphrey, Phil Lane, and Curt Naser requesting
           item be placed on AC agenda re Billy Weitzer sabbatical (attachment)
   c. Oral reports

4. Council Subcommittee Reports
   a. Subcommittee on voting rights
   b. Subcommittee for considering remaining items from ad hoc JOR committee
      recommendations
   c. Subcommittee to consider proposing IDEA form for administrators

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

6. Old Business
   a. Proposal from CUC to close University College (attachments)
   b. Proposal from UCC re core credit approval for courses outside a particular core area
      (attachments)

7. New business
   a. Election of faculty to the Honorary Degree Committee
b. Request to reconsider the Workers’ Bill of Rights (attachment)
c. Proposal from UCC re policy on incompletes (attachment)
d. Recommendations from ACEC re Pending Items (attachments)
e. Report from Committee on Conference re June 2011 Board of Trustees’ meeting and
discussion of faculty views in preparation for upcoming meeting of the Committee on
Conference with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees (ongoing Item 2)
f. Faculty representation for the School of Nursing Dean search committee

- List of Attachments is on page 2
- List of Pending and Ongoing items is on page 3

List of Attachments:

For item 3.a.i Minutes from AC meeting of 5/2/11 (pages 4-10)
For item 3.a.ii Minutes from AC meeting of 5/9/11 (pages 11-20)
For item 3.b.i Memo from ACEC to AC dated 9/1/11 re roster and meeting dates (page 21)
For item 3.b.ii Memo from ACEC to AC dated 9/1/11 re taking minutes (pages 22-23)
For item 3.b.iii Memo of 6/7/11 re administrative approval of JOR entry on Student Evaluation
of Teaching (page 24)
For item 3.b.iv Memo of 6/8/11 with administrative approval of JOR entry on Student
Evaluation of Teaching (page 25)
For item 3.b.v Memo of 6/7/11 re administrative approval of JOR entry on closing Masters in
Taxation program (page 26)
For item 3.b.vi Memo of 6/8/11 with administrative approval of JOR entry on closing Masters in
Taxation program (page 27)
For item 3.b.vii Memo of 8/28/11, Hugh Humphrey, Phil Lane, and Curt Naser requestin Curt
Naser and Phil Lane to AC (pages 28-29)
For item 6.a Proposal from CUC to close University College (pages 30-92); memo dated
8/28/11 re follow-up to 5/9/11 AC discussion (pages 93-94)
For item 6.b Memo of 2/22/11, UCC to AC re core credit approval (pages 95-98); Core
Course Review Guidelines (pages 99-100); Core Course Review Form (page 101); Core Course Recommendation Form (page 102); CAS Mission of the
Core statement (pages 103-108); UCC minutes of 2/8/11 (pages 109-111)
For item 7.b Memo of 4/6/11, 14 faculty to AC re Workers’ Bill of Rights (pages 112-113)
For item 7.c Memo of 3/14/11, UCC to AC re incomplete policy (pages 114-117); Excerpt of
UCC minutes of 3/11 re incomplete policy (page 118)
For item 7.d Memo of 4/18/11, ACEC to AC re pending items (pages 119-122); Memo of
12/21/10, Rick DeWitt to ACEC, without appendices (pages 123-130);
Complete 12/21/10 memo with appendices is available electronically at
www.faculty.fairfield.edu/ac
Pending Items:
A. Recommendations in report in spring 2002 from Faculty Athletics Committee concerning (i) amounts of time student-athletes are absent from classes for trips/athletic activities, (ii) demands placed on student athletes for year-round training, (iii) number of scheduled athletic events that conflict with the University’s final exam schedule, and (iv) amount of money spent on various athletic programs. (See agenda and attachments for 12/4/02 AC meeting; item 6.b of 3/3/03 meeting.)

B. Issues raised at the 10/4/99 AC meeting concerning faculty participation on the finance/budget committee. (See minutes of AC meeting of 11/4/99; 10/29/99 letter from Phil Lane attached to 5/1/00 AC agenda; excerpt of GF minutes of 11/13/92 attached to AC 5/1/00 agenda; AC motion of 11/6/00.)

C. Distance learning issues. (See item 7 of AC minutes of 5/5/03.)

D. Report from the Educational Technologies Committee on security, long-term feasibility, potential for integration, ownership, accessibility, etc. of servers containing faculty data. (See AC minutes of 2/5/2007; AC 4/2/07 3b; AC 12/3/2007 7b).

E. Faculty Data Committee (AC 12/3/07).

F. Issues related to parking on campus; faculty on University parking study (AC 2/5/07 7c; AC 3/5/07 6a; AC 4/2/07 6a; AC 9/10/07 3bi; AC 10/1/07 6c; AC 2/4/08 3bi).

G. MFA in Creative Writing, Five-Year-Review due in 12/2012 (AC 12/3/07).

H. AC investigation whether to switch to all-online, all-hardcopy or continue with both options for IDEA forms. Due in spring 2012. (AC 4/19/10)

I. AC investigation whether to continue use of “yellow sheet” qualitative evaluations after spring 2012. Begin fall 2011, Due by spring 2012. (AC 4/19/10)

J. AC revisits the accessibility of teaching evaluation data, Due spring 2012. (AC 4/19/10)

K. AC three year review of Merit Appeals Policy, fall 2013. (AC 11/1/10)

L. AC three year review of Intellectual Properties Policy, spring 2014. (AC 3/7/11)

Ongoing Items:
1. Report by SVPAA to AC each semester to inform the council of any approved exceptions to the Athletic Department’s policy of not scheduling athletic events that conflict with final exams.

2. Report from the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees after each meeting with board members. At the end of each academic year, discuss items for the Conference Committee to put on the agenda for their meetings with members of the board the following year.
Present: Professors Peter Bayers, Chris Bernhardt, Rick DeWitt (Executive Secretary), Don Greenberg, Dennis Hodgson, Mark Ligas, Doug Lyon, Irene Mulvey (Secretary of the General Faculty), Rona Preli (Chair), Susan Rakowitz, Joyce Shea, Debra Strauss, Michael Tucker, Brian Walker, Min Xu, David Zera

Administrators: Deans Jack Beal, Robbin Crabtree, Susan Franzosa, Jeanne Novotny, Norm Solomon

FUSA Representative: Taylor McGuinness

Guests: Professor Manyul Im (Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee)

Regrets: Professors Steve Bayne, Jocelyn Boryczka, Senior V.P for Academic Affairs Paul Fitzgerald, S.J.

Chair Preli called the meeting to order at 3:31

1. Presidential courtesy
None.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty
None.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
3.a. Approval of minutes of AC meeting of 4/4/11

Professor DeWitt asked for corrections. Professor Bayne noted his name was misspelled on page 5; no other corrections.

MOTION [Walker/Shea]: To approve the minutes of the 4/4/11 AC meeting as corrected.

MOTION PASSED 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.
3.b. Correspondence

Professor DeWitt noted that the first four items of correspondence contain administrative approval of items for the Journal of Record; items v through viii will be considered under agenda item 7.g.; item ix is a memo from 14 faculty to the AC concerning the Workers’ Bill of Rights which we will take up under agenda item 7.h.; and items x and xi are information-only items related to ongoing item 1 concerning athletic events that conflict with finals.

3.c. Oral Reports

Professor DeWitt noted it is up to the Council to decide whether and when to hold additional AC meetings, but the ACEC recommends that at the end of this meeting we move to recess rather than adjourn, and reconvene today’s meeting on Monday, 5/9, 3:30 to 5:00 and if needed to finish business, reconvene again on Monday 5/16/11. He also noted that emergency summer meeting dates must be selected by the Council, and that the ACEC recommends Monday, 6/20/11, 11:00-12:30 and Monday, 7/18/11, 1:00-2:30 for possible summer meetings. There was general agreement that these dates are good. Professor DeWitt reminded the Council that these summer meetings will only be held if something unexpected and pressing arises.

4. Council Subcommittee Reports

4.a. Subcommittee on student absence policy

Professors Ligas and Shea delivered the report. They reported a meeting with Dean of Students Tom Pellegrino who suggested a meeting with Susan Birge and Judith Weindling to discuss issues related to health as a reason for absence. Work needs to be done on this issue. What, for example, is expected from the student? It was pointed out that the health center can not excuse a student, only the faculty can. All the health center can do is report, if the student gives permission, that the student was seen by the health center on a particular date and time. The subcommittee recommends a policy with respect to student absence based more on trust. The faculty need to make the course policy explicit and the student must notify the faculty in a timely manner. It is expected that for extended absences the student notify the faculty promptly.

Professor DeWitt noted that since a student absence policy is an academic policy, such a policy should be approved by the Council and appear in the Journal of Record. He asked if this recommendation, or suitably modified language, was intended for the Journal of Record.

Professor Shea responded that at this point these are only suggestions and are not ready to be made into policy, and that the subcommittee did not see themselves as formulating language for the Journal of Record. Prof. Shea asked Faculty Secretary Mulvey if she thought such language should go into the Journal of Record; Prof. Mulvey responded she did not have strong feelings on the matter.

Professor Ligas indicated that Dean Pellegrino does not want any changes made to student absence policy without faculty input. Professor Xu asked how can you be sure if the student is
actually ill or just not prepared for the exam. Professor Shea responded that there can be no clear
guideline on this and each faulty must make a judgment on a case by case basis.

Dean Solomon inquired whether there should be some guidelines to gain consistency. Dean
Solomon pointed out that there is no policy guiding faculty on makeup exams. Professor Shea
indicated that students can appeal a faculty decision to not give a makeup exam and further that
faculty should on their syllabus make explicit their makeup policy. Dean Solomon responded
that in reality not all faculty do make policy explicit.

Professor Preli asked Prof. DeWitt to take over the chair duties momentarily, and she commented
that not all faculty and adjuncts are proactive, and how is a student to deal with a non responsive
faculty. Does not a base line policy binding all faculty make sense? Professor Ligas indicated
that the committee concentrated on the student end of the absence issue and if directed the
committee can give more attention to the faculty end. Chair Preli asked if the committee wanted
input for their work and Professor Shea stated the committee always welcomes input.

Professor DeWitt indicated that since, for example, student absence can affect grades it is an
academic issue and reiterated that such a policy needs to be approved by the Council rather than
being formulated by the Dean of Students and going into the Catalog without faculty approval.

Professor Mulvey stated that the Academic Council had not given the subcommittee a
sufficiently detailed charge to allow them to formulate policy recommendations. Professor
Bernhardt indicated that while most students are fine there may be some who manipulate
absences and he wondered if we should keep track of student absences. Professor Shea answered
that this is a policy for the majority of students and the original charge to the subcommittee was
to look at issues around student absences. Professor DeWitt suggested the council expand the
charge of the subcommittee. Professor Rakowitz stated she is the first to speak out for student
responsibility but suggested a distinction be made between missed classes and missed exams.

Chair Preli asked the Council if it wished to take any action on this matter and after no
responses, brought this topic’s discussion to an end by thanking the subcommittee for their work.

4.b. Subcommittee on voting rights

Professor DeWitt reported that the subcommittee consisted of Professor Bayne, Professor Lyon
and himself, and the subcommittee is meeting regularly and making progress.

4.c. Subcommittee on ensuring that faculty policies are correct in official
documents

Professor Mulvey reported this committee was established in October 2007 because it had come
to light that often policies were inaccurate in official university documents. Prof. Mulvey noted
that the ad hoc Journal of Record committee had recommended and the Council recently
approved that an annual review of policies be conducted by the Faculty Secretary, and that with
this the subcommittee considers its work to be done.
Professor DeWitt noted the subcommittee’s report included the motion from 2007 forming the subcommittee, then following a brief paragraph the next entry in the report is from 2010, and asked what the committee had done between 2007 and 2010? Professor Mulvey answered that without her notes and minutes she did not remember. Chair Preli thanked the subcommittee on behalf of the council for their work.

4.d. Subcommitteee for considering remaining items from ad hoc JOR committee recommendations

Professor DeWitt noted that at the last meeting the Council charged the ACEC with forming this subcommittee, and he subsequently put out a call for volunteers. Professors Bayne, Mulvey, Rakowitz, and he volunteered. The subcommittee consists of these four members and has scheduled its first meeting. Professor Rakowitz stated that the committee had not yet met but asked why there was no representative from the administration on the subcommittee. Prof. DeWitt stated that at the last ACEC meeting the ACEC considered having SVP Fitzgerald be on the subcommittee. He stated he thought it inappropriate for SVP Fitzgerald to have voting rights on a subcommittee that will be making recommendations over which he as SVP will later have veto power.

MOTION [Rakowitz/Mulvey]: That the Council ask SVP Fitzgerald to appoint a member of the administration to this subcommittee.

MOTIONS PASSED 9 in favor, 3 opposed, 2 abstentions.

4.e. Subcommittee to consider proposing IDEA form for administrators

Professor DeWitt thanked Professors Bill Abbott, Wendi Kohli, Cheryl Tromley, and Dean Robbin Crabtree for volunteering to serve on this subcommittee, and noted the subcommittee is in the process of setting up their first meeting.

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

None.

6. Old Business

6.a. Language for the Journal of Record re Student Evaluation of Teaching entry

Professor Mulvey noted that page 28 of the packet contains a memo from the ACEC to the Council with proposed revisions to the Journal of Record language on Student Evaluation of Teaching. The ACEC recommends the Council approve these revisions. The revisions are intended to incorporate the changes recommended by the FDEC and approved by the Council at the last AC meeting.
MOTION [Mulvey/Hodgson]: That the Council approve the changes to the Journal of Record entry on Student Evaluation of Teaching as shown on page 28 of the packet for the Academic Council meeting of 5/2/11.

MOTION PASSED 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

Professor Walker asked if it is now policy that every faculty member administer the IDEA evaluation. Professor Mulvey answered Yes it is policy. Dean Crabtree asked if we should consider appropriate exceptions to the policy. Professor Bernhardt asked what will happen with independent studies? Professor Lyon noted that we have many small thesis classes. Professor Mulvey noted that this is not a new problem since administering the previous teaching evaluation in every class was also Journal of Record policy and suggested this could be considered by the FDEC. Professor Tucker stated that forms are generated even for classes with only one student. Dean Franzosa noted that if the number of students is too small no document will be produced.

MOTION [Walker/second]: That the Council refer to the FDEC the matter of whether every class need administer the IDEA evaluation.

MOTION PASSED 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions.

7. New business

7.a. Consideration of slate of candidates for Committee on Committees

All faculty members who had volunteered to stand for election to the Committee on Committees are listed on page 20 of the packet.

MOTION [Bernhardt/Walker]: That the Council approve the slate of candidates for the election to the Committee on Committees as shown on page 29 of the packet for the Academic Council meeting of 5/2/11.

MOTION PASSED 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

7.b. Proposal from UCC re core credit approval for courses outside a particular core area

Professor Preli welcomed Professor Manyul Im, Chair of the UCC. Professor Im explained that the UCC has approved that a procedure for approving courses for core credit proposed by someone in a discipline outside a particular core area be established that is transparent and uniform across the university. A social science core review committee would be formed that consisted of representatives from all the social sciences plus one outside faculty member, similar to the natural science core review committee. The social science core review committee would evaluate courses proposed for core credit by someone outside the specific social science area,
and make recommendations to the UCC to approve or reject the course for social science core credit. The UCC would make the final decision. In addition, each core area reviewing unit (the various departments plus the natural science and social science core review committees) would establish guidelines as to what learning outcomes are desired for any core course in their respective area of the core. To establish this procedure the Journal of Record would have to be amended with respect to routing procedure.

Professor Bernhardt asked how this procedure would work, for example, if a non social science committee member was evaluating a social science course. Professor Im stated that outside members can provide perspective to the committee.

Professor DeWitt noted that the second bulleted motion on page 31 of the packet specifies that the review committee will include one member from outside the social sciences, and that each department will nominate at least one individual to serve on the committee. So would every department be required to nominate someone for this committee? Professor Im answered no, there would be 6 members on the committee, one from each social science area and one outside member.

Professor DeWitt asked about the rationale for the routing procedure. He noted that the proposed Journal of Record language on page 32 of the packet no longer requires a proposed core course first go to the relevant department for review. Professor Im stated the procedure is designed to guarantee transparency.

Dean Crabtree pointed out this is the model that the natural sciences use to decide core credit for science requirements and that it is highly collaborative and successful. Dean Crabtree continued that the natural sciences have determined what learning outcomes satisfy core.

Professor DeWitt noted that on page 31 the first and last paragraphs require a proposed core course include a detailed description of how the course fulfills learning outcomes specified by the various departments and core review committees. But in the Course Review Guidelines on page 33, the requirement is to describe how the course fulfills a different set of learning outcomes, namely those stated in the Mission of the Core Statement. Professor Im stated that the latter reference to the Mission of the Core Statement was a mistake left over from earlier versions of the proposal, and this needs to be corrected.

Professor Rakowitz thought the language concerning the intention of the committee needed clarification.

Professor Hodgson indicated that he did not see the problem this new procedure was intended to address. He further stated there is not now a description of requirements for a social science core course and we are creating a bureaucracy to deal with a non problem. Professor Im answered that at present if a non social science department proposed a course for social science core credit there is no procedure for approval or even consideration except to appeal directly to a department.
Professor DeWitt pointed out what seems to be a problem with the procedures for the initial election of social science core review committee members, as described on page 31. Five of the six newly elected members will serve 3 year terms; 1 will serve a 2 year term. So in future years, every 3 years 5 of the 6 committee members will be up for replacement. He recommended the usual staggering be used.

Dean Crabtree indicated that the 1999 core learning outcomes need to be updated and further indicated that these courses are for core credit and not discipline credit. Professor Im stated that this procedure does not take authority from the department but simply insures a fair and transparent procedure.

Professor Tucker asked what of the economic implications if departments lose students within the core. Professor Im indicated that the UCC did not consider this matter.

Professor Walker stated that the natural science procedure has not been not accurately described. In contrast to the description given earlier in this meeting, and in contrast to the proposed procedure for the social science core review committee, proposed core courses by someone outside a particular natural science go first to the relevant department, then to the natural science core review committee. Professor DeWitt noted this illustrates the problem he mentioned earlier with the proposed new routing procedure on page 32. If he wanted to offer a course for social science core because, for example, he thought it contained a sufficient sociology component, that course should first to go to the Sociology department for review, as the current JOR language requires but the proposed new language does not.

Professor DeWitt also asked how a philosophy course, for example, would be offered for social science core. It was responded that the course would need to be cross listed with one of the social science departments. Professor Rakowitz noted that this is not the case with natural science core courses offered by departments outside the natural sciences, for example, there is a Psychology course that currently counts for natural science credit even though it is not cross listed with any department in the natural sciences.

The council took no action on this agenda item.

**MOTION [DeWitt/second]: That this meeting be recessed and reconvened on Monday, 5/9/11, from 3:30 to 5:00 PM.**

**MOTION PASSED** unanimously.

Meeting recessed at 5:00 PM.
Submitted by Donald Greenberg
MINUTES (Draft)  
Academic Council Meeting  
Monday, May 9, 2011  
Reconvened from the May 2nd Meeting  
CNS 200  
3:30 – 5:00 PM

Present: Professors Peter Bayers, Steve Bayne, Chris Bernhardt, Jocelyn Boryczka, Rick DeWitt (Executive Secretary), Don Greenberg, Dennis Hodgson, Doug Lyon, Irene Mulvey (Secretary of the General Faculty), Rona Preli (Chair), Susan Rakowitz, Joyce Shea, Debra Strauss, Michael Tucker, Brian Walker, Min Xu, David Zera

Administrators: Deans Robbin Crabtree, Norm Solomon; Senior V.P. for Academic Affairs Paul Fitzgerald, S.J.

Guests: Prof. Elizabeth Langran, Prof. Richard Regan, Prof. Gerald Campbell, Associate Dean Aaron Perkus.

Regrets: Deans Susan Franzosa, Jean Novotny.

Chair Preli called the meeting to order at 3:35 PM, noting that as this is a reconvened meeting we will pick up where we left off at the 5/2/11 AC meeting, with item 7.b.

Professor DeWitt stated that as the presenter for the first items is not present, we should reorder the agenda. Professor Ligas noted that as he would be presenting item 7.f, we could move to that item.

**MOTION** [Mulvey/Tucker]: To reorder the agenda to take up item 7.f. next.

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

7. New Business

7.f. Proposal to close the MS Taxation Program

Prof. Ligas presented for Prof. Don Gibson. Prof. Ligas explained that the MS Taxation Program began 5 to 6 years ago in response to increased graduate level interest in taxation. A shift of students to the MS in Accounting occurred as a large number of students wanted the MS in Accounting and the numbers for the MS Taxation Program were not as large as expected. Prof. Ligas continued that it is difficult to hire accountants with a specialty in taxation since there are fewer with doctoral degrees and it is hard to attract them to the university given the range of
other opportunities on the east coast and its high cost of living. It was noted that the EPC voted unanimously to close the program which will graduate its final student in 2013.

Prof. Preli asked if there were questions.

**MOTION [Hodgson/Zera]: That the AC approve dissolution of the M.S. Program in Taxation at the end of 3 years or when the current students in the program finish, whichever occurs first.**

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

Prof. Rakowitz asked what happens if students do not graduate after three years?

Prof. Ligas responded that the students will be out in three years. Dean Solomon added that students have been advised and a phase out process has been created.

**MOTION [DeWitt/Bernhardt]: To reorder the agenda to take up item 7.i next.**

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

### 7.i. Discussion of faculty views in preparation for upcoming meetings of the Committee on Conference with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees

Prof. Preli asked how the AC wants to advise the Committee on Conference.

Prof. Greenberg stated that the Committee on Conference should ask the Board of Trustees to disband the merit program and go back to rational ways to compensate the faculty.

Prof. Hodgson asked if the Committee on Conference is mandated to discuss all issues brought up by members of the AC.

Prof. Mulvey responded that the AC can give the Committee directive, but that it should reach a consensus. Prof. Mulvey stated that the Committee requested more input and direction from the AC.

Prof. Tucker stated that faculty opposed merit and the university cannot fund it.

Dean Crabtree stated that she did not disagree with her colleagues and agreed that merit is a lot of work, but stated that now may not be the most opportune time to have the Committee discuss merit with the Board of Trustees. Dean Crabtree suggested that faculty may want to focus on the development of priorities related to the comprehensive campaign as faculty representation in the process is unfolding to determine how funds raised will be deployed to the academic division.
Dean Crabtree is not sure if the Board is in a place to engage this issue, but it is one that is timely and important.

Prof. Mulvey agreed with Prof. Greenberg that the Board should hear from the faculty that merit is not working because, without this information, the Board may think that it is a success. Prof. Mulvey stated that she was not sure what Dean Crabtree was discussing and could not advise the Committee on Conference to discuss something without knowing what it is.

SVP Fitzgerald explained that President von Arx will clarify that a net of 20 full-time positions will be funded through the Comprehensive Campaign in his presentation to the General Faculty. SVP Fitzgerald will present on enrollment, IDEA, NEASC and AACSB accreditation to the Academic Affairs committee of the BOT in June.

Prof. Lyon stated that the merit program lacks any assessment and it is not wrong to suggest that we assess the program.

Prof. Hodgson stated that the message about banning merit is warranted. Prof. Hodgson suggested that an affordable program implemented on an annual basis should be desirable. Prof. Hodgson recommended annual awards in three categories funded by the interest accrued from segments of the endowment and not integrated into the base salary.

Prof. Bernhardt stated that he liked Prof. Hodgson’s suggestion, yet, given the agreement on CPI this year, some protections could be lost if arguments are advanced against merit.

Prof. Preli asked if there was any consensus as to whether or not the Committee on Conference should raise the issue of merit with the Board.

SVP Fitzgerald stated that the Committee on Conference could raise the issue to consider merit be funded with CPI and in recognition of extraordinary work.

Prof. Mulvey stated that this was a good message since there is no money and the system is unfunded.

Prof. Walker stated that the Committee on Conference could convey to the Board that the faculty put a good faith effort into creating a merit system for which there is no funding.

Prof. Preli asked the AC if these were reasonable messages.

**MOTION [DeWitt/Walker]: To reorder the agenda to take up item 7.d next.**

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

**7.d. ETC survey and recommendations**
Prof. Preli invited the AC to turn to the Educational Technologies Committee Academic Computing Survey of the Faculty Summary on pp. 50 – 53 of the packet.

Prof. Langran, chair of the Educational Technologies Committee (ETC), explained that the ETC was bringing the survey results to the AC so that it could raise concerns and make suggestions, etc. Prof. Langran explained that the survey had 133 faculty respondents from different ranks and inclusive of adjuncts. Faculty could contact Prof. Langran and ETC members directly or indirectly with concerns about academic computing support that focused on classroom issues particularly. The ETC undertook the survey to collect systematic data in order to see the broad picture beyond individual anecdotes. Overall, the survey reflected that the level of satisfaction with computing support depended on where the faculty teach. The ETC hopes that the survey data will help CNS and others to address issues proactively. Prof. Langran continued that CNS hired another technician to address classroom computing issues for courses taught later in the day and early evening. Prof. Langran explained that many want broader support for academic computing and, while the issue is not solved, there are proposals. Prof. Langran indicated that in the executive summary of the survey, it is noted that other universities support a separate technical support service within the academic division and this may be something to consider for the future.

Prof. DeWitt congratulated the ETC on its work and directed attention to the bullet points on the top of p. 51 of the packet, asking if the ETC wanted the AC to act on any of these bullets or engage in further discussion.

Prof. Langran responded that the ETC had not put together language for the AC as action items which is something that the ETC may want to draft for the fall. Prof. Langran indicated that there is a reorganization that will impact CNS and the Media Center so it may be best to see how things shake out over summer before making recommendations.

Prof. Hodgson asked to hear more about ETC ideas on bullet point 3 on p. 51 to “strive for greater uniformity in the configuration of classroom technology.”

Prof. Langran stated that the ETC worked with the Classroom Management Committee to do an audit of every classroom that included technology, sight lines to the board, carpeting, etc. in order to get a detailed view. The audits revealed that there were 50 configurations of classrooms and updates to rooms resulted from differing requests. The projector wall units are different in different rooms. Prof. Langran explained that projection issues are the most pressing.

Prof. Regan suggested that a reasonable goal is that 99% of the classroom technology items should work.

SVP Fitzgerald stated that the Classroom Advisory Committee, a group from different parts of the university, graded the classrooms from A to F and found that many of the classrooms are in very poor condition. The Committee put together a prioritized list for addressing this situation. SVP Fitzgerald stated that there is budget to address the list and that the Office of the Registrar is
responsible for the fit and finish in every classroom. SVP Fitzgerald stated that some technology systems are one-off systems since some faculty got grant money to teach a particular room, etc.

Dean Solomon thanked the ETC for its work and suggested that the ETC/AC work with the Board or Advancement to seek external funding in order to address these matters. Dean Solomon continued that the other issue is organizational such as the placement of CNS under the VP of Finance. Dean Solomon stated that as the Comprehensive Campaign moves forward, these are things important enough to discuss with administrators and others so they work for years.

Prof. DeWitt assumed role as Chair of the AC, and Prof. Preli raised a question regarding the availability of resources for GSEAP whose courses are offered late in the evening.

Prof. Langran stated that a new person is available until 7:30 p.m.

Prof. Preli stated that there is no designated person to deal with evening classes and that there should be equity among timeslots to get the same coverage.

Prof. Langran stated that the survey showed an even split among the timecodes.

Prof. Preli stated that other schools have classes that run at night.

Prof. Langran stated that three years ago technicians were let go and since then, there has been a remarkable degradation in quality of support.

Prof. Preli resumed her role as Chair.

Prof. DeWitt stated that items 1 and 6 on pg. 51 involve increased costs that the ETC might consider if it makes recommendations. Prof. DeWitt stated that the other bullet items on p. 51 seem straightforward.

Prof. Langran stated that the Office of the Registrar is putting in place for next year a means for identifying what types of technology are needed for the faculty to teach in particular rooms which should provide a better match.

Prof. Mulvey thanked the ETC for the survey and its work. Prof. Mulvey stated that she was not sure what the AC could offer at this point since the work is going so well, but offered that the AC should do whatever it could to support the ETC. Prof. Mulvey stated that language could be drafted for the AC to pass motions to recommend things to Julie Dolan, etc. Prof. Mulvey stated that action items could be presented to the AC in the fall and then followed up with a survey in a few years.

Prof. Langran stated that she could not speak for the ETC in the fall, but welcomed the invitation to draft language to come to the AC. Prof. Langran stated that the ETC wanted to introduce the AC to these items, get its feedback, and provide the opportunity for questions. Prof. Langran stated that the survey data should receive attention and the ETC should engage further with the AC to think creatively about resources, positions, and support.
Prof. Shea raised a concern about the mechanisms for on-going feedback and suggestions since the survey is a moving target. Prof. Shea asked if there were any suggestions as to how the AC could facilitate getting feedback to the ETC. Prof. Shea stated that she was following up on Prof. DeWitt’s recommendation that the ETC determine costs of positions, but strongly suggested that decisions in these areas impacted our ability to deliver education to students.

Prof. Langran stated that half of the respondents to the survey, particularly adjuncts did not know who their ETC representative was. Prof. Langran stated that the ETC can improve on this. Prof. Langran stated that everything that comes to ETC is put on the agenda for discussion.

Prof. Mulvey stated that the adjunct issue is crucial and this information should come from their chairs since it is unrealistic to expect the ETC to be the link to adjuncts.

Prof. Preli thanked the ETC for its good work.

**MOTION [DeWitt/Walker]: To reorder the agenda to take up item 7.e next.**

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

### 7.e. Proposal from CUC to close University College

Prof. Campbell, Chair, Committee on University College, referred the AC to the six motions listed on p. 64 of the packet that, taken together, will close the UC and move it into CAS and DSB. Prof. Campbell stated that there were several issues that need to be worked out and if agreement on organizational structure could be reached first, then the others could follow. Prof. Campbell referred the AC to the meeting minutes for the EPC which unanimously approved the motions to close the UC and to the material on pp. 79-126 from the CUC.

Associate Dean Perkus referred the AC to p. 80 of the AC packet. Associate Dean Perkus stated that this material includes analysis of what UC includes and assessment of what is working well and what is not. Associate Dean Perkus stated that the UC’s initial framing is no longer applicable and the UC should be integrated into other areas. Associate Dean Perkus stated that the Associate of Arts degree is no longer offered; and 12 students are graduating while 50 to 60 others are non-matriculating or are matriculating in other schools. Associate Dean Perkus stated that the student population is trending younger each year with 70% under 28 years old and half taking day courses; working adults are not part of this population while other students are taking advantage of the UC. Associate Dean Perkus stated that the justification for the UC is no longer there. Associate Dean Perkus stated that there was a proposal to no longer offer the Bachelor of Professional Studies degree but that degree is still being offered, and the goal is not to stop serving part-time students. Associate Dean Perkus stated that the motions are to close the administrative structure of the UC.
Prof. Campbell referred to pp. 84-85 of the packet for a summary of recent events and then p. 86 for implementation of the motions.

Acting Dean of UC Crabtree commended the CUC for their work. Dean Crabtree referred to Phase 0 on p. 88 of the packet that starts the process of closing the UC, the most significant phase that, if AC and GF support it, will enable a review of academic policies to begin next year. Dean Crabtree referred to Appendix A on pp. 96-97 that identifies issues to be reviewed by faculty committees and the administration. Dean Crabtree stated that there were inconsistent financial policies regarding the UC to figure out; and the UCC has been briefed on what is coming their way as well as to other school’s curriculum committees. Dean Crabtree stated that current UC students would be protected and given the same high level of service and will be supported to integrate further into existing schools.

Prof. Campbell then asked if the AC had questions.

Prof. Hodgson stated that voting to close the UC and then considering the policy changes in Phase 2 seems to be doing things in the wrong order and could cause problems since, with the UC closed, it would be unclear what the policies would be, so some students could be grandfathered in, but there would be no policies for new students. Prof. Hodgson asked if it is going to be viable to close UC, make new rules, and have an on-going influx of new students to UC?

Dean Crabtree stated that it is the conundrum of this work regarding discussing each program in turn and then the UC as a whole. Dean Crabtree stated that some students are already integrated into CAS and DSB. Dean Crabtree stated that some policies are administrative and will be developed in dialogue with faculty committees. Dean Crabtree stated that the real question is the core curriculum, and that the DSB is sending a revised core to the UCC. Dean Crabtree stated that the UCC could discuss a modified core for UC students. Dean Crabtree stated that programs for particular markets are important.

Prof. Campbell referred the AC to the fixed timeline in the packet.

Prof. Hodgson asked if there is some need for some decisions? Prof. Hodgson stated that making policy decisions under old UC rules is a policy decision.

Dean Crabtree stated that UC decisions have been ad hoc and not subject to review. Dean Crabtree stated that the CUC acted in the interest of students and in maintaining a position in the market. Dean Crabtree stated we should hold our noses and jump into the deep end, and trust that the process will work out and that the committees can substantively and expeditiously look at these policies.

Prof. Mulvey stated that these motions must go to the GF and they need to be ready to go in a rigorous way which makes it inappropriate for the AC to vote on them at this meeting. Prof. Mulvey stated that it may be better to expedite this matter for the fall when the portion of the AC packet on these motions can be sent the incoming members of the AC for next year and they can
contact Dean Crabtree and Prof. Campbell with any questions. Prof. Mulvey recommended putting this on the AC agenda in fall and, ideally, to the GF in October.

SVP Fitzgerald thanked Prof. Campbell and the CUC. SVP Fitzgerald stated that Fairfield has a reputation as a high quality institution that puts efforts into high quality faculty and programs. SVP Fitzgerald stated that the issue is not trying to make extra money by letting students in the back door, but letting others in the front door. SVP Fitzgerald referred to closing the Associate of Arts degree, Prof. Bayne’s exploration of Liberal Studies Masters program, and interest in a Masters in Public Administration Program. SVP Fitzgerald stated that there should be a focus on quality for the future.

Prof. Lyon stated that the easiest way to dissolve the programs is to stop admitting students.

Associate Dean Perkus stated that each student is treated on a case-by-case level, and closing UC is not to discontinue part-time studies, so the best solution is not to stop admitting part-time students since the intent is not to stop serving part-time students.

Prof. DeWitt stated that he had a number of questions, starting on p. 77 at the bottom, asking if the financial information on p. 102 under D came from VP Dolan.

Prof. Campbell stated that the information was from VP Dolan.

Dean Crabtree stated that information from VP Dolan was unclear as to whether or not the UC was profitable.

Prof. DeWitt noted the bottom of page 77 of the packet, where there is a reference that the CUC would be asking VP Dolan to provide a clearer explanation of the financial picture for University College. He asked if this clarification was included in the packet. Prof. Campbell replied that it was not.

Prof. Bayne referred to the list of Jesuit schools with models for dealing with similar programs and the information on p. 119 asking if the information in brackets is undergraduate enrollments.

Prof. Campbell responded yes.

Prof Bayne noted that a number of schools on this list with undergraduate enrollments similar to ours used the same model as our University College, and inquired as to whether the committee investigated how this model was working at these institutions.

Prof. Campbell responded no.

Prof. Ligas asked if we would be losing some of these students to other programs?

Dean Crabtree responded that it was not clear how UC got permission to market as a distinct entity which makes marketing very confusing given the focus on marketing the entire University. Dean Crabtree stated that part-time students do not care what school, but rather what degree
program in which they want to study. Dean Crabtree stated that students get degrees from the CAS and DSB, not from the UC, which get revenues, credits, and resources from those tuitions. Dean Crabtree sees it as a disservice to the university to market the UC separately.

Dean Solomon thanked the CUC and Prof. Campbell for their work and urged the AC to treat this proposal with some urgency since some things need to get resolved for students and the University. Dean Solomon stated that continuing undergraduates transfer out their senior year to UC to save on tuition and this can only be resolved on an organizational level and the other issue is financial. Dean Solomon stated that there are other issues such as the core and with a lot of work to be done, it is better to move forward.

Prof. Bayers asked what closing UC officially meant for admission rates.

SVP Fitzgerald stated that we need to apply the same standards for admissions to part-time and non-traditional students as we do for full-time students.

Prof. Walker stated that it seems to be an issue in flux and that more things are coming in the future so we need to get more clarity on these issues.

MOTION [Walker/Rakowitz]: To delay consideration of this until the first meeting of September.

Prof. Mulvey spoke in favor of the motion, reiterating that all questions and answers need to be thoroughly answered and documented as this goes forward to the GF.

Prof. DeWitt spoke against the motion since the AC already set aside the following Monday for an additional meeting to finish our work for this year. He stated that while he would rather there not be a vote on this until the fall, the AC should recess and then reconvene next Monday and continue our work on this.

Prof. Greenberg spoke against the motion, stating that administrators have summer, but faculty do not and it should not be expected that these issues will be clearer in the fall.

Dean Crabtree spoke against the motion, stating that the desire to have answers to questions is a sound impulse, yet questions can be referred to committees for whom this is their business. Dean Crabtree stated that these questions can be sent to the other committees after agreement that the UC is closed.

Prof. Mulvey spoke in favor of the motion, stating that it is premature for the AC to vote this year on a complex issue for several reasons, not least of all that is it essential for the issue to be ready for the GF and to go smoothly at the GF.

Prof. Hodgson spoke in favor of the motion since another meeting will not necessarily speed up the process given the complexity of the issues that need to be presented to the GF.

Prof. Preli asked if the AC was prepared to vote on the motion.
Prof. DeWitt asked if it is our understanding that if we approve the motion, then the AC will not discuss this any further this year?

Prof. Preli stated yes, approval of the motion will end discussion of this for this year.

Prof. Greenberg asked if this is a motion to table.

Prof. DeWitt noted that a motion to table this would be out of order, and this should be considered a motion to postpone consideration of this matter. Such a motion requires a majority vote.

**MOTION PASSED** 8 in favor, 5 opposed, 2 abstentions.

Dean Crabtree expressed her interest in hearing from people, what questions they want answered, and the modified packet they want to see in order to avoid spending next year doing this.

Prof. Mulvey stated that she is happy to work with Dean Crabtree over the summer.

Prof. DeWitt noted that the Council still has a number of items to deal with, and suggested we recess and reconvene the meeting.

**MOTION [DeWitt/Bayne]: To recess this meeting and reconvene next Monday, 3:30 to 5:00.**

In answer to a question, Prof. Mulvey noted that a motion to recess is not debatable.

**MOTION FAILED** 3 in favor, 10 opposed, 2 abstentions.

**MOTION [Fitzgerald/Rakowitz]: To adjourn.**

**MOTION PASSES** 12 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention.

Meeting adjourned at 5:02 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jocelyn M. Boryczka
Associate Professor of Politics
Director of Peace & Justice Studies
MEMO

To: Academic Council
From: Academic Council Executive Committee
Date: 9/1/11
Re: Academic Council Meeting Dates and Roster for 2011-2012

Below are the regular Monday meeting dates for the Council for 2011-2012, and two other suggested (tentative) dates. As required by the Faculty Handbook, the dates listed as tentative will need to be approved by the Council.

Meeting Dates for 2011-2012: All meetings are on Mondays from 3:30 PM to 5:00 PM; location TBD.
September 12
October 3
November 7
December 5
February 6
March 5
April 2
April 16 (tentative)
April 30 (tentative; alternative to May 7 date)

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jocelyn Boryczka</td>
<td>Behavioral and Social Sciences</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Greenberg</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences at large</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Rakowitz</td>
<td>Behavioral and Social Sciences</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td>Dolan School of Business</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona Preli</td>
<td>Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Hodgson*</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences at large</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Zera</td>
<td>Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Strauss</td>
<td>Dolan School of Business</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Keenan</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences at large</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Lane</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences at large</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Petrino</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Bayne</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Walker</td>
<td>Natural Science/Mathematics/Engineering</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Shea</td>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Tromley</td>
<td>Dolan School of Business</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Dennin</td>
<td>Natural Science/Mathematics/Engineering</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Fitzgerald, S.J.</td>
<td>Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
<td>ex officio vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbin Crabtree</td>
<td>Dean, College of Arts and Sciences; Acting Dean, University College</td>
<td>ex officio no vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Campbell</td>
<td>Dean, School of Nursing</td>
<td>ex officio no vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Gibson</td>
<td>Dean, Dolan School of Business</td>
<td>ex officio no vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Beal</td>
<td>Dean, School of Engineering</td>
<td>ex officio no vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Franzosa</td>
<td>Dean, Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions</td>
<td>ex officio no vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Mulvey</td>
<td>Secretary of the General Faculty</td>
<td>ex officio vote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHAIR:
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY:
*2011-12 replaced by
MEMO

To: Academic Council
From: Academic Council Executive Committee
Date: 9/1/11
Re: Academic Council Minutes

Below are guidelines for taking minutes of Academic Council meetings, drawn from requirements in the *Faculty Handbook* and Journal of Record, and on what has worked well in the past.

1. The *Faculty Handbook* specifies that the Council minutes “shall indicate the votes of members (i.e., tally or roll call) as well as major proposals and their proponents and opponents.” Most votes on the Council are taken by tally, in which case the total number of votes for and against need to be recorded in the minutes. If a roll call vote is taken, the name of each Council member voting in favor and against need to be recorded in the minutes.

2. As stated in the *Handbook*, “the Academic Council shall be the executive arm of the General Faculty. As such, it is empowered to consider, make decisions and make recommendations on any matter of academic concern that falls within the purview of the faculty, except for matters specifically reserved to the General Faculty. It shall also provide the opportunity for exchange of opinion between faculty and administration in the ordinary working of the University.” It is important that accurate minutes be recorded, as the Academic Council minutes are generally the only way that faculty will know what the Council has done on their behalf, and why it was done.

3. The *Handbook* also specifies that records of *Handbook* committees contain minority as well as majority opinion. This has been a good practice for Council minutes as well, and Council minutes should continue to follow this practice.

4. The Journal of Record (1/22/68) requires that “the gist of all communications to the Academic Council be published in the Council minutes.” The communications themselves, including committee reports, documentation, etc. are included in the agenda and packet distributed before every meeting, copies of which are maintained by the General Faculty Secretary.

5. The Council acts by voting on motions. To avoid misunderstandings at a later date, it is essential that the exact wording of a motion be known before the Council votes and that the exact wording be recorded in the minutes.
6. To facilitate consultation of the minutes:
   a. In the minutes, number the agenda items exactly as the items are numbered on the agenda for that meeting.
   b. Write the complete date of the meeting on each page in a footer, and include page numbers.
   c. Provide a separate boldface caption for each agenda item.
   d. Place each motion in an indented and boldface paragraph, and indicate in boldface the result of any vote on the motion.

7. The *Faculty Handbook* specifies that “the Recording Secretary shall be responsible for the preparation of the minutes in consultation with the Executive Secretary.” Minutes should be prepared as soon as possible after the meeting, ideally within one week. The minutes should be clearly labeled as draft minutes, and forwarded to the Council’s Executive Secretary. The Recording Secretary is not responsible for distributing the minutes. The Executive Secretary may send draft minutes or excerpts of draft minutes to subcommittees or the faculty. Once the Council approves the minutes, the Executive Secretary is responsible for “distributing Council-approved minutes to all members of the General Faculty.”
MEMO

To: Paul Fitzgerald, S.J., Sr. VP for Academic Affairs
From: Rick DeWitt, Academic Council Executive Secretary
Date: 6/7/11
Re: Changes to the Journal of Record re entry on Student Evaluation of Teaching
Cc: Rona Preli (AC Chair), Irene Mulvey (GFS)

Dear Paul,

At the Academic Council meeting of 5/2/11, the Council passed the following motion:

**MOTION:** That the Council approve the changes to the Journal of Record entry on Student Evaluation of Teaching as shown on page 28 of the packet for the Academic Council meeting of 5/2/11.

**MOTION PASSED** 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

Copied below and attached to this email are (i) the page from the 5/2/11 AC packet referred to in the motion, and (ii) an excerpt from the draft minutes of the 5/2/11 AC meeting. In keeping with policies in the JOR, I am forwarding this to you on behalf of the Council. As you know, you have 15 calendar days in which to respond to the Council with your approval or objection.

As always, if there is any additional information I can provide, please let me know.

Regards,
Rick

[Included in the original memo: (i) Page 28 of packet of AC meeting of 5/2/11, referred to in the motion and containing the language for the JOR, and (ii) excerpt from draft minutes of 5/2/11 AC meeting re Student Evaluation of Teaching.]
[For Item 3.b.iv.]

From: Paul Fitzgerald [pfitzgerald@fairfield.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2011 8:48 AM
To: Richard DeWitt
Cc: 'Preli, Rona'; 'Mulvey, Irene'
Subject: Re: Administrative approval of changes to the JOR re Student Evaluation of Teaching

Dear Rick,

I am pleased to accept and approve the motion of the Academic Council changing the Journal of Record entry on Student Evaluation of Teaching as shown on page 28 of the packet for the 5/2/11 meeting of the AC.

Sincerely yours,

Paul

--
Rev. Paul J. Fitzgerald, S.J.
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
Fairfield University
1073 North Benson Road
Fairfield, CT 06824-5195
Tel: (203) 254 4000 ext. 2778
Fax: (203) 254 4291
pfitzgerald@fairfield.edu
MEMO

To:       Paul Fitzgerald, S.J., Sr. VP for Academic Affairs

From:    Rick DeWitt, Academic Council Executive Secretary

Date:   6/7/11

Re:       Language for the Journal of Record re Closing the MS Taxation Program

Cc:        Rona Preli (AC Chair), Irene Mulvey (GFS)

Dear Paul,

At the Academic Council meeting of 5/9/11, the Council passed the following motion:

MOTION: That the AC approve dissolution of the M.S. Program in Taxation at the end of 3 years or when the current students in the program finish, whichever occurs first.

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

Copied below and attached to this email is an excerpt from the draft minutes of the 5/9/11 AC meeting containing the Council’s discussion of this item. Should this receive administrative approval, an entry noting the closing of the MS Taxation Program will be recorded in the Journal of Record. In keeping with policies in the JOR, I am forwarding this to you on behalf of the Council. As you know, you have 15 calendar days in which to respond to the Council with your approval or objection.

As always, if there is any additional information I can provide, please let me know.

Regards,

Rick

[Included in original memo: excerpt from draft minutes of AC meeting of 5/9/11 re closing of MS Taxation Program.]
Dear Rick,

I am pleased to accept and approve the motion of the Academic Council to close the MS Tax Program as stated in the minutes of the 5/9/11 meeting.

Sincerely yours,

Paul

---
Rev. Paul J. Fitzgerald, S.J.
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
Fairfield University
1073 North Benson Road
Fairfield, CT 06824-5195
Tel: (203) 254 4000 ext. 2778
Fax: (203) 254 4291
pfitzgerald@fairfield.edu
[For Item 7.g.]
To: Academic Council
From: Hugh Humphrey, Phil Lane, Curt Naser
RE: Sabbatical for Billy Weitzer
DATE: 8/28/2011

President von Arx recently announced changes to the senior management, including a new “Senior Vice President for Strategic Initiatives,” for which there will be a search conducted to fill this new position. The areas of responsibility cover in part those areas that had been described in the past for the Executive Vice President Billy Weitzer, yet the Executive Vice President has been granted an unprecedented year long sabbatical. There is no mention in President von Arx’s memo of the position of the Executive Vice President.

A number of faculty find the granting of a sabbatical to a senior administrator who does not have faculty rank to be troubling. The University has no extant policy or precedent for such a sabbatical, and at a very troubled fiscal time for the University, it seems on the face of it to be irresponsible to grant a paid leave to one of its highest paid administrators. It is even more troubling to find out that the position of the Executive Vice President no longer exists. That would imply that there is no job for Dr. Weitzer to return to.

One has to assume that because this was named by President von Arx as a “sabbatical”, that Dr. Weitzer will enjoy full pay for this coming year and has a promised position to return to. But that position no longer appears to exist. So we are naturally puzzled as to whether this is really a sabbatical or something else entirely.

Given the unprecedented nature of this decision, the lack of formal policy guiding it, the apparent fact that we are paying a very high salary to an administrator to do research in a job that has no research expectations in a time of serious fiscal constraint, and the apparent contradiction between the two announcements by the President, we believe that it is appropriate for the Academic Council to seek direct clarification on a number of questions:

1) Has the University committed to Dr. Weitzer that he will resume a similar or equivalent job at the end of his one year “sabbatical”?

2) Is Dr. Weitzer receiving full pay during the coming year?

3) EVP Weitzer has been involved in many aspects of the University’s strategic plan, much of which directly involves faculty. Why would the person responsible for shepherding this complex work be suddenly granted a year’s sabbatical when so much of that work is yet to be done?

4) The University has a five year accreditation report due to NEASC this year, and the NEASC report clearly involves matters under faculty purview. Mr. Weitzer has been preparing for that report, in part through the work of the University Assessment Committee. This seems like a very odd time for the person charged with the responsibility to manage the report to NEASC to be granted an unprecedented sabbatical.
5) Respecting Fairfield’s Mission Statement is clearly a legitimate faculty concern. The University is in a difficult fiscal situation. The University recently announced to the faculty and staff that due to a severe budget shortfall consequent upon the failure to reach target enrollments, that a special retirement incentive program for administrators and staff is being offered. Should insufficient numbers of administrators and staff take this offer, layoffs are quite possible. Fairfield’s Mission Statement states that Fairfield “seeks to develop a greater sense of community within itself, a sense that all of its members belong to and are involved in the University, sharing common goals and a common commitment to truth and justice, and manifesting in their lives the common concern for others which is the obligation of all educated, mature human beings.” In light of this, how can the University, in the midst of such budgetary difficulties, justify having one of its most highly paid administrators take a sabbatical? That salary would no doubt save 2, 3, 4, maybe 5 staff positions. How is it consistent with our Mission Statement for the staff to face the threat of layoffs when a senior administrator can enjoy an unprecedented sabbatical?

6) Admissions is an area clearly under faculty purview, and given trends, an area that should be of great concern. The failure to meet target enrollment this year follows upon a steady decline in a number of measures of institutional health and effectiveness. The admission yield rate (the percentage of students Fairfield has accepted who then accept us) is one of the most central of the admissions figures. Making one’s class (and meeting budget targets) and yield rates are like stock prices to a business. These are fundamental indicators of the health and effectiveness of the institution. In 2004 our yield rate fell below 20% (from a high above 50% in the 1970’s), and it has fallen steadily since, reaching all time lows in the past few years of 15%. This places Fairfield last compared to institutions such as Sacred Heart, St. Peter’s, St. Joseph’s, Scranton, University of Connecticut, Santa Clara, Quinnipiac, Loyola Maryland, and most (maybe all) other similar institutions. Financial aid planning this past year failed to turn these trends around. In the face of such data, how can the administration justify providing a senior and highly paid administrator with a sabbatical?

We suggest the following motion for the Council’s consideration:

MOTION: The Academic Council directs the Academic Council Executive Committee to write the President requesting clarification and reasoning behind the granting of an unprecedented administrative sabbatical for the Executive Vice President, including the question of whether Mr. Weitzer has the option to return to his post as Executive Vice President or some other similar position at Fairfield, whether this is a paid sabbatical, and what the expected return to the University is on this extraordinary investment.

Thank you for your consideration,

Hugh Humphrey, Religious Studies
Phil Lane, Economics
Curt Naser, Philosophy
[For Item 6.a.]

Date: April 20, 2011

To: Academic Council

From: Gerard Campbell
Chair, Committee on University College

Subject: Request for Academic Council to consider Motion to Close University College

As Chair of the Committee on University College (CUC), I am hereby requesting that Academic Council consider the six-part motion shown below.

Motion:

I. That University College (UC) be closed officially, with plans for degree completion or transition for all current UC students.

II. That each degree-granting program currently housed in UC be transferred to the academic school where its curriculum and faculty reside. The Bachelor of Professional Studies (BPS) should be considered by both CAS and DSB, and these schools should make recommendations concerning the continuation or closure of the BPS degree program.

III. That CAS and DSB begin consideration of the best school-based administrative and support structures for part-time for-credit and degree-granting programs and students.

IV. That the administration and faculty work to develop Continuing Studies as a distinct administrative unit (i.e., a “Center for Continuing Studies”) for non-credit and enrichment programs only. This unit should be focused on entrepreneurial program development, marketing, and delivery in collaboration with the academic schools.

V. That the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) begin reviewing all academic policies related to part-time students and their degree programs.

VI. That, at the time University College is closed officially and after all related restructuring is completed, the CUC be reconfigured as appropriate and recommended by the Academic Council.

This six-part motion was initiated by the CUC, where it was unanimously approved at our meeting on 3/10/11. The motion was approved by the UCC at their 4/5/11 meeting, with a vote of 11 for, 1 against, and 1 abstention. The motion was also approved unanimously by the EPC at their 4/14/11 meeting.
Subsequent pages of this packet include the following supporting materials:
[Corresponding pages for the 9/12/11 AC packet are shown in brackets.]

pages 2-3 [32-34]: relevant excerpts from the 4/14/11 meeting of the EPC
pages 4-8 [35-40]: relevant excerpts from the 4/5/11 meeting of the UCC
pages 9-12 [41-45]: relevant excerpts from the 3/10/11 meeting of the CUC
pages 13-51 [46-92]: original motion packet.

Please let me know if you would like me to provide anything else at this time.
Attending: Profs. S. Bachelor, C. Gannett, M. Pagano, S. Phelan, C. Scheraga, C. Staecker, J. Yarrington (chair)

Regrets & excused absences: Profs S. Franzosa, S. Grossman, W. Kohli, N. Solomon and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs P. Fitzgerald.

#6: Discussion of Motions from the CUC (Deans R. Crabtree and A. Perkus and Prof. G. Campbell visiting)

Prof Campbell presented a revised packet, highlighted some changes from the previous document:

On page 1 an abstract was added. Following is a new section presenting the background on UC. An additional new section follows with a summary of recent events related to the present motion. The motion is presented in six parts, which are to be considered together as a single motion. Also the timeline for future action has been revised and rephrased.

Dean Crabtree reiterated her gratefulness to CUC and UCC and EPC- all have worked very hard, and this has been a model of shared governance. It has been a very collaborative and supportive process. Dean Crabtree met with Prof N. Solomon, who raised the issue that the Dolan School of Business likely has no interest in the BPS program, and is concerned about the official recommendation that they consider it. Dean Crabtree responded that this is only a recommendation, so the DSB and its curriculum committee could decide to follow it or not, or to consider the question fairly expeditiously.

Dean Perkus stated that the joint meeting with AC and EPC was very helpful and helped to shape the new background section.

Prof Staecker asked a question regarding Motion part IV: has the university already decided that it wants to be in the market of continuing education? Have we addressed the fundamental question of whether or not any non-degree non-credit programs should exist at all?

Dean Crabtree responded that we have not yet done much market research on this. SVPAA Fitzgerald envisions a three stage process. First, some existing non-credit programs will continue in new homes at Fairfield. Then a consultant might be hired to do a complete market analysis. Based on this analysis, further decisions about structures, staffing, and programs could be made. They have some information that the market is in decline, but they need more research.

Prof Pagano asked regarding Motion part V: why the UCC rather than EPC? Dean Crabtree responded that academic policies are the purview of the UCC. Many of these issues will be UCC decisions, some will be UCC recommendations. Other committees should be involved in consultation. Prof Campbell added that Appendix A of the document details the committee
routing procedure. Dean Crabtree continued, stating that this can be complicated. For the non-credit non-degree programs, the faculty has interest but not necessarily purview. Most UC policies have never been approved by the faculty, or were approved under now-obsolete governance structures. All of these things will need to be reviewed and decided through various consultations with and approvals by the faculty of the schools, the UCC, and the school deans. Prof Yarrington stated that this is a very nice revision of the document, very clear and clean. Committee members voiced agreement.

Dean Crabtree said that the UCC has been briefed on the progress of the motion at least 3 times this year, most recently to alert them to potential new agenda items for next year.

Prof Phelan said that the document analysis is clear, but I agree with Prof. Staecker that the market analysis needs to be done. A specific question: What body will be overseeing the outlined plan phases?

Dean Crabtree answered that the CUC will handle most aspects. She will recommend that the CUC should not be dissolved until at least a year after the closure of UC, to ensure that things are properly wrapped up. But this will be the Academic Council’s decision, and probably discussed extensively by the Committee on Committees. It will be the SVPAA decision what to do with the non-credit non-degree programs, the school deans will be responsible for phases involving their colleges, as will the school curriculum committees and departments, as appropriate. The UC staff are aware of how various positions will be phased out of UC and hopefully phased into other institutional structures. Associate Dean Perkus added that they expect the CUC to be busy throughout the entire process.

Prof Yarrington asked what will happen to the physical offices in Dolan. Dean Crabtree responded that hopefully within a year, the UC staff will be physically integrated with their new departments. They should not stay separated from the rest of the campus. But this is an issue for others at the university to decide.

Visitors left the meeting, and Prof Scheraga moved the six-part motion. The motion was seconded by Prof. Bachelor.

Prof Bachelor voiced support for the motion citing the reasons enumerated in the packet. He was already in favor of the plan, and the revised document clarifies the rationale. Prof Scheraga also I supported the motion, but is concerned that no marketing research has been done to assess the demographic. If there is no demographic, then the program will collapse. Typically at this stage in the planning of such a program we would already know that there is a clientele. Associate Dean Perkus and SVPAA Fitzgerald seem to have searched for a clientele but have not found it.

Prof Scheraga also referenced Associate Dean Perkus' statements concerning how the UC demographic has changed. This must be either because the mission has drifted, or because the original market no longer exists. Prof Gannett offered that motion part IV needs to be interpreted as including serious market research. Prof Yarrington said that in spite of this, the motion is still a good idea- certainly many overhead costs need to be trimmed. She likes the idea of continuing these programs and sharing the revenues with the departments. Prof Gannett reiterated that it is
consistent with the mission of the university to offer these programs, but they need to work financially. She asked how the departments will get support and resources to administer these programs. Prof Scheraga said that the plan seems to be "build it and they will come". Once we start receiving extra revenue from these programs, the burden on the faculty will be lifted. Prof Yarrington added that the integration of these programs into the colleges with more faculty oversight will be great.

Prof Scheraga called the question.

The motion is unanimously approved by those in attendance, and one vote to approve is registered by proxy from Prof. S. Grossman.
Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Meeting  
April 5, 2011  
3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.  
Dimenna-Nyselius Library Conference Room  
Excerpt from Minutes

Present:  Robbin Crabtree, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and UC interim Dean, Mousumi Bose Godbole, Bob Epstein, Manyul Im (Chair), Jerelyn Johnson, Alison Kris, Scott Lacy, John Miecznikowski, Aaron Perkus, Elizabeth Petrino, Katsiaryna (Katya) Salavei, Les Schaffer, Roxana Walker-Canton, Tommy Xie, Qin Zhang, Gerry Campbell (Guest), Maggie Wills (Guest), Kathy Nantz (Guest)

Excused:  Giovanni Ruffini

4. Approve Committee on University College Motions (Gerry Campbell in attendance)

The Chair invited Prof. Campbell, Chair of the Committee on University College (CUC) to speak to the UCC.  Prof. Campbell mentioned that Dean Crabtree, Aaron Perkus, and he prepared the packet that was prepared for today’s UCC meeting.

Campbell gave an overview of the packet, which contained a six-part motion reflecting a recommendation from the CUC to close University College and relocate its programs as follows:

- Part-time degree programs would be moved to the schools (CAS & DSB), after thorough consideration by school curriculum committees, UCC and other relevant parties.

- Non-credit, non-degree programs would be moved to a newly-established Center for Continuing Studies, which would be a distinct administrative unit.

Campbell stated that if the UCC approves the motions to close University College, the motions will subsequently be considered by the Educational Planning Committee, followed by Academic Council, followed by the Faculty of Fairfield University.

Perkus began to review the packet and discussed pages 2-4 in the packet.  He described the history of University College.  He stated that “University College is an open and rolling admissions portal for both credit and non-credit courses and programs, including any of the baccalaureate programs, at Fairfield University.  There are no admissions criteria other than evidence of a completed high school degree (or equivalent). Credit students come to take courses for personal enrichment, to fulfill prerequisites, or to matriculate into degree programs. Once a student has completed 12 credits over two semesters, s/he is eligible to apply for full matriculation into any major at Fairfield. That is, after successful completing of 12 credits, a student can either do a “change of school” into Arts and Sciences or Dolan School of Business and pursue fulltime study (with the regular core requirements and under policies for all regular full-time students) or stay within University College (either fulltime or part-time) and complete
any of the degrees in the two previously mentioned colleges with a modified core, reduced tuition schedule, and a combination of day, evening and online courses. The only degree that University College grants is the Bachelors of Professional Studies (BA/BS).” Any part time student is considered a UCC student. Perkus stated that the population of students in University College is shrinking.

Perkus then commented “the way it is currently configured, University College presents a liability for the University. As a stand-alone college, it has a dean, an associate dean, a director of distance education and new program development, a full-time academic advisor, a full-time program development specialist for non-credit and special programs, and two full-time administrative staff members. There has been no growth in the non-credit areas for several years (and the current programs have cleared little profit), and much of the enrollment in the credit area is either generated from “special” semesters (summer, winter, March intersession) or from serving populations already being served by academic departments (day course takers, students in several majors). While the online formatting of courses has generated substantial revenue over the past 10 years, there is nothing about that format that necessitates it remain within a University College structure. It is clear from the data that there is insufficient market demand to continue to support a school structure in this area. At the same time, there is evidence that there is ongoing market potential for programming to serve populations seeking enrichment, non-degree career development, post-baccalaureate certificates of academic specialization, and other continuing studies engagements.”

Campbell then outlined a summary of recent events related to the recommendation to close University College. Specifically, he highlighted a series of events that have transpired since September 2010 (pages 5 and 6 in the packet).

**September 2010**

- The CUC convenes, and the SVPAA addresses the committee, expressing concerns related to quality and efficiency in the delivery of UC programs.
- Acting Dean Crabtree presents an outline of issues produced by the summer administrative task forces and proposes a process designed to lead to the closing of University College and the integration of its programs into the schools (CAS & DSB).

**October – December 2010**

- After moving to close the Associate of Arts degree program in UC, the CUC departs from the steps outlined by the administrative task forces to look at the “big picture” regarding the future of UC.
- Alternative organizational structures are considered based on a review of those seen at other Jesuit universities. The alternative structures are as follows:
### Model A
Separate School  
(e.g. Fairfield)

### Model B
Distinctive Centers  
(e.g. Xavier)

### Model C
Distributed Model  
(e.g. Seattle)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model A</th>
<th>Model B</th>
<th>Model C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part-time degree</td>
<td>In University College</td>
<td>Center for Part-time Studies</td>
<td>integrated in schools (e.g., CAS, DSB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-credit, non-</td>
<td>In University College</td>
<td>Center for Continuing Studies</td>
<td>integrated in schools (e.g., CAS, DSB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degree programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Dean, Associate Dean</td>
<td>Director for each center</td>
<td>Responsibilities handled by school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>administrators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A joint meeting is held between the CUC, the EPC and the Academic Council Executive Committee to obtain inputs on the types of information that the CUC should include with any proposal it might produce.

**January – February 2011**

- The CUC discusses alternative structures, and eventually a consensus emerges for a structure that falls between models B and C, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Recommended Structure</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part-time degree</td>
<td>integrated in schools (e.g., CAS, DSB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-credit, non-degree programs</td>
<td>Center for Continuing Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Part-time programs integrated with school administration; Director for Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The CUC drafts a proposal for the recommended structure, including background information, a six-part motion, and data on University College.

Campbell then reviewed the six-part motion (included below). He stated that the six-part motion provides a structure but omits many details.

**Motion:**

**I.** The CUC recommends that University College (UC) be closed officially, with plans for degree completion or transition for all current UC students.

**II.** The CUC recommends that each degree-granting program currently housed in UC be transferred to the academic school where its curriculum and faculty reside. The Bachelor of Professional Studies (BPS) should be considered by both CAS and DSB,
and these schools should make recommendations concerning the continuation or closure of the BPS degree program.

III. The CUC recommends that CAS and DSB begin consideration of the best school-based administrative and support structures for part-time for-credit and degree-granting programs and students.

IV. The CUC recommends that the administration and faculty work to develop Continuing Studies as a distinct administrative unit (i.e., a “Center for Continuing Studies”) for non-credit and enrichment programs only. This unit should be focused on entrepreneurial program development, marketing, and delivery in collaboration with the academic schools.

V. The CUC recommends that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) begin reviewing all academic policies related to part-time students and their degree programs.

VI. The CUC recommends that, at the time University College is closed officially and after all related restructuring is completed, the CUC be reconfigured as appropriate and recommended by the Academic Council.

Crabtree commented that there has been a mission drift in UC; administrative structure of unit has changed. Perkus and his staff have been very diligent in asking studies to matriculate. She mentioned that all of the current students in UC will be shepherded along with care so that they can complete their degree. There is more work to be done with regards to the closing of UC and most of the work will be done in school curriculum committees. She stated if these motions passed on all the levels, the UCC the DSB Curriculum Committee and ASCC will all have business to do in the future. If the motions passed, the CUC can continue to do its work and advise programs.

The Chair then opened the floor for questions.

Salavei asked why the population of traditional students is shrinking?

Perkus responded that there isn’t a large population interested in taking one or two courses at a time in the evening. A typical UCC student is taking day and evening courses and on-line courses. Seventy percent of students are thirty years old or less. We have a healthy number of UCC students who are older than thirty, but this does not justify own college. Crabtree mentioned that local businesses are not reimbursing students for taking classes as often as in the past.

Xie stated a large portion of UCC students will be going to DSB and CAS. Do Faculty in these schools have experience dealing with part-time students?

Crabtree responded that Faculty have always been teaching part-time students. The Dean’s office has been communicating with UC students. Beth Boquet’s office works well with
this population. Most of the UC students are majoring in Communication, English, Accounting, and Marketing. Other programs have 2-3 students, perhaps because these students do not offer consistent evening courses. The UC staff will be realigned into DSB and CAS.

Xie then asked if the transition will make the academic career for UC students more challenging?

Perkus responded that current UC students will be treated with great care and consideration every step in the way. Crabtree commented that from SVPAA’s perspective, UC students should have same high quality classes that are available to full-time students.

Zhang asked, in the future, will there be a tuition discount for part-time students?

Perkus responded that no decisions have been made as to how much part-time students will pay in tuition.

Zhang then asked if new students still being admitted now to UCC?

Crabtree responded that they will be admitted until the Faculty approve the changes. She then asked what is a part-time course worth? The Curriculum Committees need to have deeper discussions on this.

Schaffer then stated we have had several high quality students enrolled in UC in Physics. If we are going to approve all of the motions, what savings will be accrued?

Crabtree responded that the closing of UC will save about $250,000 per year in administrative structure.

The Chair asked, what is a non-credit program? What makes a program non-credit?

Dean Crabtree reviewed the non-credit programs and credit programs on page 19 of the packet. The non-credit programs are needed for another program.

The Chair asked how do you integrate a non-credit student into a credit course?

Crabtree responded that the rule is that the faculty member has to approve of the student being in the class.

Johnson asked if courses will still be offered in the summer and for enrichment?

Crabtree responded that the Department of Modern Languages is well poised. The Departments will be incentivized to offer courses in the summer and for enrichment. Academic departments need to be given more control over revenues.

Schaffer commented that right now there is open enrollment in UC, and some students take 1-2 courses at first.
Crabtree responded that UCC should look into the open enrollment aspect.

Walker-Canton asked how many students are enrolled in UC and what kind of resources are needed for faculty?

Perkus responded that right now UC offers evening courses in the Fall and Spring. There are 195 degree seeking students in UC. Most of the students are seeking a Bachelor of Professional studies. Other popular majors are Communication, English, Accounting, and Marketing. I do not see this to be the end of adjunct contracts.

Crabtree responded that Department Chairs want more control over what courses are being offered and who teaches these courses. This process will be more streamlined after changes. Need to look deeply at on-line courses.

The Chair thanked Prof. Campbell for his time.

Miecznikowski moved to approve the six-part motion, seconded by Salavei.

Petrino spoke in favor of the motions. She wants to see more oversight from the Department of English on what courses are offered from UC and who teaches these courses. She asked who will be advising these students.

Crabtree responded that entry advising is very intensive. Once students are majors, they are being advised by the Department in which they have declared a major. Crabtree commented that students get quality advising in English. Perkus commented that UC is thinking of implementing transition advisors, where students work with advisors in departments.

Walker-Canton asked if students who enter as part time, can they stay as part-time students?

Crabtree responded that all degree programs do not have to be available. Programs decide if they are willing and able to offer the major in the evening. The Core is offered in the evening.

The Chair called the question.

The Chair called for a vote: 11 for, 1 against, 1 abstention. Motion carried.
Committee on University College  
Excerpts from Minutes of March 10, 2011

In attendance: Anne Campbell, Gerry Campbell (chair), Acting Dean Robbin Crabtree, Ed Deak, Joe Dennin, Ryan Drake, invited guest Aaron Perkus

Absent: Dee Lippman

**Item 3: Motion to Close University College**

Professor G. Campbell stated that the present packet (distributed previously) reflects the suggestions from the CUC/EPC/ACEC joint meeting of 2/17/11.

Professor Dennin asked whether the motion is to be taken as one whole or whether it is broken into six parts.

Professor G. Campbell responded that he believes that all of the steps go together.

Professor Dennin expressed that there could be a danger in presenting the motion this way, as someone will likely move to break it up into different motions.

Acting Dean Crabtree asserted that this could potentially happen at the AC meeting, depending on how they wanted to look at the overall set of issues.

Professor Dennin suggested that the motion *not* be broken up into six different parts.

Associate Dean Perkus stated that #4 in the motion is perhaps the least developed part of it, and that it might be more beneficial to separate it from the other five parts. In that case, if all other parts of the motion were to be passed, little would be lost.

Professor Dennin asked whether the programs mentioned in #4 were still ongoing.

Associate Dean Perkus said yes, but they are making very little money.

Professor Dennin asked whether, regardless of money, the programs were involved in significant activities.

Acting Dean Crabtree noted that #4 is a recommendation that would proceed ultimately as an administrative decision. She said she thought that there remains a belief among the CUC that there should or could be possibilities for incentivizing these programs. Judy Dobai, she said, found that there is a shrinking market for these programs in the region, although the SVPAA believes in this work and he is in favor of having these kinds of programs. She also noted that, as this motion moves forward, there could be a series of instructions at each step (e.g., to UCC or others), along with the delegation of particular tasks to appropriate faculty bodies and/or staff.
Professor Dennin suggested that the committee might propose that the Center for Continuing Studies mentioned in #4 be “investigated” rather than “developed.”

Associate Dean Perkus responded that, if pressed to show data justifying why we should form the unit mentioned in #4, we would have a very weak case to make about profitability. This is not to say, however, that over time and with proper development, that it couldn’t thrive; it’s just presently somewhat out of step with the other five parts of the motion.

Professor G. Campbell noted that given the resources the University has and where it is located, it is not a stretch to think that the programs in #4 would thrive. If we look for them, they’re going to be there. We should be looking for them.

Acting Dean Crabtree voiced her agreement with Professor G. Campbell. Faculty really want there to be support for developing some central point with reference to spearheading non-credit programs that can exploit opportunities in the surrounding community. This hasn’t ever been resourced properly in terms of focus, mission, and skill sets. It is still an empirical question, and we should be doing better in this respect than we have been doing. She proposed that the CUC keep #4 in the packet, but rephrase thus: “The CUC recommends that the administration work to develop Continuing Studies as a distinct administrative unit …”

Prof. Dennin proposed to rephrase: “administration and faculty work to develop Continuing Studies as a distinct administrative unit …”

Acting Dean Crabtree added that such development should indeed be administratively led, rather than simply led by faculty.

Dean Crabtree distributed an overview statement by Julie Dolan addressing the financial picture in University College. The information was not as clear as it could be, but it was an attempt to get a true picture of net revenue from UC programs. Dean Crabtree said this was never required by UC in the past. Because there was not true cost accounting, the revenue formerly reported by UC was actually much larger than it really was; that is, it only reported tuition minus instructional costs, no other costs were accounted for fully. Staff salaries were not charged against revenues, no cost for registration, billing, advising, and other services were accounted for. Dean Crabtree asked what the role of this language might be regarding the packet and where it might appear.

Professor G. Campbell suggested that the committee take that up after the motion.

Professor Dennin moved to introduce the motion, seconded by Professor A. Campbell.

Professor G. Campbell spoke in favor of the motion, saying that it provides a framework for the big picture so that everyone has an idea of what will be happening with the programs currently contained in UC. The Center for Continuing Studies offers the possibility for growth and builds on strengths of the University. Moving part-time degree programs to the schools limits redundancies, promotes efficiency and will improve quality.
Professor Dennin spoke in favor of the motion, but did note that there was an issue of students transferring to part-time during their senior year. He said he has no problem with them doing so, though the language on this particular issue has nothing to do with administrative structure. Whatever the structure turns out to be, the same question remains about part-time seniors. This is separate from structural issues. How would this get handled? Professor Dennin strongly believed, he said, that students should be allowed to do this, since it could have a positive impact on the students’ family budget. While it is not crucial to the motion, it nonetheless keeps coming up in the argument.

Acting Dean Crabtree responded that it is a structural issue because UC is a separate school and some of its programs are available to other Fairfield students, which makes it a structural issue. On the one hand, she said, it is also an Admissions question. What are the expectations we communicate to all of our full-time admitted students about living & learning, about engagement for four years, etc.? The UCC should weigh in on this: whether there are recommendations on students moving between part- and full-time status. That will come in due time, when UCC receives this motion, and again after it passes through all the committees.

Professor Dennin noted that the issue has been in the air in these discussions, including in those of the Budget Committee.

Associate Dean Perkus explained his proposed argument for the closure of UC. Speaking in favor of the motion, he provided the following in support of moving parts of UC to other schools to further integration within the University:

Argument for Closure of University College:

1. **Be it resolved that University College be closed (claim of policy)**
   1.1. **University College is not fulfilling its mission**
      1.1.1. The students enrolling in University College are younger than the “adult” students envisioned in the college’s charge (Appendix D.6)
      1.1.2. The typical UC student is taking a combination of day, evening and online courses—not a clearly segregated population (Appendix D.6)
      1.1.3. The students are often internal students who have migrated to UC:
         1.1.3.1. To save money
         1.1.3.2. To complete a weaker core
         1.1.3.3. To salvage “old” educational credits
      1.1.4. There has been a sharp decrease in the number of “casual course taking” students (Appendix D.7)
      1.1.5. There has been little to no growth in the non-credit programming (Appendix D.1)
   1.2. **University College is inefficient**
      1.2.1. The administrative costs are disproportionate to the revenue generated (Appendix D1)
      1.2.2. The parallel scheduling in fall and spring semesters generates too many under-enrolled sections and uses faculty resources inefficiently
      1.2.3. Revenues generated are not shared with other schools or departments although their faculty and oversight are utilized
   1.3. **University College is out of sync with the strategic direction of Fairfield University**
1.3.1. Academic oversight had not be consistent with program or faculty review in the other schools
1.3.2. Different admissions criteria sometimes causes un(der)-prepared students to bring down the level of academic rigor in a class
1.3.3. Different Core requirements poses concerns for degree integrity (Appendix C)

2. Part-Time students and degree-programs be moved to CAS and DSB
   2.1. Integration of students and programs within the degree-granting areas consistent with strategic direction
   2.2. Scheduling and advising efficiencies and competencies will decrease waste and raise level of integration and engagement
   2.3. Revenue returned to schools as the number of majors will increase proportionally
   2.4. Resources realigned to Deans’ Offices
   2.5. School and university curriculum committees will work to align admissions and academic policies and practices to those of the host school
   2.6. All online courses will be directly reviewed by UCC
   2.7. BPS program will be reviewed by the school curriculum committees with recommendations for either discontinuation, modification, or continuation

3. Non-Credit, non-degree programs would be moved to a newly-established Center for Continuing Studies
   3.1. Collaboration and revenue sharing models would be developed
   3.2. All non-credit initiatives would be developed and supported based on clear mission guidelines and revenue expectations
   3.3. Staffing would be based on a competency model with contractual review based on concrete performance indicators.

Acting Dean Crabtree spoke in favor of the motion, beginning by thanking the committee for being so deeply engaged with these issues during a time of crisis; it has been collegial, frank, data-driven, and open. The present motion reflects the quality and integrity of that work. She also spoke to affirm what has been said: much of this proposed integration has already been taking place over the past few years. The University should see this through in a concerted way, and it could increase the quality of programs for part-time and continuing students. Even if BPS goes forward in CAS or DSB, a sense of University ownership will be enhanced by this integration. She commended the committee for the hard work to get to this point.

Professor G. Campbell called the question. The motion was unanimously approved by the committee.

Professor Dennin asked whether the concept of a modified core was a new concept.

Acting Dean Crabtree responded that it was not; it has been going on in different programs (e.g., for engineering students, for nursing students, etc.)

Professor G. Campbell stated that he will send copies of the revised packet to UCC, AC, Professor Rick DeWitt, and Professor Irene Mulvey. He asked whether we should include the language from Ms. Julie Dolan introduced by Acting Dean Crabtree as an appendix. She said that since it wasn’t clear, she would ask the Finance VP to provide something for EPC, since resource issues are primary within their charge.
Professor G. Campbell noted that further revisions might result from the process.

Professor Dennin asked whether the committee would be presenting the packet to the AC this year.

Acting Dean Crabtree said that CUC might be on the agenda in the final spring meeting, but she was unsure. It was also unclear whether the motion would come to a vote at that time, given other AC business.

Professor Dennin asked if we had any sense of whether the UCC is for or against the motion.

Acting Dean Crabtree said that she had been keeping UCC abreast of the transformation at each stage and that they are anticipating a series of proposals and issues that they can take up and work with next year.
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Background on University College

What is University College?

University College is an academic community of Fairfield University designed to provide opportunities for lifetime learning to adults with diverse educational needs. Its commitment is to a curriculum that enhances personal growth and career development, and to a schedule which allows adults with job and civic responsibilities to pursue higher education part-time. (JofR Appendix 13)

History of Continuing Studies at Fairfield University

1972  Center for Lifetime Learning offered its first courses
1975  Connecticut Center for Continuing Education became part of the University
1979  School of Continuing Education was established
1982  Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions merged with School of Continuing Education to form School of Graduate and Continuing Education
1987  The School of Graduate and Continuing Studies was separated into two schools:
      The School of Continuing Education and the Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions
2002  School of Continuing Education renamed University College
      (NEASC Report 2007, vii)

What does University College include? (see Appendix B)

University College is an open and rolling admissions portal for both credit and non-credit courses and programs, including any of the baccalaureate programs, at Fairfield University. There are no admissions criteria other than evidence of a completed high school degree (or equivalent). Credit students come to take courses for personal enrichment, to fulfill prerequisites, or to matriculate into degree programs. Once a student has completed 12 credits over two semesters, s/he is eligible to apply for full matriculation into any major at Fairfield. That is, after successful completing of 12 credits, a student can either do a “change of school” into Arts and Sciences or Dolan School of Business and pursue full-time study (with the regular core requirements and under policies for all regular full-time students) or stay within University College (either fulltime or part-time) and complete any of the degrees in the two previously...
mentioned colleges with a modified core (Appendix C), reduced tuition schedule, and a combination of day, evening and online courses.

The only degree that University College grants is the Bachelors of Professional Studies (BA/BS). This degree uses a modified core and distributive major (combining several academic areas) concluding with a capstone experience (GS 399). There are a few distinct features to this degree that make it appealing to students. Outside of the major, credits earned (both internal and transfer) may be over 10 years old. A wider range of transfer credits is considered than for transfer into either DSB or CAS. Up to 75 credits can be transferred for outside institutions (compared to 60 for CAS or DSB transfer students). Students have the option of CLEP or credit by portfolio examination. As well, the degree can be earned entirely online. On average, roughly 10 students graduate in this program every year. Typically, over 50% of all degree-seeking University College students take at least one daytime course each semester, and over 30% take two or more daytime classes each semester.

**What has been working well within University College?**

University College plays a vital role for a certain population of students who would otherwise be unable to earn a degree at Fairfield. The flexible admissions policies and short semester terms allow students to work towards their degree while maintaining employment, family responsibilities, or other commitments to their time. Typically, degree-seeking UC students enroll in two to three classes per semester on a year-round basis (often taking nine classes or more in a year. For example: 3 fall, 1 winter, 3 spring, 2 summer) (see Appendix D.7). This allows them to make steady progress while maintaining a manageable balance in their lives. If students have the flexibility to take courses in the day, evening or online, they are able to put together curriculum maps in a DSB or CAS major or fulfill the requirements for the Bachelors of Professional Studies program.

**What’s has not been working well within University College?**

Looking only at the fall and spring semesters for the past five years (since summer and winter UC classes are open to all students), there has been a 31% decrease in total credits enrolled and a 50% decrease in the number of credits enrolled by Non-Degree Seeking students. (See Appendix D.7) Much of the growth in University College’s revenues can be attributed to the online courses, particularly in the summer and winter sessions. However, after peaking in summer 2008, overall enrollment in online courses has fallen about 30% (see Appendix D.8).

In analyzing the data from the past five years, it has become apparent that while the initial charge for University College (to provide opportunities for life-time learning to adults with diverse educational needs) remains in place, the recent trend in both student enrollment and institution-wide integration raises an important question as to whether the initial University College structure remains viable. The fall 2009 census report on University College enrollment reveals a bimodal population. Of all the registered UC credit-students, 31% are under 23 years old, and 47.6% are under 28 years old. Over 38% are taking at least one daytime course (see Appendix D.6).
If we look at the degree-seeking students from this census file (40% of the entire UC credit population), the number jumps to 41% under 23 years old and 69.2% under 28 years old. Of this group, 70.5% are taking two or more day classes. Thus, the demographics of the UC student population for degree-seeking students have shifted towards that of those typically served in the fulltime residential programs in DSB and CAS (see Appendix D.6).

At the same time, we find that departments (in collaboration with the deans’ offices) in the College of Arts and Sciences and Dolan School of Business are doing more and more of the scheduling and are increasingly providing much of the advising for these University College students. The four largest majors (English, Communication, Marketing, Accounting) directly schedule evening and cross-listed courses and provide primary advising to the degree-seeking students. Neither CAS nor DSB, nor their academic departments, receive credit for generating part-time student revenues nor a share of them for program enhancement and other strategic goals (see Appendix D.2 & D.4).

Based on an inventory of this past academic year, 48% of all University College courses are taught by fulltime faculty as overload (see Appendix D.5). These courses are often offered either in an identical format to what they are already offering in the day program (thus potentially cross-listed) or in a special format (one-week / online winter or summer) which is primarily populated by current fulltimeCAS and DSB students.

**Bachelor of Professional Studies in Particular**

Over the past five years there have been 128 unique students who have matriculated into the BPS program, and 61 of these have graduated. Of the 128 students who have matriculated into the BPS, almost half (61) are exclusively Fairfield University students who have never taken courses elsewhere (see Appendix D.6). Typically, students who move internally do so for one of three reasons:

1. They are returning to Fairfield after a long absence (or dismissal) and wish to complete their degree at Fairfield University;
2. They are not able to meet the GPA requirements in their major, so they are transferring to the BPS in order to salvage their academic credits and proceed toward graduation with a degree;
3. They need to drop down to part-time status (perhaps due to medical issues, scheduling conflicts, financial concerns, etc.) and thus are not able to complete regular degree requirements.

**Overall Assessment/Reflection regarding the Present State of University College:**

The way it is currently configured, University College presents a liability for the University. As a stand-alone college, it has a dean, an associate dean, a director of distance education and new program development, a full-time academic advisor, a full-time program development specialist for non-credit and special programs, and two fulltime administrative staff members. There has been no growth in the non-credit areas for several years (and the current programs have cleared little profit), and much of the enrollment in the credit area is either generated from “special”
semesters (summer, winter, March intersession) or from serving populations already being served by academic departments (day course takers, students in several majors) (see Appendix D.1). While the online formatting of courses has generated substantial revenue over the past 10 years, there is nothing about that format that necessitates it remain within a University College structure. The UCC will be looking into online courses beginning spring 2011, and substantial changes in federal regulation for online programs are emerging. In addition, the separate admissions standards, core requirements and tuition schedule allows UC students to achieve the same degree (say a BA in history) while entering with a very different level of preparation, paying a different tuition and completing a different core (all the major program requirements, however, are identical).

It remains to be settled what the future offerings for “adults with diverse educational needs” ought to be at Fairfield University. Questions regarding admission, tuition, curricular oversight, advising and degree-programs specially designed for this population are all issues that need to be addressed. However, it is clear from the data that there is insufficient market demand to continue to support a school structure in this area.

At the same time, there is evidence that there is ongoing market potential for programming to serve populations seeking enrichment, non-degree career development, post-baccalaureate certificates of academic specialization, and other continuing studies engagements. Such market development requires more emphasis and different staff expertise than is currently provided. Again, such market development and programming would not require an administratively complex structure, but rather a small, nimble, incentive-based one that coordinates closely with enrollment management and marketing, and collaborates with the academic schools.

Summary of Recent Events Related to the Recommendation to Close University College

**May 2010**

- Dean Edna Wilson is laid off; the administration signals a desire to close University College.
- Academic Council forms a Subcommittee to investigate the situation re University College.

**June 2010**

- The AC Subcommittee produces a report highlighting important issues and governance matters. A key point is that the administration cannot unilaterally close University College.

**Summer 2010**

- Robbin Crabtree appointed Acting Dean of University College.
• Two task forces composed of University administrators explore financial, structural, and enrollment issues in UC. Several academic policy and program issues are identified for CUC consideration.

September 2010

• The CUC convenes, and the SVPAA addresses the committee, expressing concerns related to quality and efficiency in the delivery of UC programs.
• Acting Dean Crabtree presents an outline of issues produced by the summer administrative task forces and proposes a process designed to lead to the closing of University College and the integration of its programs into the schools (CAS & DSB).

October – December 2010

• After moving to close the Associate of Arts degree program in UC, the CUC departs from the steps outlined by the administrative task forces to look at the “big picture” regarding the future of UC.
• Alternative organizational structures are considered based on a review of those seen at other Jesuit universities (see Appendix E). The alternative structures are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model A</th>
<th>Model B</th>
<th>Model C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separate School (e.g. Fairfield)</td>
<td>Distinctive Centers (e.g. Xavier)</td>
<td>Distributed Model (e.g. Seattle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time degree programs</td>
<td>Center for Part-time Studies</td>
<td>integrated in schools (e.g., CAS, DSB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in University College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-credit, non-degree programs</td>
<td>Center for Continuing Studies</td>
<td>integrated in schools (e.g., CAS, DSB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in University College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Dean, Associate Dean</td>
<td>Responsibilities handled by school administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director for each center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• A joint meeting is held between the CUC, the EPC and the Academic Council Executive Committee to obtain inputs on the types of information that the CUC should include with any proposal it might produce.
January – February 2011

- The CUC discusses alternative structures, and eventually a consensus emerges for a structure that falls between models B and C, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part-time degree programs</th>
<th>Recommended Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-credit, non-degree programs</td>
<td>integrated in schools (e.g., CAS, DSB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Center for Continuing Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time programs integrated with school administration; Director for Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Potential models for the Center for Continuing Studies are identified (see Appendix F). The entrepreneurial nature of the Center is discussed, and the need to clarify relationships to schools, departments and faculty is highlighted.
- The CUC drafts a proposal for the recommended structure, including background information, a six-part motion, and data on University College.
- A second joint meeting is held between the CUC, the EPC and the Academic Council Executive Committee on Feb. 17, 2011 to review the draft proposal. Feedback is received by the CUC, and suggestions from that joint meeting have been incorporated in this packet.

University College Restructuring Motion
from the Committee on University College (CUC)

SUMMARY DOCUMENT -
(An elaborated version of the motion with rationale for each part follows this summary document)

Motion:

I. The CUC recommends that University College (UC) be closed officially, with plans for degree completion or transition for all current UC students.

II. The CUC recommends that each degree-granting program currently housed in UC be transferred to the academic school where its curriculum and faculty reside. The Bachelor of Professional Studies (BPS) should be considered by both CAS and DSB, and these schools should make recommendations concerning the continuation or closure of the BPS degree program.
III. The CUC recommends that CAS and DSB begin consideration of the best school-based administrative and support structures for part-time for-credit and degree-granting programs and students.

IV. The CUC recommends that the administration and faculty work to develop Continuing Studies as a distinct administrative unit (i.e., a “Center for Continuing Studies”) for non-credit and enrichment programs only. This unit should be focused on entrepreneurial program development, marketing, and delivery in collaboration with the academic schools.

V. The CUC recommends that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) begin reviewing all academic policies related to part-time students and their degree programs.

VI. The CUC recommends that, at the time University College is closed officially and after all related restructuring is completed, the CUC be reconfigured as appropriate and recommended by the Academic Council.

IMPLEMENTATION PHASES (POSSIBLE TIMELINE):

Phase 0: University College operates with an Acting-Dean and with staff maintaining current positions and duties. All students served and supported from Dolan House. Motions related to the future of UC (and the CUC) begin to move through committees. 
(2010-11)

Phase 1: All relevant bodies vote to close the school and reassign its functions to other units. All committees and administrators collaborate on motions and recommendations to guide the transition, and the State of Connecticut offers final approval. Timing of this process would determine the pace of the following, which might be:
(2011-12)

Phase 1A: UCC begins consideration of academic policy issues. School curriculum committees begin consideration of BPS, BA, and BS programs. Decisions and recommendations begin moving through other committees and are discussed by relevant administrative offices. Notification of policy changes/recommendations precipitates corresponding changes to protocols in a variety of offices across campus.
(Fall 2011)

University College begins transition including planning for reassignment of staff, duties, plans for space, and updated webpage and marketing materials (if and as necessary), etc. A Center for Continuing Studies is envisioned, a job description is developed for its director, and a search is authorized (interim director is appointed until authorized and completed). An Acting-Dean of University College oversees remainder of transition.
Accounting and revenue sharing issues related to interactions between the Center for Continuing Studies, faculty, departments and schools are addressed by relevant committees and administrative offices.

Phase 1B:  
(Spring 2012) Based on policy changes, DSB and CAS deans and faculties (the school planning committees, curriculum committees, etc.) develop protocols related to absorbing part-time program administration. This semester/phase would be the last opportunity for students to matriculate in programs as they are currently configured.

Phase 2:  
(2012-13) New policies and procedures are in place. The DSB and CAS are staffed and prepared to administrate part-time programs. New part-time students begin admission and matriculation into newly configured programs.

Phase 3:  
(2013-14) All “Grandfathered” students complete UC programs as they are currently configured. Current programs are formally “sunsetted” once all eligible students have completed (or transferred into new programs).

University College Restructuring Motion  
from the Committee on University College (CUC)

The following six-part motion proposes what the Committee on University College recommends are the best administrative structures for part-time for-credit and degree-granting programs and continuing studies at Fairfield University. These recommendations arose from sustained and thorough discussion on the CUC along with regular consultation with EPC, AC EC, UCC, and appropriate administrators. These recommendations incorporate a plan for thorough consideration of remaining issues through collaboration among Faculty Handbook Committees, central administrative offices, and the faculties and deans of the schools.

Motion:

I. The CUC recommends that University College (UC) be closed officially, with plans for degree completion or transition for all current UC students.

Rationale:
Context: The Study Abroad Program has been reconfigured as International Programs and disaggregated from University College. The retirement of Associate Dean Susan Fitzgerald occasioned a reorganization of this program, combining two administrative positions (associate dean and assistant dean) into one: Director of International Programs. The IP unit now reports directly to the SVPAA. At the same time, the SVPAA sought to
restructure University College, laid off the Dean, and made a request to the Academic Council that UC be closed in order to move toward more efficient operations for part-time and non-credit programs. This series of events and actions precipitated a wholesale review of the issues, structures, and programs remaining in University College.

Reasons:
1. Over time, University College’s population has drifted to include more and more former full-time residential undergraduates looking to take advantage of the discounted tuition rate or easier graduation requirements. Meanwhile, more and more UC students are choosing to take classes during the day (and online), suggesting that there are fewer “typical” UC students being served exclusively in the evening. At the same time, Fairfield has made great strides in increasing both its student diversity and advising capacity in ways that no longer require part-time students to have separate services and management.

2. The current UC administrative structure (and the ways UC functions as a separate school) is not cost-effective as overlap and coordination have led to frequent inefficiencies: poorly planned scheduling of courses leading to under-enrolled sections within and between semester terms, transfer of fourth year full-time students to part-time status while they still seek and utilize full time service and academic support, decentralized and uncoordinated advertising campaigns with separate budgets, increased demands on the Registrar’s office because of different calendars (e.g., ASAP courses), etc. Many administrative tasks currently performed by University College in relation to part-time students are redundant to the other school/College deans’ office staff work, and this creates extra steps and a layer of administrative complexity that is not needed.

3. With increasingly tight budgets, a full-fledged school structure for part-time programs and continuing education at Fairfield requires top-heavy staff and considerable operational resources, while some of the other schools are understaffed relative to their share of the overall academic program at Fairfield University and/or relative to their potential for growth or new revenue generation. With realignment of current UC staff and operational resources, the schools (i.e., deans’ offices) could absorb this work and do so effectively with increased efficiency.

II. The CUC recommends that each degree-granting program currently housed in UC be transferred to the academic school where its curriculum and faculty reside. The Bachelor of Professional Studies (BPS) should be considered by both CAS and DSB, and these schools should make recommendations concerning the continuation or closure of the BPS degree program.

Rationale:

There is some continued market demand for BA and BS degree and degree-completion programs that appeal to non-traditional aged students who are returning to college after a
long hiatus, who may be full-time working persons, and/or who seek programs with open enrollment policies and accelerated models for courses and programs. The faculty and administration need to consider carefully whether this market is large enough to justify commitment of increasingly tight university resources, whether this market can generate sufficient revenues to justify programs developed or continued specifically for it, and whether such programs have characteristics that are consistent with current University standards. In particular, the future of the Bachelor of Professional Studies program needs to be reviewed.

The growing number and importance of Fairfield University graduate programs reflects additional changes in the market. These various market changes and pressures occur in an economic context in which Fairfield University may not have the resources to adequately support all of its current academic programs at previous levels or for targeted growth. We need to make choices about which revenue-generating programs to support and about which new areas we want to strategically develop. Review of programs and decisions whether to continue them come within the context of Fairfield’s mission and Strategic Plan, along with the current student quality and diversity, and the University’s stature and trajectory as a whole.

III. The CUC recommends that CAS and DSB begin consideration of the best school-based administrative and support structures for part-time for-credit and degree-granting programs and students.

Rationale:

Currently, University College for-credit and degree-granting programs that utilize faculty, courses, and curricula in the College and the Dolan School of Business are not administered fully by CAS or DSB; neither school gets credit for generating enrollments or revenues from these programs, and neither school is incentivized to do so. Neither the faculty in these schools nor the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) has provided recent or regular review of academic policies and programs in UC, though UC students have the same major requirements as other CAS and DSB students. Currently, part-time degree-seeking students are not integrated as members of their academic programs in all routine procedures; several programs with a large number of part-time students (e.g., English, Communication, Marketing) seek this integration as do the Deans of CAS and DSB.

The proposed reorganization of all University College operations would lead to CAS and DSB taking full and direct responsibility for part-time students within their programs, in imitation of SOE, the SON, and GSEAP. That is, SOE, SON, and GSEAP already have part-time students fully integrated into their schools with scheduling of courses, assignment of faculty, and oversight of programs all supervised.supported by the Deans’ offices/staffs and department chairs/program directors in these schools to meet the needs of their part-time students. The same oversight structures would work for DSB and CAS, and staffing resources in these two units should be augmented to facilitate integration.
Several suggestions for issues that CAS and DSB faculty and Deans should consider regarding this transition are included in Appendix A: “Overview of Issues Related to the Transition to Closing University College,” though this list is likely not exhaustive. While UC currently provides centralized administrative support for course scheduling for evening, ASAP I & II, winter interim, spring intensive, online*, and summer courses, if these activities are to be integrated with the schools, the two schools will need to provide this administrative oversight and managerial support. Staffing resources should be realigned to ensure the schools can manage this work, which is already unfolding with great collaboration (and some administrative redundancy). Support and incentives for departments who provide “extra” revenue-generating courses and programs should be put into place.

(*Note on Online Courses and Programs: Due to new/emergent Federal Regulations, a wholesale review of Fairfield University’s practices is unfolding. The CUC recommends that, once the implication of these regulations is fully understood, a task force (including significant involvement from UCC) be developed to create a long-term strategic vision for online and distance education at Fairfield, along with a concrete plan and timeline for implementation. Arising from a concurrent set of conversations unrelated to the reconfiguration of University College, the UCC has put online course issues on its agenda for future business.)

IV. The CUC recommends that the administration and faculty work to develop Continuing Studies as a distinct administrative unit (i.e., a “Center for Continuing Studies”) for non-credit and enrichment programs only. This unit should be focused on entrepreneurial program development, marketing, and delivery in collaboration with the academic schools.

Rationale:

Currently, University College consists of both credit (discussed above) and non-credit programming. Non-credit courses and other programming for non-degree seeking students, cultural enrichment, periodic alumni academic engagements, and similar programming continues to be an important aspect of Fairfield’s mission. However, the administration of such programs can be done with a streamlined staff and without the current administrative structure of a school.

The current non-credit programming in University College is dominated by external agencies that utilize Fairfield University facilities and brand to market and deliver their content. The relationship with the following agencies is strictly financial, albeit mutually beneficial: SHRM, CFP, SIG, Reading Institute, EDTOGO, Kaplan. Additionally, there are some non-credit programs created by Fairfield fulltime and affiliate faculty that are run through University College (e.g., Jazz Camp, Art Lectures, EMT, WIPS, Leadership certificate). The Au Pair and Institute for Retired Professionals (IRP) programs, administered by University College, utilize credit courses offered by University College,
the College of Arts and Sciences, and Dolan School of Business to market seats in already running courses to these auditing populations. The Interior Design program is currently running both credit and non-credit options for students (this program is undergoing review in the spring of 2011 and decisions about its future, including where to locate it, will be based on the self-study and external review). There are additional programs offered to the Institute of Retired Professionals, including a summer institute and monthly seminars.

With disaggregation of part-time for-credit and degree programs from non-credit continuing education programs, a Center or Office for Continuing Studies could function as a point of contact between external populations/program agents and the schools/academic departments for the development of opportunities for course taking, auditing, collaborative program development, and other enrichment engagements with the University. This center would have an entrepreneurial mission designed to develop programming (loosely defined) for the community (also loosely defined) based on principles consistent with Fairfield’s mission and functioning under a clear revenue sharing model through which collaborative programming would be developed and implemented with stakeholders across the campus. The director should have demonstrated ability to assess and respond to the needs of diverse populations and potential partners including corporate and small business, state and local government, and non-profit, community based, religious, and educational organizations. This director would work through the deans’ offices of each of the schools (perhaps each school would designate an appropriate point of contact) related to any programs that would use the school’s faculty or courses. Such a center could provide more structure to the current practice where faculty are free-agents and programs are developed with no concerted curricular planning, decision-making, or revenue sharing at the department or school level. Moving forward, non-credit and non-degree programs should be built around sound business plans that reflect strategic priorities and provide incentives for success and clear benefits to the University.

The new structures outlined in this set of proposals arise from an exploration of issues as described throughout these documents related to markets, enrollments, budgets, and administrative redundancies, along with a comparative analysis of administrative structures for part-time and continuing studies at AJCU and other similar and competitor institutions. Ostensibly, the structures proposed here would mostly utilize resources realigned from the current UC personnel and operating budgets and are designed to be as budget neutral as possible. The salary of the Director of the Center for Continuing Studies, which is a new position, would be an investment that would be expected to result in high returns through increased revenues from non-credit/non-degree programs developed collaboratively with the schools. When defining the Director position, former Fairfield UC personnel (e.g., Art McAdams) and those at other institutions could be contacted to identify what works and perceived best practices.

V. The CUC recommends that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) begin reviewing all academic policies related to part-time students and their degree programs.
Rationale:

The attached Appendix A: “Overview of Issues Related to the Transition to Closing University College,” contains a series of academic policy issues and administrative protocols and practices that require review. This will be important regardless of the future of University College or which structures develop for part-time programs. The recommendations in this proposal include a timeline for consideration of these and related issues, such as whether part-time degree-granting programs should have distinctive admissions and graduation requirements, whether one clear set of rules should be developed governing movement of students between part-time and full-time programs, and whether/how evening, ASAP, summer, interim, and online courses should relate to full-time residential undergraduate students’ schedules/requirements and full-time faculty teaching loads. These issues should be resolved by UCC and other bodies, and in full coordination with appropriate administrative offices, within the context of a clear roadmap regarding the future of University College and the academic programs currently housed within it.

VI. The CUC recommends that, at the time University College is closed officially and after all related restructuring is completed, the CUC be reconfigured as appropriate and recommended by the Academic Council.

Rationale: If UC ceases to exist in its current form, there will be no need for a Handbook Committee on University College. However, lifelong learning, part-time students, and other related issues will continue to require some relationship to faculty/shared governance. The CUC could be reconstituted with a new name and charge based on the recommendations of the CUC and the Academic Council (and then through 2/3 vote of the General Faculty). If a distinctive charge cannot be identified, the CUC should be removed from the list of Handbook Committees.

IMPLEMENTATION PHASES (tentative suggested timeline in parentheses):

Phase 0: (2010-11) University College operates with an Acting-Dean and with staff maintaining current positions and duties. All students served and supported from Dolan House. Motions related to the future of UC (and the CUC) begin to move through committees. Academic policy issues are referred to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

Phase 1: (2011-12) Assuming all relevant bodies vote to close the school, to integrate part-time BA and BS programs into CAS and DSB, and restructure non-credit programs in relation to a Center for Continuing Studies, all administrators sign off on those recommendations, and the State of Connecticut is appropriately notified and
provides all necessary approvals, the process would unfold, more or less, as follows:

University College programs continue to provide educational opportunities for adults who seek Fairfield's academic offerings on a part-time basis, such as the completion of an undergraduate degree or courses to prepare for a graduate program. An Acting Dean would continue to manage all for-credit and degree programs for part-time students until their integration into the CAS and DSB has been completed. UC begins transition to the new structure, with all current UC students following current/old rules and programs. Matriculated students may continue to move toward completion of UC degrees or may matriculate into other schools’ degree programs (as is currently the case); new students are recruited and matriculated into any approved degree programs. UC students should be supported through effective admissions, advising, and degree evaluation services.

A Center for Continuing Studies is established with plans for staffing and marketing/re-branding. A job description should be developed and a search should be conducted for a Director of the Center for Continuing Studies (and an interim director could be appointed until such time a search can be authorized and completed). Resources currently supporting UC staff and operating budgets may be reassigned to other academic units as appropriate throughout the transition. Some UC staff positions may be phased out or restructured, depending on assessment of current need. Some new staff positions may be created to meet new demands created by restructuring. Budget neutral solutions should be utilized as much as possible. Much care should be taken to ensure adequate staffing for all current UC students and programs through the sunset and transition period. All current staff should be given as much notice as possible if their current position is being phased out with this transition, and given the opportunity to apply for open/new positions at the University and/or adequate time to seek other employment.

A number of academic policy issues should be considered by the UCC (on which all schools are represented by their deans to facilitate optimal faculty-administration collaboration on the development of recommendations) and then routed through other committees as appropriate. This includes: formalization of recommendations about provisional admission and matriculation for UC students, waivers and exemptions related to age of prior coursework, the alternative core curriculum for part-time students, rules about between full- and part-time student status, and policies governing online courses (e.g., an online course approval process, the number that full- versus part-time students may take any given semester or count for graduation, etc.). Appropriate “sunsetting” timelines and “grandfathering” procedures should be developed in relation to any proposed changes to protect all current UC students. As well, any new policies should be sensitive to the academic needs of part-time students who may be many years out of formal education, full-time working professionals, etc.
Additionally, and in tandem with the emergence of new academic policies, a number of related institutional practices will need to be considered. For example, appropriate offices need to consider admissions and matriculation criteria and procedures, financial models (price per credit, revenue sharing), registration and billing procedures, marketing strategies, etc. The academic administrators should discuss potential alternative procedures and practices with appropriate bodies, such as the CUC, EPC, AC, Admissions & Scholarship Committee (re: part-time student admissions procedures); the Budget Committee (re: pricing and financial modeling); and the Academic Support Committee (re: advising and other students support services).

Concurrently, it will be necessary to provide professional development for department chairs, faculty, and professional staff around the academic backgrounds and needs of non-traditional and part-time student populations. The Deans’ offices, the CAE, the Office of Academic Engagement, and the GSEAP, which has considerable expertise, will be important partners in this work. In fact, this work had already begun prior to any of the events or actions that precipitated the reorganization of University College.

Every effort should be made in the faculty committees and schools to develop and approve new academic policies by May 2012. Then, new procedures arising from those policies should be developed by the various administrative offices for implementation by September 2012. This timing will be contingent upon the progress made on proposals for structural and policy changes during the spring 2011 and the 2011-12 academic year.

**Phase 2: (2012-13)**

New policies, procedures, and program configurations are in place for new part-time students while current/continuing part-time students move through their programs with current requirements/policies.

The closure of UC should be reflected in the Journal of Record, all references to the school should be deleted from University communications vehicles (e.g., marketing materials, web pages, catalogues, etc.), and all school governance documents should be revised accordingly and if/as necessary.

**Phase 3: (2013-14)**

Based on careful advising of current UC students throughout the transition, all “Grandfathered” students should be completing UC programs as currently configured. Current programs are formally “sunsetted” once all eligible students have completed or transferred into other programs if they desire.
APPENDIX A:

Overview of Issues Related to the Transition to Closing University College

Once the direction is in place for the transition to closing University College, the Committee on University College (CUC) will set in motion consideration of all related issues. The issues listed below, and any other emergent or related issues as raised by faculty committees, other bodies, or administrators can be folded into the discussion any time.

Possible routing procedures appear in bold italics in each area below, though all administrative consultations have not been listed. It is assumed that there will be need for significant input (and/or decisions) from Finance; Undergraduate Admissions and Enrollment Management, Registrar, and other offices in the Academic Division; Marketing & Communications; and, to a lesser extent, Student Affairs and Facilities Management.

Current policies and practices would be in place until new ones are developed through faculty committee review, administrative review, or a combination of the two, as appropriate.

I. Motion related to closure of University College and related recommendations about appropriate homes for part-time undergraduate for-credit and degree-granting programs, as well as non-credit non-degree programs:

1. See motion, background, rationale, and proposed timeline in UC Restructuring Proposal.
2. Timeline includes “Sunsetting” and “grandfathering” procedures for policies governing current part-time students along with a transition plan that is sensitive to their needs
3. Referral of academic policy issues (as outlined below) to UCC and AC as appropriate
4. Other recommendations for transition period

CUC → Acting UC Dean → Sr. VPAA and School Deans → UCC → EPC → AC → General Faculty → State

II. Integration of part-time programs and students into CAS and DSB, and policies/practices related to ongoing administration of these programs, e.g.:

1. Requirements for part-time students in the schools (admission, matriculation, graduation)
2. Program and department-specific policies, requirements, and guidelines
3. Staffing in College/school offices commensurate with new programs/students
4. Scheduling of courses in evening, interim sessions, and summer
5. Identification and supervision of instructional staff for additional courses in the schools
6. Advising part-time students
7. Integration of part-time with full-time students
8. Rules governing movement between full- and part-time status
9. New part-time program development and oversight

Various parts of the process could involve all or a subset of the following routing: CUC → Acting UC Dean → School Deans & Sr. VP → school CCs → UCC → EPC → AC → State (if necessary for significant changes to or elimination of any individual programs; outside accrediting agencies might also be involved with certain programs)

III. Continuation (and reassignment) or elimination of degree program currently offered in UC:

1. Bachelor of Professional Studies BA/BS -- CUC (and Acting Dean) → School Curriculum Committees → UCC → EPC → AC → State

IV. Broader policy issues (non-exhaustive list, requiring collaboration between faculty committees and various administrative offices):

2. Program-specific core requirements versus one University Core Curriculum
3. Policies on exceptions to core requirements (including any exceptions for professional schools or types of students)
4. Registration for part-time students (Same as f/t undergrads or later? Billing or pay upon registration?)
5. Pricing structures for part-time students and financial implications of rules regarding students shifting from full-time to part-time and vice versa; related policies for residency requirements and withdrawal/readmission
6. Formal procedures for post-bac certificate programs (for-credit but non-degree)
7. Revenue sharing and other incentives to departments to serve part-time, returning, and other non-traditional students scheduling needs, e.g.:
   a. Calculating evening and ASAP courses into faculty loads (University or school-specific rules?)
   b. Calculating summer and interim sessions in relation to f/t faculty loads (University or school-specific rules?)
8. Policies on online courses: course review procedures, number of online courses p/t versus f/t students may take, faculty development for online teaching, etc. (UCC has this on list of future business)
9. Student services for part-time, evening, and other non-traditional undergrads (dovetails with current efforts related to graduate students and in progress)

Routing dependent upon the issue. Most of these could be referred to UCC for initial determination in consultation with Academic Council Executive Committee.

V. Recommendations on appropriate structures for Continuing Studies (non-credit, non-degree)
1. Philosophy – entrepreneurial, marketing, revenue-generating
2. Interface with outside vendors, other potential partners, and market populations
3. Collaboration with the schools related to program development, use of schools resources (faculty, curricula), and revenue sharing
4. Interface between facilities and academic units
5. Director qualifications and position description
6. Include input from prior director(s) (e.g., Art McAdams), and contact other institutions (e.g., Xaiver) regarding what works and perceived best practices.

CUC → Acting UC Dean & Sr. VP → (EPC) → other deans and administrators as determined
## Appendix B: University College Offerings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree/Certificate</th>
<th>Non-Credit</th>
<th>Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interior Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Decorating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Human Resource Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certified Financial Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Institute for the Gifted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Computer Certificate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Leadership Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(note: other programs have come and gone over the years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accelerated Language Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associates Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelors Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Professional Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Behavioral Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Information Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Organizational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Liberal Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Professional Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Accounting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Marketing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Online Professional Studies Degree Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Community College Articulations Certificates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Professional Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accounting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interior Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree/Certificate</td>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Retired Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Au Pair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Camp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDTOGO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Lectures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Tours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend Immersion Program (language study)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan Art Tours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(note: other programs have come and gone over the years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SELECT Program (recent high school graduates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visiting Students (Summer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online Classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connecticut Works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course takers for enrichment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree/Certificate</th>
<th>Non-Credit</th>
<th>Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C: Core Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>University College</th>
<th>College of Arts and Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area I: Mathematics and Natural Sciences</strong></td>
<td>Four courses – at least one math and one science</td>
<td>Two mathematics, one must include come calculus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two natural science courses</td>
<td>Two natural science courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area II: History, and the Social and Behavioral Sciences</strong></td>
<td>HI 30 plus one 200-level history course.</td>
<td>HI 30 plus one 200-level history course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four courses in at least two of the following disciplines: AY, EC, PO, PY, SO, CO 100, CO 230</td>
<td>Two courses in AY, EC, PO, PY, SO, CO (100, 230). May be in same discipline. (CO majors must take Area II in discipline other than OC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area III: Philosophy, Religious Studies, and Applied Ethics</strong></td>
<td>One PH</td>
<td>Two PH: PH 10 is required followed by a 100 level course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One RS</td>
<td>Two RS: RS 10 is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One PH, RS, or AE</td>
<td>One additional course in PH (200 level), RS or AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area IV: English and Performing Arts</strong></td>
<td>EN 11</td>
<td>Three semesters in EN: EN 11 and EN 12 required. The other must be a literature course at the 100 level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EN 12</td>
<td>Two visual and performing arts, one must be a lecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two visual and performing arts, one must be a lecture</td>
<td>Two visual and performing arts, one must be a lecture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area V: Modern and Classical Language</strong></td>
<td>Three courses from among the following: HI, PH, RS, AE, EN, AH, MU, SA or MLL</td>
<td>Two semesters at the intermediate level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*UC has no core language requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Credits (assuming @ 8 credits and each science course is 4 credits)</strong></td>
<td>20 courses (60-63 credits depending on science credits)</td>
<td>20 courses (62-64 credits depending on science credits)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Various Data and Information from University College

1. University College 5 year Revenue & Expenditure Analysis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Org</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>FY'10</th>
<th>FY'09</th>
<th>FY'08</th>
<th>FY'07</th>
<th>FY'06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>302160</td>
<td>SCE Non-Credit*</td>
<td>$430,092.10</td>
<td>$2,071,932.45</td>
<td>$484,613.76</td>
<td>$373,861.17</td>
<td>$433,862.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>$147,756.71</td>
<td>$147,791.64</td>
<td>$155,290.39</td>
<td>$169,990.63</td>
<td>$235,167.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>$92,357.05</td>
<td>$1,285,520.70</td>
<td>(64,007.18)</td>
<td>(65,203.46)</td>
<td>$138,205.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net</td>
<td>$189,978.35</td>
<td>$638,620.11</td>
<td>$393,330.55</td>
<td>$269,074.00</td>
<td>$60,489.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302580</td>
<td>Tech Voc Program*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$381,076.20</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>$286,501.85</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net</td>
<td>$94,574.35</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302230</td>
<td>Accelerated Lang Pgm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$3,925.00</td>
<td>(1,251.00)</td>
<td>(2,212.00)</td>
<td>(1,692.00)</td>
<td>$13,145.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>$1,764.03</td>
<td>$2,046.96</td>
<td>$4,512.76</td>
<td>$1,390.63</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>$456.40</td>
<td>$281.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net</td>
<td>$1,704.57</td>
<td>(3,579.03)</td>
<td>(6,724.76)</td>
<td>(3,082.63)</td>
<td>$12,445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205030</td>
<td>UC Undergrad Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$580.00</td>
<td>$755.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,890.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>$1,656,070.20</td>
<td>$1,736,582.59</td>
<td>$1,529,837.03</td>
<td>$1,652,043.57</td>
<td>$1,443,017.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>$65,273.82</td>
<td>$61,724.91</td>
<td>$103,166.29</td>
<td>$87,106.57</td>
<td>$95,471.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net</td>
<td>(1,720,764.02)</td>
<td>(1,797,552.50)</td>
<td>(1,633,003.32)</td>
<td>(1,739,150.14)</td>
<td>(1,533,599.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205045</td>
<td>UC Grad Comm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$112,399.62</td>
<td>$84,933.64</td>
<td>$115,089.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,064.00</td>
<td>$1,991.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2,064.00)</td>
<td>(114,391.47)</td>
<td>(84,933.64)</td>
<td>(115,089.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205000</td>
<td>UC Admin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>$603,067.78</td>
<td>$626,710.50</td>
<td>$546,719.22</td>
<td>$545,733.92</td>
<td>$494,188.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>$55,017.71</td>
<td>$26,812.48</td>
<td>$33,513.92</td>
<td>$44,633.93</td>
<td>$26,992.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net</td>
<td>(658,085.49)</td>
<td>(653,522.98)</td>
<td>(580,233.14)</td>
<td>(590,367.85)</td>
<td>(521,181.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102000</td>
<td>SCE Credit Tuition**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>$1,810,364.00</td>
<td>$2,121,405.75</td>
<td>$1,637,812.50</td>
<td>$1,384,035.48</td>
<td>$1,457,290.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intersession</td>
<td>$451,242.00</td>
<td>$493,398.00</td>
<td>$453,033.00</td>
<td>$446,259.00</td>
<td>$285,316.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>$1,747,133.00</td>
<td>$1,955,500.00</td>
<td>$1,725,775.00</td>
<td>$1,533,757.00</td>
<td>$1,482,404.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>$2,183,770.00</td>
<td>$2,295,495.10</td>
<td>$1,978,420.56</td>
<td>$1,741,916.55</td>
<td>$1,559,829.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overhead Recap G&amp;C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,557.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>$6,192,549.00</td>
<td>$6,905,798.85</td>
<td>$5,795,041.06</td>
<td>$5,107,525.78</td>
<td>$4,784,840.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Tech Voc Included in SCE Non-Credit totals until 2010 when it was separated into its own org
** SCE Credit Tuition also includes accts for Study Abroad/Fall and Study Abroad/Spring. Excluded these totals for this analysis.

** Net revenue for all UC credit enrollment (tuition revenue minus faculty and administration salaries and expenditures).
Does not include facility costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY'10</th>
<th>FY'09</th>
<th>FY'08</th>
<th>FY'07</th>
<th>FY'06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$3,813,699.49</td>
<td>$4,454,723.37</td>
<td>$3,581,804.60</td>
<td>$2,778,007.79</td>
<td>$2,730,059.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Distribution of Majors among UC students

Top 10 Majors of UC students based on GPA 2.0 or over, 30 credits or over, last registered spring 2009 through present:

Professional Studies/Liberal Studies BA (35);
English (29);
Politics (19);
Finance (19);
Org Comm (15);
Professional Studies/ Org Leadership (15);
Soc and Anthro (13);
International Studies (11);
Economics (10);
Marketing (10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0000</td>
<td>Major Not Declared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHC</td>
<td>Communication-Human Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMS</td>
<td>Communication-Media Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOR</td>
<td>Communication-Organizational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECWR</td>
<td>English/Creative Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJOU</td>
<td>English/Journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>International Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLLG</td>
<td>Modern Language, German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLLI</td>
<td>Modern Language, Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLLS</td>
<td>Modern Language, Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLI</td>
<td>Politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSBE</td>
<td>Prof Studies-Behavior Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSCO</td>
<td>Prof Studies-Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSLB</td>
<td>Prof Studies-Liberal Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLST</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCI</td>
<td>Sociology and Anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPAH</td>
<td>Vis/Perf Art History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPCL</td>
<td>Vis/Perf Classical Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFFM</td>
<td>New Media Film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPSA</td>
<td>Vis/Perf Studio Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPTL</td>
<td>New Media Television</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BS Total Enrollment: 101

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BS</th>
<th>Major Not Declared</th>
<th>0000</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCT</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSU</td>
<td>Business Undeclared</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSC</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNCE</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INBU</td>
<td>International Business</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSY</td>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGEN</td>
<td>Management-Entrepreneur Con</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGHR</td>
<td>Management-Hum Res Conc</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMT</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKCO</td>
<td>Marketing-Integ Mkt Comm Conc</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSIN</td>
<td>Prof Studies-Info Technology</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSLB</td>
<td>Prof Studies-Liberal Studies</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSOL</td>
<td>Prof Studies-Organiz Leadership</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NDS

| NDS       | Major Not Declared | 0000 | 164 |

3. **Presence of University College students in day courses**

This chart represents enrollment quantities of University College students (both full and part-time) in day courses.
Based on an analysis of the 195 degree-seeking University College students who took courses in the Fall 2009 semester, 70% took 2 or more day courses, 76% took at least one night course, and 36% took at least one online course (note these percentages represent an overlap of students).

4. # of cross-listed courses on average in a typical semester

Roughly 30 UC sections are cross-listed each semester (UC has 5 or fewer slots—these are primarily evening sections of AC, AE, CO, FI, MG, and MK.

5. University College teaching opportunities beyond load

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester Format</th>
<th>Number of sections</th>
<th>Number of sections taught by fulltime faculty beyond load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fourteen week Fall 2010 (not including AE, CO, AC, FI, MG, MK because these departments/areas schedule courses in the evening as part of load)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourteen week Spring 2011 (not including AE, CO, AC, FI, MG, MK because these departments/areas schedule courses in the evening as part of load)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Week (ASAP I+II) Fall 2010 Traditional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Week (ASAP I+II) Fall 2010 Online</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Week (ASAP I+II) Spring 2011 Traditional</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Week (ASAP I+II) Spring 2011 Online</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-Week Winter session 2011 Online</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Week Intensive Winter session 2011</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Week Intensive March 2010</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Week Intensive May 2010</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four week June Day/Evening 2010 Traditional</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four week July Day/Evening 2010 Traditional</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Week Summer 2010 Online</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Week August 2010 Traditional</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
200909 Census File

Summary

- Registered Students for Fall 2009: **755**
  - Part-time 719 (95.2%) (<12 credits)
  - Full-time 36 (4.8%) (≥12 credits)

- Age
  - Age 17 and under 14 (1.9%)
  - Ages 18-22 220 (29.1%)
  - Ages 23-27 125 (16.6%)
  - Ages 28-33 59 (7.8%)
  - Ages 34-40 44 (5.8%)
  - Ages 41-50 78 (10.3%)
  - Ages 51-60 63 (8.3%)
  - Ages 61+ 90 (11.9%)
  - Unknown 65 (8.6%)

- Gender
  - Female 438 (58.0%)
  - Male 294 (38.9%)
  - Unknown 23 (3.1%)

- Location
  - CT 695 (92.1%)
    - Ffld. County 594 (78.7%) of entire student population
  - NY 25 (3.3%)
  - International 18 (2.4%)
  - Northeast region 14 (1.9%)
  - Unknown 11 (1.5%)
  - Other 10 (1.3%)

- Financial Aid 81 (10.7%)

- Tuition Remission 40 (5.3%)

- Dependent Grant in Aid 23 (3.0%)

- Matriculated 226 (29.9%)

- Degree Breakdown
  - NDS 462 (61.2%)
    - IRP 88 (11.7%)
    - Au Pair 58 (7.7%)
  - BA 134 (17.7%)
    - PSLB 22 (2.9%)
    - ENGL 18 (2.4%)
  - CERTS 62 (8.2%)
    - INDR/INDP 36 (4.8%)
  - BS 61 (8.1%)
  - CERT 28 (3.7%)
  - AA 6 (0.8%)

- Registered Courses
Day courses 292 38.7% At least one, regular full-time course
Night courses 661 87.5% At least one course
Online courses 146 19.3% At least one course
Auditors 148 19.6% At least one course

Groupings* 
- Group 1 327 43.3% Non-matric, first time, 1 or 2 courses
- Group 2 135 17.9% Non-matric, previous
- Group 3 18 2.4% Non-matric, full-time
- Group 4 195 25.8% Degree-seeking
- Group 5 306 40.5% Non-credit courses
- Group 6 37 4.9% Matriculated, credit-bearing courses

*There is some overlap

Group 1: Mostly NDS students who live in Fairfield County, 20% “college age” and 20% “mature age.”
Group 2: Mostly NDS and CERTS students who live in Fairfield County, 40% are “college age.”
Group 3: From this small group, 75% are from Connecticut, half are BA/BS, and all are between 18 and 25 years old.
Group 4: Out of the degree-seekers, 85% are from Connecticut, 2/3rd are between 17 and 27 years old and almost all are part-time
Group 5: From the non-credit students, about 30% are “college age” and 30% are “mature age” and 88% are from Fairfield County
Group 6: Made up of NDS students and Interior Design certificate-takers, almost all are from Fairfield County, at a variety of ages, and most are taking only 1 or 2 courses

*Notes: For the basis of this report, “full-time” is considered 12 or more credits in one semester and “matriculated” relies on the matriculation code give to the Office of Institutional Research by University College staff.

Group 1 – Non-matriculated, first time students
- This group is for students taking 1 or 2 courses for the first time at Fairfield for the Fall 2009 semester
  - There is an even split between “college age” (18-22) and “mature age” (61 and above) students
  - 83% are from Fairfield County
  - 86% are NDS students
    - This number is so large due to some students eventually declaring a major, but they haven’t yet
  - *The total student number (327) is inflated due to the fact that noncredit students will have “earned hours” value of 0 since they do not “complete” credits
• Registered Students in Group 1: 327
  o All are part-time

• Age
  o Age 17 and under 12 3.7%
  o Ages 18-22 67 20.5%
  o Ages 23-27 37 11.3%
  o Ages 28-33 10 3.7%
  o Ages 34-40 16 4.2%
  o Ages 41-50 34 9.5%
  o Ages 51-60 32 9.8%
  o Ages 61+ 71 21.7%
  o Unknown 48 14.7%

• Gender
  o Female 211 64.5%
  o Male 96 29.4%
  o Unknown 20 6.1%

• Location
  o CT 303 92.7%
    ▪ Ffld. County 272 83.1% of entire group population
  o International 18 5.5%
  o Northeast Region 3 1.0%
  o Other 3 1.0%

• Financial Aid
  none

• Tuition Remission
  9 2.4%

• Dependent Grant in Aid
  2 0.6%

• Registered Courses
  o 1 course 173 52.9%
  o 2 courses 154 47.1%
  o Day courses 91 27.8% at least one day course
  o Night courses 308 94.2% at least one day course
  o Online courses 33 10.1%
  o Auditors 114 34.9%

• Degree Breakdown
  o NDS 283 86.5%
    ▪ IRP 70 21.4% of entire group population
    ▪ Au Pair 43 13.1% of entire group population
  o CERT 22 6.7%
  o CERTS 15 4.6%
  o BA/BS 5 1.5%

• Visitors
  o High school 9 2.4%
    ▪ 8 are taking MA 0227 - Calculus III: Engineering & Physics Majors
Group 2 – Non-matriculated, previous students

- This group is for students who have taken a course in the past and are back again this semester, they are also non-matriculated

- Registered Students in Group 2: 135
  - All are part-time

- Age
  - Ages 18-22 54 40.0%
  - Ages 23-27 19 14.1%
  - Ages 28-33 19 14.1%
  - Ages 34-40 9 6.7%
  - Ages 41-50 17 12.6%
  - Ages 51-61 16 11.9%

- Gender
  - Male 68 50.4%
  - Female 67 49.6%

- Location
  - CT 131 97.0%
    - Ffld. County 113 83.7%

- Financial Aid 4 3.0%

- Tuition Remission 15 11.1%

- Dependent Grant in Aid 5 3.7%

- Registered Courses
  - 1 course 40 29.6%
  - 2 courses 45 33.3%
  - 3 courses 45 33.3%
  - 4 courses 5 3.7%
  - Day courses 47 37.8%
    - 1 course 17 36.1% of the number of Day courses
    - 2+ courses 30 63.8% of the number of Day courses
  - Night courses 109 80.7%
  - Online courses 25 18.5%

- Degree Breakdown
  - NDS 76 56.3%
  - CERTS 35 25.9%
    - Int. Design 19 14.1% of entire group population
  - BA 17 12.6%
  - BS 4 3.0%
  - CERT 2 1.5%
  - AA 1 0.7%

- Progression
  - Median credit hours completed: 12
  - 26 students have earned 3 or less credit hours
  - 53 students have earned between 4 and 12 credit hours
34 students have earned between 15 and 30 credit hours
22 students have earned between 33 and 164 credit hours

Group 3 – Non-matriculated, full-time students
- This group is a subset of Groups 1 and 2, for all the non-matriculated students which are full-time
- Since it is full-time, 94% are taking day classes, which is rare for UC students
- Also 50% of the students are BA/BS compared to the more common NDS focus
- *All of these students are already accounted for in Group 1 and Group 2

- Registered Students in Group 3: 18
  - All are full-time
- Age
  - Ages 18-19 9 50.0%
  - Ages 20-22 8 44.4%
  - Age 25 1 5.6%
- Gender
  - Male 11 61.1%
  - Female 7 38.9%
- Location
  - CT 13 72.2%
  - Ffld. County 11 61.1%
  - Other 5 27.8%
- Financial Aid 5 27.8%
- Tuition Remission none
- Dependent Grant in Aid 5 27.8%
- Registered Courses
  - 4 courses 13 72.2%
  - 5 courses 5 27.8%
  - Day courses 17 94.4%
  - Night courses 15 83.3%
  - Online courses 5 27.8%
- Degree Breakdown
  - BA/BS 9 50.0%
  - NDS 8 44.4%
  - CERTS 1 5.6%
- Progression
  - Median credit hours completed: 39
  - 8 students have earned 6 credit hours or less
  - 4 students have earned between 10 and 24 credit hours
  - 6 students have earned between 26 and 76 credit hours

Group 4 – Degree-seeking students
- Matriculated and non-matriculated leading to AA, BA or BS (no MA/MS offered)
• *30 of these students are already accounted for in Groups 1-3  
  o These students are all non-matriculated

• Registered students in Group 4:  **195**  
  o Part-time 171 87.7%  
  o Full-time 24 12.3%

• Age  
  o Ages 17-22 80 41.0%  
  o Ages 23-27 55 28.2%  
  o Ages 28-33 21 10.8%  
  o Ages 34-40 12 6.0%  
  o Ages 41-50 16 8.0%  
  o Ages 51-63 11 5.5%

• Gender  
  o Male 106 54.4%  
  o Female 89 45.6%

• Location  
  o CT 166 85.1%  
    ▪ Ffld. County 133 68.2%  
  o NY 12 6.2%  
  o Northeast Region 11 5.6%

• Financial Aid 72 36.9%
• Tuition Remission 6 3.1%
• Dependent Grant in Aid 9 4.6%

• Registered Courses  
  o 1 course 32 16.4%  
  o 2 courses 65 33.3%  
  o 3 courses 70 35.9%  
  o 4 courses 19 9.7%  
  o 5+ courses 9 2.1%  
  o Day courses 105 53.8%  
    ▪ 1 course 31 29.5%  
    ▪ 2+ courses 74 70.5%  
  o Night courses 150 76.9%  
  o Online courses 70 35.9%

• Matriculated 163 83.6%

• Degree Breakdown  
  o BA 128 65.6%  
    ▪ PSLB 22 11.3%  
    ▪ ENGL 18 9.2%  
  o BS 61 31.3%  
    ▪ BUSU 12 6.2%  
    ▪ MARK 10 5.1%  
  o AA 6 3.1%

• Progression
- Median credit hours completed: 80
- 22 students have earned up to 12 credit hours
- 15 students have earned between 15 and 30 credit hours
- 40 students have earned between 33 and 64 credit hours
- 54 students have earned between 68 and 100 credit hours
- 55 students have earned more than 100 credit hours

**Group 5 – Non-degree seekers/non-credit certificates**

- Students who are non-degree seekers or completing non-credit certificates (Level 04)
  - Tend to be “college age” or “retirement age”
  - Great majority are taking only 1 or 2 courses

- Registered students in Group 5: **306**
  - All are part-time

- **Age**
  - Ages 17-22: 117 (38.2%)
  - Ages 23-27: 29 (9.5%)
  - Ages 28-33: 11 (3.6%)
  - Ages 34-40: 12 (3.9%)
  - Ages 41-55: 45 (14.7%)
  - Ages 56-65: 27 (8.8%)
  - Ages 65+: 66 (21.6%)
  - Unknown: 56 (18.3%)
• Gender
  o Female 211 69.0%
  o Male 78 25.5%
  o Unknown 17 5.6%

• Location
  o CT 294 96.1%
    • Ffld. County 269 87.9%
  o NY 6 2.0%
  o Other 6 2.0%
• Financial Aid 1 0.3%
• Tuition Remission 3 1.0%
• Dependent Grant in Aid 1 1.3%
• Registered Courses
  o 1 course 117 38.2%
  o 2 courses 140 45.8%
  o 3 courses 46 15.0%
  o 4 courses 3 1.0%
  o Day courses 116 37.9%
    • 1 course 84 27.5%
    • 2+ courses 32 72.5%
  o Night courses 293 95.8%
  o Online courses 16 5.2%
  o Auditors 143 46.7%
• Degree Breakdown
  o NDS 276 90.2%
    • IRP 86 28.1% of entire group population
    • Au Pair 58 19.0% of entire group population
  o CERT 28 9.2%

Group 6 – Matriculated, credit-bearing certificate students/non-degree seekers
• Group Summary
  o These are “left-over” students that didn’t fit into another category, but they all have common traits
  o All are matriculated
  o All are taking credit-bearing courses (even without a degree in mind)

• Registered students in Group 6: 37
• Age
  o Ages 21-29 14 37.8%
  o Ages 30-46 10 27.0%
  o Ages 47-57 9 24.3%
  o Unknown 4 10.8%
• Gender
  o Female 28 75.7%
• Male          9  24.3%

• Location
  • CT          37  100.0%
    ▪ Ffld. County 28  75.7%

• Financial Aid  2  5.4%

• Tuition Remission  9  24.3%

• Dependant Grant in Aid  1  2.7%

• Registered Courses
  • 1 course  15  40.5%
  • 2 courses  15  40.5%
  • 3+ courses  7  18.9%
  • Day courses  10  27.0%  all NDS students
  • Night courses  3  8.1%  all NDS students
  • Online courses  12  32.4%  all NDS students

• Degree Breakdown
  • NDS       26  70.3%
  • CERTS    11  29.7%
    ▪ All are Interior Design students

• Progression
  • Median credit hours completed: 36
  • 13 students have earned between 3 and 12 credits
  • 12 students have earned between 27 and 79 credits
  • 12 students have earned more than 102 credits
## University College Enrollment 2005-06 to Current (Five Years)

### ALL STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Total Credits</th>
<th>Avg. Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>4548</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>4193</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>3552</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>4077</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>4015</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>4313</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>4336</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>4082</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>3680</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>3638</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>3141</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BY DEGREE

#### BA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Total Credits</th>
<th>Avg. Credits</th>
<th>Top Major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>PSBA (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>PSYC (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>PSBA (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>PSBA (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>PSBA (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>PSYC (16)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>PSLB (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1191</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>PSLB (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>PSLB (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>ENGL (17)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>BUSU (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### NS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Total Credits</th>
<th>Avg. Credits</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>2692</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>2179</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>2279</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>2427</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>2701</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>2452</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>2497</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*UNDECIDED tied for Top Major in this semester
**n/a due to no census file being available

---
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8. Online Students by Term
### Appendix E: Alternative Structures for Programs Currently Housed in University College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A – University College Model (School or College)</th>
<th>B – Xavier Model (Offices, Centers or Division)</th>
<th>C – Seattle Model (Distributed to Schools)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston College (9100)</td>
<td>Xavier has:</td>
<td>Holy Cross (2900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creighton (4100)</td>
<td>-- Center for Adult &amp; Part-time programs</td>
<td>Loyola Maryland (3700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham (8000)</td>
<td>-- Xavier Leadership Center for non-credit/non-degree &amp; consulting</td>
<td>Loyola Marymount (5600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown (6700)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Clara* (5300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzaga (4400)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seattle (4200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola Chicago (9600)</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco (5500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette (7700)</td>
<td>Canisius (3200)</td>
<td>* Santa Clara does have a separate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis (5600)</td>
<td>John Carroll (3000)</td>
<td>Institute for Lifelong Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockhurst (3000)</td>
<td>Le Moyne (2800)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph’s (5400)</td>
<td>Loyola New Orleans (2700)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Louis (7600)</td>
<td>Detroit Mercy (3100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Peter’s (3100)</td>
<td>Spring Hill (1500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton (4000)</td>
<td>Wheeling Jesuit (1400)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield (4000)</td>
<td>Xavier (3800)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 institutions</td>
<td>8 institutions</td>
<td>6 institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average undergrad enrollment: (5400)</td>
<td>average undergrad enrollment: (2700)</td>
<td>average undergrad enrollment: (4500)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Advantages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A – University College Model (School or College)</th>
<th>B – Xavier Model (Offices, Centers or Division)</th>
<th>C – Seattle Model (Distributed to Schools)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-- Enables continuation of BPS</td>
<td>-- Centralized marketing for non-credit / non-degree programs</td>
<td>-- Already have part-time students in some schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- May provide highest level of attention for part-time students</td>
<td>-- may offer greater motivation to increase revenues (e.g., online)</td>
<td>-- Resource neutral; reassignment of UC resources to the schools for appropriate staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- role of CUC is clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantage(s)</td>
<td>Disadvantage(s)</td>
<td>Disadvantage(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Point person(s) for future CUC to work with</td>
<td>-- New Dean would be needed</td>
<td>-- New administrator(s) may need to be hired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Resources allocated to schools</td>
<td>-- Costly administrative structure; revenues do not justify current structure</td>
<td>-- Requires two administrative units in place of one (UC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Works against integration</td>
<td>-- Biggest change from current structure</td>
<td>-- Role of future CUC not clear (no point person)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix F: Potential Models for a “Center for Continuing Studies” (Villanova & Xavier)**
The courses are offered on campus and at various corporate sites throughout the tri-state area.

Partnering with BISK Education, the Continuing Studies Office offers Project Management, Human Resources, Six Sigma and other non-credit certificate programs via Distance Learning to over twelve thousand (12,000) students a year.

Quick Links
- On-Line Bill: V-Bill
- March 8, 2011 Graduate, Part-Time and Continuing Studies Open House
- Non-Credit/Certificate Programs
- Corporate and On-Site
- On-Line Learning
- Courses for Credit
- Sallie Mae Smart Option LoanSM
- Citibank CitAssist® Loan

Class Start Dates/Events
- **January 21-22, 2011, Friday and Saturday**
  - Master Certificate in Project Management classes begin
- **January 27-28, 2011, Friday**
  - Alcohol & Drug Counseling classes begin
- **February, 2011**
  - ESL Certificate Program - Business Communication classes begin
- **February 3, 2011, Thursday**
  - Evening Foundations in Project Management Training and PMP® Credential Prep classes begin
- **February 7, 2011, Monday**
  - Fundamentals of Fundraising classes begin
- **February 7, 2011, Monday**
  - Spring 2011 PHR/SPHR classes begin
- **February 21, 2011, Monday**
  - Spring 2011 GPHR Classes begin
- **Week of March 1, 2011, Tuesday**
  - PMI Learning System, AIP Treasury, APICS Supply Chain, IIA's CIA Internal Auditing Learning System classes begin
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Office of Continuing Studies

About Us
• Meet Our Staff
• Guidelines
• Education Opportunities
• Photo Gallery
• Registration Forms
• Frequently Asked Questions

You are exploring: VU > Academic Affairs > Office of Continuing Studies

Meet Our Staff

James Kane Jr., M.S., SPHR  james.kane@villanova.edu  (610) 519-4502
Director, Continuing Studies

Suzanne Allen  suzanne.allen@villanova.edu  (610) 519-5240
Assistant Director, Continuing Studies

Karen Christie  karen.christie@villanova.edu  (610) 519-4504
Continuing Studies Supervisor, Paralegal Program

Judy Gantle  judygantle@villanova.edu  (610) 519-8024
Program Specialist, Alcohol and Drug Program, Fundraising Program, Veteran's Benefits

Loretta Schaffer  lorretaschaffer@villanova.edu  (610) 519-4813
Program Specialist, AFN, CMA, CPECS, CPA, APA Programs

Linda Pagliaro  lindapagliaro@villanova.edu  (610) 519-4303
Program Specialist, Human Resource Management Programs

Graduate Business Programs

Admissions Process
• Open Enrollment
• Executive Education

Business Strategy
• Leadership
• Finance & Accounting
• Technology
• Marketing

The Mini-MBA
• Locations
• Corporate Advantage Program

Registration
• Custom Programs
• Executive MBA
• Faculty
• Informational Events
• Contact Us

You are exploring: VU > Business > Graduate Business Programs > Executive Education > Open Enrollment

Open Enrollment

Open Enrollment—Programs for Individuals

Whether you’re looking to sharpen your business acumen or taking the first step towards an advanced degree, VSB’s Open Enrollment Programs offer you the opportunity to experience a dynamic learning environment.

VSB Executive Education programs are delivered by a unique combination of faculty and practitioners who are recognized both for their deep industry experience as well as excellence in teaching and research.

Programs Offered:

• The Mini-MBA
• Finance for the Non-Financial Manager
• Managing Risk Strategically: Fundamentals of Business Risk Assessment
• Technology Trends that Matter: The Effective Use of New Media for Marketing
• Re-thinking Your Business Strategy - A Systems Thinking Perspective
• Creating & Leading High Performance Teams
NURSING PROGRAMS

The School of Nursing at Xavier University has as its goal the preparation of professional nurses educated to meet the health care needs of diverse populations in an ever-changing highly technical health care environment.

Graduates of Xavier nursing are prepared to practice nursing today and be leaders of tomorrow. The philosophy of the department has always been to prepare nurses to be holistic leaders in healthcare delivery with an educational foundation grounded in Jesuit values. Xavier University’s School of Nursing is proud of the innovative programs developed over the years that creatively address changes in the current health care arena.

Now, we are bringing those programs to Nursing professionals outside of Xavier’s traditional student base, through the Nursing Program at Xavier Leadership Center.

Taped by the School of Nursing’s extraordinary faculty, all XLC Nursing Program courses offer XLC’s trademark focus on facilitated learning, and help nurses take advantage of the latest advancements and information in the Nursing field.
The Xavier Leadership Center Nursing Program helps you make a difference.

Course Titles

Open Enrollment Programs

• Nurse Leader Certificate Program
• Nursing Informatics Board Certification Exam Review
• The Impact of Healthcare Reform
OUR TEAM

With a combination of tested business experts and acclaimed instructors, the Xavier Leadership Center team will deliver an outstanding program curriculum tailored to your organization's needs.

To learn more about our unique team of business professionals and instructors, please review our XLC Facilitators page.

XLC Leadership Team

Len Brzozowski, Executive Director
Bruce Miller, Managing Partner
Shelly Wallace, Associate Director

Marla Phillips, PhD (Director, Med-X)
Sue Enright (Director, Programs)
Jane Stark (Director, Marketing and Business Development)
Amanda Odom (Marketing and Communications Coordinator)

Len Brzozowski

Len Brzozowski is the Executive Director of the Xavier Leadership Center, helping companies across a wide variety of industries develop the leadership skills necessary to succeed in today's dynamic market environment. By engaging leaders from every level of the enterprise, Len helps companies effectively identify and implement solutions to overcome business, interpersonal and organizational challenges.

Len holds advanced degrees in engineering systems and business strategy from Dartmouth College and has worked on a variety of public and private sector management consulting projects with the firms Cresap, McCormick and Paget and McKinsey & Company. His work has involved clients including Georgia Power, Air Products and Chemicals, Macy's, Michigan Department of Education, Burns and Wilcox, The US Department of Agriculture, Stahls' Inc., and Lucas Girling.

Before joining Xavier, Len was a successful entrepreneur, running his company - Robotron Corporation - a global designer and builder of high frequency welding and induction heating equipment and systems. His operating experience includes Europe, Asia, and Mexico. Under his leadership, Robotron was recognized by Crain's Detroit Business as one of the leading technology companies of Michigan, and was named as one of the 50 most innovative small business in the United States by the US Chamber of Commerce.

Len has written and published many articles on the topics of education, leadership, strategy implementation, management and entrepreneurship in The Journal of Bank Research, The Journal of Systems, Synergetics, and Cybernetics of the IEEE, Agricultural Economics Research, Small Business Focus and The Year. He has provided testimony to the Joint Science and Technology Committee of US congress on improving mathematics and science education, and is a frequent lecturer to local organizations and businesses on the topics of organizational change, leadership, and systems theory.
Training Leadership for Every Discipline

Solving most problems requires a conceptual understanding of theory, coupled with a practical implementation experience. This is why we use not only Xavier faculty from all the schools and colleges on campus, but draw from a wide network of experienced business professionals, consultants, coaches, retired executives and industry experts who are drawn to Xavier by their passion to help serve and make a difference. To help ensure your custom program delivers outstanding results, we have more than 100 facilitators from a variety of backgrounds, industries and experiences—not only in Cincinnati, but around the world.

XLC Facilitators
MEMORANDUM
Fairfield University

TO: Academic Council

FROM: Gerry Campbell, Committee on University College, 2010-11 Chair; Acting University College Dean Robbin Crabtree; Secretary of the General Faculty Irene Mulvey; Associate University College Dean Aaron Perkus

DATE: August 28, 2011

RE: Follow-up to 5/9/2011 Academic Council discussion re proposal to close University College

Background.
The Academic Council first took up the issue of matters related to University College at a meeting on May 19, 2010. At that meeting, following approval of a Petition for Immediate Hearing to put the matter on the agenda immediately, the Council passed a motion setting up a subcommittee to “to investigate the situation with regard to University College, compile a list of relevant academic issues and implications and make recommendations, if appropriate, to the AC and the SVPAA before any final decisions are made.” The issues cited in the discussion of the motion to approve the Petition for Immediate Hearing, both procedural and academic, were that changes that clearly required robust faculty input had been made without input from appropriate faculty or Handbook committees. The subcommittee reported back to the Academic Council at an emergency summer meeting on June 25, 2010. A motion was passed insisting “that the University College Dean be kept on throughout the entire process of any reorganization of UC with a meaningful and appropriately compensated role as consultant”. During the two-hour June 25 Council meeting, the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs apologized for mistakes he had made, affirmed the subcommittee’s statement that no decisions had been made, affirmed that University College cannot be closed without faculty review, and committed to proposing, in Fall 2010, that programs currently offered in University College be reassigned to other schools and programs.

Over the course of eight meetings in academic year 2010-11, the Committee on University College undertook a thorough study of the organizational structure of University College which culminated in a six-part motion outlining the Committee on University College’s recommendation to close University College and relocate its programs as outlined in the six-part motion. The six-part motion (part of a 63-page report) was approved unanimously by the Committee on University College on March 10, 2011; approved (11 in favor, one opposed, one abstaining) by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee on April 5, 2011; and approved unanimously by the Educational Planning Committee on April 14, 2011. The Academic Council began discussing the report at its last meeting of the academic year on May 9, 2011.

Some of the discussion in the draft Council minutes from the May 9 meeting indicated a concern on the part of some Council members that voting to close University College before approving all the necessary policy changes and conducting appropriate academic reviews is doing things in the wrong order and could cause problems. It was noted that this was a conundrum of the work since developing policies assuming a closed University College is as problematic as voting to close University College without appropriate policies in place. One point of view expressed was that we “should hold our noses and jump into the deep end, and trust that the process will work out and that the committees can substantively and expeditiously
look at these policies.” Given that the motion to close a school must be approved by the General Faculty and the General Faculty would presumably be reluctant to close a school without all attendant policies in place, another point of view was that whatever the Council recommends that the General Faculty consider must be as complete as possible with all relevant concerns addressed. Ultimately, the Council passed a motion “to delay consideration of [the report from University College and the six-part motion] until the first meeting in September [2011].” Acting University College Dean Crabtree expressed her interest in hearing from people, what questions they would want answered, and the modified packet they would want to see in order to move forward as quickly as possible. The Secretary of the General Faculty offered to work with Dean Crabtree over the summer in order to convey what the General Faculty should see in order to be able to consider the report and six-part motion from the Committee on University College.

**Summer 2011.**

Over the course of the summer, in informal emails and one meeting, the Acting University College Dean, the Associate University College Dean, the Secretary of the General Faculty and the out-going chair of the University College Committee considered how best to proceed with the goal of moving the matter forward for resolution. The suggestions from this informal *ad hoc* group are what follow in this memo.

**Suggestions and recommendations.**

The first consideration for the Academic Council should be to consider the decision, in principle, to close University College. The concern about making a practical, final decision to close University College without all the newly required policies in place and without the necessary academic review taking place ahead of time appeared to be a barrier to the Council discussion and to the Council moving forward to a vote. Questions about what the next steps would be should be fully answered before any proposals are sent to the General Faculty.

We suggest that the following next steps may assist the Academic Council in ultimately reaching a decision to send forward to the General Faculty. These steps are predicated on the assumption that they follow from a formal Academic Council decision to agree, in principle, to close University College:

1. That the Council set up joint Subcommittee: Academic Council (2 members)/Committee on University College (2 members)/Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (2 members)/administration (2 members) to (i) propose policies and procedures for part-time undergraduate students in the College of Arts and Sciences and the Dolan School of Business (i.e., admission, transfer credit, regular core, standard major, time limits) and (ii) to consult with the College of Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee and the Dolan School of Business Undergraduate Committee to consider the wisdom of continuing the Bachelor of Professional Studies degree;
2. That the Council set up a Subcommittee to consider the wisdom and viability of a Center for Continuing Education.

Ideally, each of the Subcommittees should attempt to report back to the Academic Council at or before the Council’s December meeting.
[For Item 6.b.]

TO: Academic Council

FROM: Manyul Im, UCC Chair &
The UCC Core Credit Subcommittee
Members: Katsiaryna (Katya) Salavei (chair of subcommittee), Finance
Giovanni Ruffini, History
Jerelyn Johnson, Modern Languages
Elizabeth Petrino, English

DATE: February 22, 2011

RE: Core Credit Approval for courses outside a particular core area

The Core Credit Subcommittee was formed on September 14, 2010 and charged with the development of a process by which a course in a discipline outside of a particular core area is approved for core credit in that area. After consulting with chairs of all departments offering core courses, the subcommittee recommends adopting a process similar to that in place in the Natural Science Core Area.¹ Motion as stated on pages 3 to 4 of this document is an amended version of an earlier motion sent to Academic Council on November 2, 2010. To summarize, the amendment removes from the earlier motion ‘Applied Ethics’ from the list of core reviewing units (and throughout the accompanying documents). This change will address the following concerns of the AC that were passed along to UCC by Elizabeth Petrino, who was the UCC Chairperson last semester:

“The AC Executive Committee met on 1/24/11 and discussed the proposal and in doing so noticed two problems: (i) at various places the proposal mistakenly references Applied Ethics as an area of the core, and (ii) the proposal includes a process for approval for core credit of Applied Ethics courses that is inconsistent with policies in the Journal of Record.”

Since area III (3) of the core, under which Applied Ethics falls, needs to be approved by either Religious Studies or Philosophy Departments as per Journal of Record, it is sufficient to have only Religious Studies and Philosophy Departments as reviewing units.”

The amended motion has been approved by a vote of 15 in favor, zero against or abstaining, at the UCC meeting of February 8, 2011 (see attached minutes). In outline, the motion proposes the following procedure:

Faculty submits to the respective core reviewing unit a Core Credit Application consisting of:
1) Syllabus
2) Core Course Review Form
Core reviewing unit reviews Core Credit Application and submits Core Course Recommendation Form to the UCC.
UCC reviews Core Credit Application and Core Course Recommendation Form and votes “Accept” or “Reject”.

¹ Please see Core Course Review Guidelines for details.
Step 1: Faculty or department submits *Core Credit Application* to either the department currently offering core courses in the area or the relevant UCC subcommittee (core reviewing unit). The *Core Credit Application* will consist of 1) syllabus and 2) *Core Course Review Form*, which will require a detailed description of how the course fulfills the learning outcomes of the relevant core area.

Step 2: Core Department or relevant UCC subcommittee reviews *Core Credit Application* and submits *Core Course Recommendation Form* to the UCC, in which it describes why or why not the course should be granted Core designation in a specific area.

Step 3: UCC reviews both the *Core Credit Application* and the *Core Course Recommendation Form* and makes a final recommendation by voting to either “Accept” or “Reject” the recommendation stated in *Core Course Recommendation Form*. In the event of a negative outcome the department in question will work with faculty/department proposing a new course towards a successful outcome, if possible.

**Motion**

- to approve the process described in the Core Course Review Guidelines by which a course in a discipline outside of a particular core area counts for core credit in that area;

- to form a UCC Core Social Science Subcommittee of faculty from the respective disciplines (Politics, Economics, Psychology, Sociology and Anthropology, and Communication) and one outside faculty member to review which courses should be designated for social-science core credit. Each department will nominate at least one individual to serve on the UCC Core Social Science Subcommittee who will then stand for election at the UCC. An election will be held in the Spring of 2011 to elect all members. Committee members may serve consecutive terms; members are elected for a three year term. One member will agree to serve only a two year term for the first term. New committee members will be elected at the beginning of the Fall semester of each year;

- to request respective core learning outcomes from the following core area reviewing units:
  - Classical & Modern Languages
  - English
  - History
  - Mathematics
  - Philosophy
  - Religious Studies
  - Visual & Performing Arts
  - UCC Core Social Science Subcommittee, once its members are elected
and amend Journal of Record as follows:

In *Journal of Record*, Appendix 2 (pp. 64-65) “Routing for Approval of Undergraduate Course/Program Revisions in the Undergraduate Divisions,” item 6 (Changes where underlined):

6. Changes in Core Requirements

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

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

1. Curriculum Area Chair(s) Core Reviewing Unit (see Table 1) to
2. UCC

Table 1: Reviewing units for each of the core areas

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

<<<<<<<<<<< END OF MOTION >>>>>>>>>>

**Rationale for creating UCC Core Social Science Subcommittee:**
Social Science and Natural Science core areas have the greatest number of large departments currently offering core courses. The UCC Core Science Course Review Committee (CSCRC) proved to be a successful model for reviewing core courses in Natural Sciences. UCC formed a one-time Social Science subcommittee to review Communication courses in 2004. A standing UCC Core Social Science Subcommittee with new members elected at the beginning of the academic year will ensure objectivity and the logistical simplicity of the review process. In the absence of such subcommittee it is not clear which department would have to report recommendation to the UCC.

**Rationale for requesting respective core learning outcomes:**
The main goal of the creation of the process by which a course in a discipline outside of a particular area of the core curriculum can be approved for core credit in that area is to link proposals with learning outcomes, and thus make the process more objective. However, as discussed at the May 4, 2010 meeting of the UCC, learning outcomes articulated in the Mission of the Core might not be current (see attached; also available on line at http://www.fairfield.edu/academic/aca_core_mission.html). For example, it was noted that the English department reviewed learning outcomes as part of the curriculum review. Motions 2a and 2b will ensure that learning outcomes used to evaluate courses are current.
I. Background

This document establishes a process by which a department or faculty member can seek approval for core credit in a discipline outside of a particular area of the Core Curriculum. As undergraduate education and faculty training becomes increasingly more interdisciplinary, it is imperative to review courses and insure that core learning objectives across disciplines are met. This process formalizes a procedure that is already in place in some core areas and insures consistency, transparency and collegiality regarding approving courses for core credit.

This process does not affect courses currently taught in the core but is to be used for courses currently unapproved for core credit. The course that receives a core credit needs to fulfill the leaning objectives for the respective core area as stated in the Mission of the Core Statement. Each goal need not be addressed to the same degree in every course, although it is important that all goals be addressed in some meaningful way.

II. Procedure for reviewing courses

A. Instructions to proposing department or faculty member

To have a course considered for core credit, a department or a faculty has to submit Core Credit Application consisting of 1) Course Syllabus; 2) Core Course Review Form via e-mail to the respective core area reviewing unit as defined in Table 1 and to the chair of the UCC. The Core Course Review Form should describe in detail how proposed course fulfill the leaning objectives for the respective core area as stated in the Mission of the Core Statement.

Table 1: Reviewing units for each of the core areas

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

Deadlines:
Fall semester application – October 1

---

2 Please see Appendix A.
Spring semester application – February 15

**B. Instructions to core reviewing unit**

Core reviewing unit reviews *Core Credit Application* and submits *Core Course Recommendation Form* and relevant minutes of a meeting of faculty of a core reviewing unit to the UCC, in which it describes why the course should or should not be granted core credit.

*Deadlines:*
Fall semester application – November 25
Spring semester application – April 25

**C. Approval Process**

UCC reviews both the *Core Credit Application* and the *Core Course Recommendation Form* and makes final recommendation by voting to either “Accept” or “Reject” the recommendation stated in *Core Course Recommendation Form* for all core areas except Philosophy and Religious Studies. In the event of a negative outcome core reviewing unit will be working with faculty/department proposing a new course towards a successful outcome whenever possible.

When reviewing courses for core credit in Philosophy and Religious Studies, the UCC will work with Philosophy and Religious Studies to achieve a compromise and will accept departmental recommendation.3

---

3 See “Restrictions on Courses in Area III of the Core” in the Journal of Record (November 2009, page 10).
CORE COURSE REVIEW FORM

Course Number and Title: ____________________________________________

Proposing Department or Faculty: ________________________________

Core Credit Area: ________________________________________________

Date: __________________________________________________________

1. Please consider each of the stated Goals and Expected Outcomes and respond with reference to your course. Please attach a current or proposed syllabus and other material you believe will clarify any points you wish to make. Each goal need not be addressed to the same degree although it is important that all be addressed in some meaningful way.

<<< Insert Core Area Goals >>>

2. Describe how proposed course enhances core curriculum area and differs from other courses currently offered in this core area.
CORE COURSE RECOMMENDATION FORM

Please refer to Core Course Review Guidelines for instructions.

Core Review Unit: __________________________________________________________

Course Number and Title: _________________________________________________

Proposing Department or Faculty: _________________________________________

Core Credit Area: _______________________________________________________

Date: __________________________________________________________________

Recommendation (circle one):   Accept    Reject

Please describe in detail why 1) the course meets (does not meet) learning outcomes of your core area as listed in Core Course Review Form and/or 2) the course complements (is too similar to) current core offerings in your core area.

Please supply a copy of the minutes of faculty of a core reviewing unit.
The Core Curriculum of Fairfield University is the foundation upon which rests the education of each of our undergraduate students. Through the selection of liberal arts courses from across the curriculum that constitute the Core, the student is made acquainted with a body of knowledge, trained in a series of specific skills, and introduced to the values that guide the conduct of the search for wisdom.

The Mission of the Core Curriculum is twofold: to nurture the formation of the undergraduate student as a thinking and caring citizen of the world of today; and to provide the general educational background against which the student can put into relief the more advanced intellectual or technical attainment of a “major” field of study.

This twofold Mission dictates the shape of the Core Curriculum. Given the Mission of the Core, the knowledge that it highlights is that which enables students to know and assess the world in which they live, to appreciate the many forces that have played a part in its shaping, and to be sensitive to the different critical perspectives that are brought to bear upon it. The skills taught through the Core are those which facilitate the task of living constructively in the world--objectivity, critical acumen, oral and written communication, dexterity with symbols and symbol-systems, aesthetic appreciation and sensitivity to difference, familiarity with new and developing methodologies and technologies. The values are those which distinguish the life of someone who dwells constructively within the world--moral and intellectual integrity, compassion, commitment, a thirst for justice. While these values are given particular shape and texture in the Christian story that indelibly marks the history and identity of Fairfield University, they are universal ideals which, as the University Mission Statement suggests, are “the obligation of all educated, mature human beings.”
Behavioral and Social Sciences
The mission of the behavioral and social science core is to engage students actively in scientific approaches to the understanding of both individual and social behavior, so that they can better understand the world in which they live. While unique in their discipline-specific approaches, the behavioral and social sciences—Anthropology, Economics, Politics, Psychology and Sociology—are based on knowledge of behavior that is collected through systematic observation and subject to empirical verification. Students of these sciences are presented with alternative paradigms of behavior. They are challenged to think in new ways to understand and solve the problems of individuals and societies.

Through their study of the behavioral and social sciences, students will:
- develop an understanding of alternative models of individual and social behavior;
- develop the ability to interpret a variety of forms of empirical data;
- be able to address behavioral and social science issues in a systematic fashion and use discipline-specific tools to formulate and test solutions to problems.

Classical and Modern Languages
The study of languages, both classical and modern, is a key element in working and learning across cultures and geographic boundaries. Language in the Core Curriculum focuses on the acquisition of the skills of reading, listening, speaking and writing, though the emphasis varies according to the chosen language. Students in core language study acquire knowledge about other cultures, literatures and historical periods. It is expected that students will use the skills and knowledge acquired in language courses in practical and intellectual pursuits.

Through their study of foreign languages, students will:
- be able to read a passage of moderate difficulty in their chosen language and, in the case of modern languages, will be able to communicate with a native speaker;
- learn grammatical and syntactical rules which will facilitate oral and written expression in the language;
- become acquainted with the life, customs and cultural traditions where the language is or was spoken.
**English**
The English core teaches students to write the English language clearly and to read literature thoughtfully, critically, and with enjoyment. The study of composition fosters students’ growth as writers by emphasizing clarity, focus, development and organization of ideas. The study of literature introduces students to imaginative works from a variety of genres and periods so as to foster students’ critical and aesthetic skills. In studying literature students consider both creative work of the individual writer and the social and cultural context in which that work was created. Faculty work with the Library staff to introduce students systematically to bibliographic research and the electronic technology, including CD-ROM databases and websites.

Through their study of composition and literature, students will:
- learn to organize ideas and express them clearly in writing for a range of audiences and a variety of purposes;
- read literature with an understanding informed by a knowledge of genre, the literary background of the era in which it was written, and of the various critical approaches that illuminate the text;
- be able to write a research paper with competence in grammar, organization, clarity, and the integration and acknowledgement of sources.

**History**
The mission of the history core is to foster an understanding of history as a continuous process in which a variety of forces (economic, geographical, political, social, cultural, intellectual, religious, technological) interact dynamically with one another. The history core fosters an understanding of the foundations of the modern world.

Through their study of history students will:
- come to understand historiographical debates, embodied in the conflicting interpretations of the past and reflective of particular historical contexts and the background and circumstances of particular authors;
- develop written, oral and research skills to support their ability to undertake critical analyses of any era or area of the globe, and that will be of enduring value in their life and work;
- develop the historical imagination that enables them to understand the role that socio-economic factors (for example, class divisions and conflict) play in shaping culture and politics;
- develop a sense of the debt that human societies, now and in the past, owe to the willing and unwilling labor and sacrifices of countless men and women who remain nameless and forgotten.
Mathematics
Mathematics has been an integral part of a liberal education from the days of Plato’s Academy, through the Jesuit Ratio Studiorum, into the intellectual life of the modern world. The revolutionary ideas of calculus occupy a unique place in Western intellectual history and make calculus well suited for study at the university level. Fairfield’s mathematics core requirement is aimed at presenting this deep mathematical subject as both an object of abstract beauty and a model of deductive reasoning. The calculus is studied as an art and a science. Although an abstract subject, the calculus draws its motivation from and provides applications to a variety of problems both from inside and outside mathematics. The theory is illustrated through applications to problems from geometry, optimization, physics, economics, business, and/or the life sciences.

Through their study of mathematics, students will:
• develop an appreciation of the calculus as a model of analytical thinking and as an object of art, illustrating the abstract beauty of mathematics in general;
• come to understand the basic concepts of the calculus—function, limit derivative, and integral;
• develop problem-solving ability and a knowledge of the calculus as a tool, applicable to problems from a wide variety of disciplines.

Natural Sciences
The primary mission of study in the natural sciences is to help students develop an understanding of and respect for the scientific method, and the knowledge of the physical world that it has produced. The natural sciences, broadly categorized as biology, chemistry and physics, are united by their common methodology. To recognize the breadth and increasingly interdisciplinary nature of the sciences, as well as the diversity of student interests, students may elect in-depth study of one natural science or a distribution across several. In their exposure to the scientific method, students learn the importance of critically questioning empirical truth claims and the value of scientific reasoning in assessing such claims.

Through their study of the natural sciences, students will:
• learn about the importance of empirical observation, replicability of experiments, falsifiability of scientific theories and hypotheses and the circumstances under which causal inferences can be drawn;
• gain some competence with the common tools of scientific explanation; mathematical, computational and/or explanatory models;
• learn the value of scientific integrity and, through their own experience of data collection and/or analysis, develop an understanding of the role of impartiality, objectivity and honesty in the scientific method.
Philosophy, Religious Studies, Applied Ethics
The mission of this area of the core is to lead students to reflect on the perennial questions that all cultures have posed—what does it mean to be a person? does life have a destiny? is there an absolute truth? how does one distinguish knowledge from opinion? how does one act ethically for the good of oneself and for the good of society? why is evil so prevalent in human history? Students explore these questions philosophically by appealing to the power of rationality and the evidence of common human experience. They investigate how the world’s religions wrestle with the same kinds of questions by drawing on experiences of sacred fulfillment expressed in texts, traditions and rituals. Through a close study of primary texts, they will also learn to use philosophical and religious insight to consider how persons are obliged to act in the often complicated circumstances of their personal and professional lives. The prominent place of the “wisdom disciplines” in the core curriculum will help students learn the importance of the Jesuit and Catholic tradition at Fairfield University and this tradition’s concern for the education of the entire person.

Through their study of these disciplines, students will:
- be able to engage the enduring issues of ancient and medieval philosophy;
- become familiar with the aims of religion and its meaning for individuals and communities;
- be able to use the methods of philosophical analysis to understand the links between moral reasoning and the issues that arise in professional fields like business, medicine and nursing.

Visual and Performing Arts
The visual and performing arts weave together knowledge, skills, and personal and cultural values. Through studying the visual and performing arts students learn about the interaction of art, society and the self, and the ways in which that interaction has been influenced by history, [social] context, and theory. Study of the visual and performing arts also encourages students to develop empathy, discernment and respect for the expressions of individuals and groups and their visions of the world. As they engage in creative work, students develop intuitive, creative, expressive and aesthetic faculties, and learn to connect these faculties to reasoning skills.

Through their study of the visual and performing arts, students will:
- know the major artistic and cultural achievements of Western and non-Western civilizations;
- examine notions of quality and excellence in the visual and performing arts and the ways in which these aesthetic value judgments have been made historically;
• acquire competence to produce, interpret, analyze, speak and write about the visual and performing arts.

**Diversity Requirements**
Prominent among the educational priorities particular to our times are the need to address the pluralistic character of our own society on the one hand, and on the other to become aware of the significant differences which mark societies whose history and cultural patterns do not conform to those of the West. To address these needs, as a graduation requirement students must normally select one course identified as a U.S. Diversity course and one identified as a World Diversity course, or may in some cases satisfy this requirement through study abroad or other approved educational experiences. These courses may be part of the Core Curriculum, Major or Minor courses, or electives.

Through their completion of these requirements, students will:
• come to an appreciation of connections between race, class and gender;
• become acquainted with the roles of privilege and difference in U.S. society;
• acquire a sense of the extent of difference and similarity between Western and non-western societies and cultures.

Approved by:
The College of Arts and Sciences Faculty
December 1, 1999
Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Minutes of meeting, February 8, 2011. Library Conference Room 233.
In attendance: Bose Godbole, Epstein, He, Im, Johnson, Kris, Miecznikowski, Perkus, Petrino, Ruffini, Salavei, Schaffer, Walker-Canton, Xie, Zhang.
Also attending: Crabtree (CAS Dean, UC Acting Dean)

Order of Business

1. Appointment of Secretary pro tempore: Ruffini.
2. Approval of Minutes of 12/7/10:

Johnson moves and Miecznikowski seconds the motion to approve the minutes of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee’s meeting of 12/7/10. Minor typographical errors raised by Zhang and Miecznikowski are entered into the draft copy by Im. The motion passes unanimously with two abstentions.

3. Announcements: Im announces that Tommy Xie is attending for Janet Striuli this semester.
4. University College update from Crabtree and Perkus

Dean Crabtree reports on the progress by the Committee on the University College in response to direction from the SVPAA to close the University College. The meeting of that committee tomorrow will propose a transition plan in which the UC fully functions in this academic year, but moves towards the closure of the school next academic year. This will be a process of committee implementation, drawdown of marketing for students, etc. Issues regarding part-time programs and part-time students will be brought to the UCC in this period. UC’s alternative core curriculum and its relationship to the standard core curriculum will also be brought to this committee. A number of issues regarding part-time students, their registration and requirement needs, and their market, will be addressed at a number of levels during this transition. Where some of these programs will reside and where their revenue will go are also questions up for consideration. After tomorrow’s meeting, proposals will ultimately come to the UCC, the Academic Council and the General Faculty. The ASCC and the School of Business have been assured by the SVPAA that they will have the revenue appropriate to absorbing the staff and other financial needs arising from this transition. We anticipate taking up these issues at the UCC by the April meeting.

Petrino asks whether the $1.3M budget shortfall announced at the most recent faculty meeting is related to retention issues with UC. Crabtree and Perkus confirm that UC was under enrollment projection for summer, fall and winter, but exceeded projection for the spring. Miecznikowski, sitting on the Faculty Salary Committee, reports that the shortfall is a combination of low sophomore retention, seniors graduating in their seventh semester, and a higher than expected number of students going abroad. Zhang asks whether CAS students switching to part-time will receive a UC degree; Crabtree confirms that they will receive CAS degrees. Epstein asks whether there is a policy of requiring a certain number of final senior-year credits be taken full-time. Crabtree responds that this sort of policy would be good for the UCC to consider; it would help address the revenue shortfall. Perkus notes that a lot of the problems uncovered by the CUC have been driven by students taking advantage of loopholes allowing them to step down to part-time status to save money.

5. Updates from chair (Im) about UCC business in progress
   a. Assessment Plan for WD and US Diversity Requirements
The chairs of those subcommittees report that they are developing outcomes for their respective diversity requirements, and will then work with Curt Naser to collect syllabi of designated courses to develop assessment tools to determine if the outcomes are being met. Petrino asks about their timetable. Im reports that he expects it to be done this year. Petrino responds that it was originally supposed to be done by the past fall. Crabtree notes that she hopes there will be more indirect assessment as well, considering the diversity requirements as they are spread throughout the curriculum, and the nature of those requirements more generally. Are these requirements “ghettoized” in designated courses, or are students encountering globally and domestically diverse perspectives throughout the curriculum? Epstein reports that the relevant Core Pathway – being led by Renee White – has this as its global intent, and has university-wide assessment as part of its goal. Crabtree suggests that the subcommittees could meet with White on this pathway. Perkus notes that official communication from e.g. the Academic Council continues to omit reference to the core pathways; NEASC requires us to consider learning outcomes, which is an issue that UCC will continue to face. Epstein responds that expecting outcomes to be reflected in official matters at this point is premature, because the core pathway process is still so young. Im will convey relevant aspects of this conversation to the subcommittees.

b. Proposal for petitioning for Core Credit (see forwarded response from Academic Council)

The proposed process approved by the UCC has been returned by the Academic Council with an objection over the wording in that process about the role of Applied Ethics. The authority for that relevant core group (Area 3) is restricted to Philosophy and Religious Studies; Applied Ethics should not be listed as one of the governing authorities in this area. Perkus notes that a number of Applied Ethics courses have probably not been approved for core credit by any relevant governing authority. General discussion follows on the fact that all AE courses may have to be assessed by Philosophy or Religious Studies to count for core credit. This would require revising catalog and registration information for relevant classes. Perkus notes that AE should have the opportunity to work with Philosophy and Religious Studies on learning outcomes to ensure that the re-assessment is a collaborative effort. Salavei notes that our proposed process includes a request for the core areas to develop their respective learning outcomes. Johnson and Crabtree discuss the possibility of having Philosophy and Religious Studies form a subcommittee to review core courses as part of UCC’s core approval process. Salavei brings forward revised language of the process deleting relevant references to Applied Ethics. Salavei moves and Petrino seconds the motion to adopt these revisions as given below.

“Delete ‘applied ethics’ from motion and Table 1 in memo to the AC as of November 2, 2010. Delete ‘applied ethics’ from ‘Core Course Review Guidelines’.”

Perkus speaks in favor of the motion as addressing the complaints of the Academic Council. Crabtree speaks in favor of the motion: this is an example of the university process of assessing and managing the core running successfully. Motion carries unanimously.

Perkus moves that all Applied Ethics courses currently offered at this university be brought before Religious Studies and Philosophy in order to continue to receive core credit pursuant to the Journal of Record as of Fall 2012. Johnson seconds the motion. Motion carries unanimously.
c. Revised Incomplete Policy (see forwarded response from Academic Council)

The Academic Council has responded to UCC’s motions on the incomplete policy by stating that they saw no rationale for the proposed changes. Im and Schaffer are drafting a rationale.

d. Supplemental Fees

Outgoing UCC chair Petrino sent a memo to relevant administrators regarding the burden caused to students by supplemental fees. She received little response, except regarding specific photography classes in VPA, and fees incurred by nursing students. Crabtree confirms that biology and chemistry are also concerned about this issue, because their lab budgets can fail to grow despite growing student populations. She also points out that lab fees do not necessarily correspond to student use of resources each semester, but correspond instead to the university’s expenses for the relevant programs. She suggests that there are finance issues at stake here that are not necessarily under the purview of the UCC. Perkus notes that one concern during the last discussion was over transparency, so that students would know about fees ahead of time. Im suggests that he have a conversation with the SVPAA. Walker-Canton asks whether some of the camera expenses can be addressed through the same funding process for the Media Center’s equipment.

6. New business:

   a. Course Repeat Policy
   b. Special Course Designations
   c. Core Outcomes
   d. Review of Online Courses

Im briefly summarizes conversations on these items to be raised via the UCC this semester. Salavei moves and Miecznikowski seconds the motion to adjourn.
[For Item 7.b.]

To: Academic Council  
From: Steve Bayne, Al Benney, Ed Dew, Rick DeWitt, Dina Franceschi, Joy Gordon, Francis Hannafey, Dennis Keenan, Mark LeClair, Curt Naser, Marcie Patton, Rose Rodrigues, Vincent Rosivach, Margaret Wills  
Date: April 6, 2011  
Subject: Workers’ Bill of Rights  
cc: FWC/AAUP Executive Committee  

Our purpose in writing is to encourage the Academic Council to reconsider the recent motion involving the Workers’ Bill of Rights. Our reasons are given below.

Not that many years ago concerned faculty worked hard to formulate and gain faculty and administrative approval of a Workers’ Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights stated that workers on campus shall be accorded certain basic rights, including the right to safe working conditions, the right to a living wage, the right to organize, and others.

We understand that the Academic Council voted at its April 4 2011 meeting to eliminate the Workers’ Bill of Rights from the Journal of Record, that is, to remove it as a Fairfield policy. In the materials presented to the Council, the Workers’ Bill of Rights was included under items that were “either outdated or not policy statements,” and this was given in those materials as the rationale for eliminating the Bill of Rights.

With all due respect, we think the Council made a mistake. The statement is not outdated—we currently have a large number of workers employed under subcontracting agreements. And this key statement concerning the Workers’ Bill of Rights, “All campus workers employed under subcontracting (or ‘outsourcing’) agreements shall be accorded these same rights,” seems clearly to be a statement of policy.

In short, neither of the reasons given—being outdated or not a policy statement—justifies the removal of the Workers’ Bill of Rights. Moreover, at a time when we are seeing workers’ rights under attack around the country, it seems especially inappropriate for Fairfield to be eliminating a policy assuring basic rights to campus workers.

Fairfield, according to our mission statement, is an institution that is “Catholic in both tradition and spirit” and one that “celebrates the God-given dignity of every human person.” We encourage the Academic Council to reconsider the elimination of the Workers’ Bill of Rights.
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.

GF: 04/17/1998
[For Item 7.c.]

MEMORANDUM
University Curriculum Committee
Fairfield University

TO: Rick DeWitt, Executive Secretary of Academic Council

FROM: Manyul Im, University Curriculum Committee Chair

DATE: March 14, 2011

RE: Response to your memo of November 12, 2010 (see attachment of AC memo below)

This memo responds to the Academic Council’s decision on May 25, 2010 not to approve the UCC’s proposed Incomplete Policy. Thank you for your clarification memo provided on November 12, 2010. The UCC has discussed your memo and moved on March 1, 2011 to request Academic Council to reconsider of the same policy based on the following clarifications of the specific reasons for adopting it.

First and foremost, the proposed Incomplete Policy addresses both

A. A pedagogically problematic asymmetry within the current policy as set forth in the University Catalog; and

B. A lacuna in the Journal of Record regarding Incompletes.

Regarding A: The proposed Policy seeks to amend that policy so that the completion of the course requirements occurs 30 days after the end of the semester in which the Incomplete is given, rather than “30 days after the beginning of the next regular semester” as stated in the Journal of Record and the Catalog. As it stands, the 3 months of Summer intervene for Incompletes that are granted in Spring term. That is a pedagogical problem because of the unreasonable length of time in between the end of Spring and the time by which the course work must be completed. It is unreasonable because of the potential effects on retention and cogency of the material for the student; it is also unreasonable because of the unfair disparity between it and the length of time afforded to students who require an Incomplete at the end of the Fall term.

Regarding B: The only policy regarding Incompletes in the JOR is this stipulation regarding the completion of the course work, with no language about the appropriate circumstances or procedures for giving a student the grade:

Completion of "Incompletes": All course work must be completed within 30 days after the beginning of the next regular semester. Any requests to extend the 30 day time period for completing an ‘Incomplete’ requires approval by the appropriate Dean. CR: 03/28/1988 amended AC: 05/17/2000
The proposed Policy would actually create a policy and formalize the procedure for administering the Incomplete grade, neither of which currently exists in the JOR, but only in University catalog copy. The current catalog states:

A grade of “I” is issued when, due to an emergency situation such as illness, a student prearranges with the professor to complete some of the course requirements after the semester ends. All course work must be completed within 30 days after the beginning of the next regular semester. Any incomplete grades still outstanding after the 30-day extension will become Fs. [emphasis added]

The proposed Policy aims to formalize the existing policy stated only in the catalog by making the procedure for the required prearrangement between student and faculty member uniform and consistent across the University.

In summary, the proposed Policy and Form for administration of Incompletes both improves the existing practice and clarifies grading procedure with respect to Incompletes.

As to the Academic Council’s worries about increase in burden to faculty members, the UCC believes the new Policy merely formalizes and ensures execution of the existing responsibility for prearranging with the student completion of the course requirements. Furthermore, the new Policy empowers faculty by providing a Journal of Record policy that requires prearrangement by the student in legitimate cases.

Finally, to address the last of the AC members’ concerns, the UCC does not believe that complete loss of contact with the student constitutes a legitimate case for issuing an Incomplete – that has never been warranted by the policy as stated in the Catalog, nor is it a sound general principle for issuing a grade that is meant to be temporary and for the benefit of students who have legitimate difficulties in completing a course on time.

(ATTACHMENT - EMAILED MEMO FROM ACADEMIC COUNCIL TO UCC CHAIR)

From: Richard DeWitt [mailto:rdewitt@mail.fairfield.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, November 17, 2010 6:36 AM
To: Petrino, Elizabeth
Cc: Fitzgerald, Paul; Mulvey, Irene; Preli, Rona
Subject: Inquiry from UCC re Incomplete policy
MEMORANDUM
Academic Council Executive Committee
Fairfield University

TO: Elizabeth Petrino, UCC Chair
FROM: Academic Council Executive Committee
DATE: November 12, 2010
RE: Response to your email of 9/24/2010

This memo is in response to your email of 9/24 asking the AC Chair for clarification about the Council’s decision to not approve the proposal from the UCC about the Incomplete Policy and a new form for Incompletes. The Council took up this matter at a meeting on May 25, but you note that the reasoning behind the Council’s decisions was not immediately apparent from the minutes. The Executive Committee discussed your request (three members of the current Executive Committee were in attendance at the 5/25 Council meeting) and, although the minutes are the official record of the meeting, in this memo we will provide our thoughts on this matter.

The motions sent to the AC by the UCC was as follows:

**Motion 2A:** To require faculty to submit an Application for an Incomplete form in consultation with students seeking an incomplete for the course. The form will include course information, a policy statement about incompletes, the reason for granting an incomplete a list of assignments to be completed, dates for completion of assignments, and the method by which the work will be submitted. The form will also include the grade to be submitted if the student fails to complete the work by the deadline.

**Motion 2B:**
To remove language about incompletes in the Journal of Record and replace it with the following:
Incompletes: An incomplete is issued when, due to an emergency situation such as a documented illness, a student prearranges with the course instructor to complete some of the course requirements after the semester ends. Before an Incomplete grade can be issued for a student, the Instructor for the course must submit a completed “Application form for an Incomplete” to the student, the Dean of the student’s school and the registrar. The form includes the reasons for granting an incomplete, as well as a list of outstanding assignments and the grade to be submitted if the student fails to submit the required assignments. All coursework must be completed within the time frame specified by the Course Instructor, but no later than 30 days after the last day of the term. Any requests to extend the time period for completing an Incomplete requires submission of an additional Application form for an Incomplete.
The motion actually put on the floor at the Council meeting was modified:

**MOTION.** An incomplete is issued when, due to an emergency situation such as a documented illness, a student arranges with the course instructor to complete some of the course requirements after the term ends. Before an Incomplete grade can be issued for a student, the Instructor and the student must agree on the reasons for granting an Incomplete, as well as a list of outstanding assignments and the grade to be submitted if the student fails to submit the required assignments. All course work must be completed within the time frame specified by the Course Instructor, but no later than 30 days after the last day of the term. Any requests to extend the time period for completing an Incomplete requires submission of an additional Application form for an Incomplete.

As you know, the preceding motion failed by a vote of 5 in favor, 8 opposed and 1 abstaining.

It is not clear that the Council recognized that there was a problem to address in this regard. The documents that reached AC with the proposal outlined a couple of issues:

- 1/3 of all Incompletes turn into Fs,
- Students with 3 Incompletes return to campus, perhaps inappropriately.

There was no rationale for why “Incompletes turning into Fs” is a problem that the faculty on the Council needed to address. Council members did not indicate any concern with the current setup and there was no faculty concerns with this brought to our attention.

We understand that a student with 3 Fs would not be allowed to return to campus and we acknowledge that a student with 3 Incompletes who returns to campus before the Incompletes turn into Fs may, in fact, be exploiting a loophole that should probably be closed. However, this problem might better be addressed by a policy whereby the record of a student with 3 Incompletes is reviewed by the appropriate Dean’s office to see if returning to campus is appropriate. In other words, there is probably a better way to address the need to close this loophole than by imposing a more burdensome Incomplete policy on the faculty.

Council members did comment on the fact that the policies proposed by the UCC put an inordinate burden on the faculty member – mandating that the student and the instructor agree on terms and conditions, mandating the filing of forms, etc. Council members commented that many times an Incomplete is granted because a student has disappeared from class and is not in contact with the Instructor. In such a case, faculty members appreciate the opportunity to give an Incomplete, since a grade of F may not be warranted.

If the UCC wishes to take up this matter again, we propose that the Council will want to understand exactly what is the problem that needs to be addressed by the faculty and how the proposed policy would address that problem. In your previous proposal to the AC, it is the opinion of the ACEC that any problems that result from the current Incomplete Policy are not really problems with the Incomplete Policy per se and should be addressed some other way.
Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Meeting  
March 1, 2011  
3:30-5:00 p.m.  
Dimenna-Nyselius Library Conference Room  
Minutes

Present: Robbin Crabtree, Dean of College of A&S and UC interim Dean, Mousumi Bose Godbole, Bob Epstein, SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, S.J., Manyul Im (Chair), Jerelyn Johnson, Alison Kris, Scott Lacy, John Miecznikowski, Aaron Perkus, Elizabeth Petrino, Katsiaryna (Katya) Salavei, Les Schaffer, Tommy Xie, Qin Zhang

Called to order at 3:31 p.m.

1. **Appointment of Secretary.** Chair appointed Elizabeth Petrino to be Secretary *pro temp*

   ...

9. **Response to Academic Council Regarding Incompletes Policy Proposal:**

   The Chair explained the rationale for the response written to Academic Council (AC) by the subcommittee, on which he and Les Schaffer served. AC wanted two things: a specific reason for the change and an explanation of the extra burden placed on faculty members with the proposed changes to the Incomplete Policy. The subcommittee stressed, among other features, the lack of an Incomplete Policy in the JOR.

   Dean Crabtree noted that, in preparing a response to AC, including mention of the lacuna in the JOR should be influential – we are also empowering faculty members through this revised policy to determine how the incomplete will be issued, since we didn’t consider the circumstances under which an incomplete could be negotiated. Salavei noted we did have a discussion and there should be information on the form regarding negotiating an incomplete. Other discussion related to the actual form used to operationalize the policy and the need to digitize forms to avoid forgery. Salavei added that the UCC’s response to the AC addresses only the first of their points. The second relates to the burden to the faculty members, which needs to be addressed. Perhaps we need to add some information to respond to the AC belief that faculty members use incompletes to deal with students who disappear at the end of the term. Im and Schaffer agreed to modify the response accordingly prior to sending it.

   **Motion to approve the UCC response to AC:** Perkus; second, Lacy.

   Chair called the question.

   **Vote:** 12 in favor, none opposed.

   ...
MEMO

To: Academic Council
From: Academic Council Executive Committee
Date: 4/18/11
Re: Recommendations on Pending Items

The AC Executive Committee met on 2/16/11 to discuss the Council’s Pending Items. The ACEC reviewed all the relevant motions, minutes and additional materials from past meetings, discussed in detail each of the Pending Items A through G, and came to a consensus on the recommendations below.

The notes below contain the recommendations of the ACEC, together with a brief rationale for each recommendation. A summary of the relevant motions, minutes, and additional materials for each of these items can be found in the memo from Rick DeWitt to the ACEC dated 12/21/10, and Appendices A through G of that memo contain all the motions, minutes, and other relevant items for each of these pending items.

Pending Item A

Recommendations in report in spring 2002 from Faculty Athletics Committee concerning (i) amounts of time student-athletes are absent from classes for trips/athletic activities, (ii) demands placed on student athletes for year-round training, (iii) number of scheduled athletic events that conflict with the University’s final exam schedule, and (iv) amount of money spent on various athletic programs. (See agenda and attachments for 12/4/02 AC meeting;, item 6.b of 3/3/03 meeting.)

Recommendation: The ACEC recommends the Council remove this from the list of Pending Items.

Rationale: The AC requested the Faculty Athletics Committee investigate the four items listed in Pending Item A. The FAC did so and gave a final report, with recommendations, on all the items it was charged to investigate by the AC. The AC subsequently acted on these recommendations, leaving nothing left pending.
Pending Item B

Issues raised at the 10/4/99 AC meeting concerning faculty participation on the finance/budget committee. (See minutes of AC meeting of 11/4/99; 10/29/99 letter from Phil Lane attached to 5/1/00 AC agenda; excerpt of GF minutes of 11/13/92 attached to AC 5/1/00 agenda; AC motion of 11/6/00.)

Recommendations: The ACEC recommends (i) that the Council decide whether at a future meeting the motions approved at the 11/13/92 General Faculty meeting* should be considered for inclusion in the Journal of Record, and (ii) that the Council remove this item from the list of Pending Items.

* The motions approved were:

- “The faculty members on the Finance Committee shall coordinate their efforts with the Salary Committee, Academic Council, FWC/AAUP, and any other committee of the General Faculty whose mission will be influenced by particular budget decisions. They shall further take advantage of internal and external consultants in analyzing budget and financial data.”

- “The faculty members of the Finance Committee shall not consent to a final budget or setting of tuition rates until the Salary Committee has completed successful negotiations on the salary and benefit portions of the next year’s contract.”

Rationale: The two motions above, although approved by the faculty, do not appear in the Journal of Record and thus are not mutually approved policies. The AC may wish to reconsider the motions above for possible inclusion in the Journal of Record, but otherwise all the issues relevant to Item B were addressed by the Council.

Item C

Distance learning issues. (See item 7 of AC minutes of 5/5/03.)

Recommendation: The ACEC recommends the Council remove this from the list of Pending Items.

Rationale: At the 5/5/03 AC meeting the Council voted on two motions concerning distance learning. The first motion failed, and thus is no longer a pending issue. A second motion passed. This motion involved requesting the chairs of the Educational Technologies Committee and the UCC, and the director of Academic Excellence, to meet with the AC “to discuss distance learning issues.” This motion does not appear to have been followed up on. Given how much has changed with respect to distance learning, the consensus of the ACEC is that this item should be
removed from the list of Pending Items, and if the Council would like to pursue current concerns about distance learning, we would be better starting fresh.

---

**Item D**

**Report from the Educational Technologies Committee on security, long-term feasibility, potential for integration, ownership, accessibility, etc. of servers containing faculty data.** (See AC minutes of 2/5/2007; AC 4/2/07 3b; AC 12/3/2007 7b).

**Recommendation:** The ACEC recommends the Council remove this from the list of Pending Items.

**Rationale:** The AC received the final report on this matter from the ETC on 12/3/07. The report noted a security audit that was currently underway, and subsequently that audit was completed and is available (password protected) on the General Faculty Secretary website. Additional tasks given the ETC by the AC were either addressed in the ETC’s report or else were passed on to the Faculty Data Committee formed at the 12/3/07 AC meeting. In short, the ETC completed the charge given it by the AC, and any remaining items have been subsumed under Pending Item E.

---

**Item E**

**Faculty Data Committee (AC 12/3/07).**

**Recommendation:** The ACEC recommends (i) the Council decide whether at a future meeting it wishes to consider recommendations 2 and 5 from the Faculty Data Committee report dated 5/20/08*, and (ii) remove this from the list of Pending Items.

* These two recommendations from the 5/20/08 Faculty Data Committee report are:

- 2. Institution-wide policies should be formulated to cover questions such as who has access to career data, such as the files stored in Chairs’, Deans’, and AVP’s offices.

- 5. Issues concerning merit reviews: Different schools have different policies (some have no policies) on issues such as where merit reviews are stored, for how long, and who has access to them. The committee recommends each school formulate a policy addressing such questions. (The committee recognizes that policies may vary from school to school, for example, depending on issues such as accreditation requirements.)

**Rationale:** The Faculty Data Committee made seven recommendations in its final report. The ACEC recently gathered additional information concerning recommendations 1, 3 and 4, and that information can be found in the email of 3/17/11 from Michael Graham-Cornell and the email of 3/18/11 from Kevin Clancy. Both of these emails are included as correspondence in the packet.
for the 5/2/11 AC meeting. The consensus of the ACEC is that these emails adequately address those recommendations. Recommendations 6 and 7 were expressions of the consensus view of the Faculty Data Committee concerning course data and faculty evaluation data, but the view of the ACEC is that these are not action items. This leaves recommendations 2 and 5 for the Council to consider; in particular, for the Council to decide whether it wishes to address these at a later meeting.

Item F

Subcommittee (Nantz, Mulvey) to consider ways of ensuring that faculty policy is correctly stated in official documents. (See AC minutes 10/1/2007)

Recommendation: The ACEC recommends this item be removed from the list of Pending Items once the subcommittee gives its final report to the Council.

Rationale: The tasks assigned this subcommittee are now subsumed under the Annual Reconciliation Process passed recently by the Council, so once the Council receives the subcommittee’s final report, there should be no more work for this subcommittee.

Item G

Issues related to parking on campus; faculty on University parking study (AC 2/5/07 7c; AC 3/5/07 6a; AC 4/2/07 6a; AC 9/10/07 3bi; AC 10/1/07 6c; AC 2/4/08 3bi).

Recommendation: The ACEC recommends the Council remove this from the list of Pending Items.

Rationale: Except for one motion passed at the 3/5/07 AC meeting, which was acted on, the Council passed no action items concerning this matter. Given this, together with the substantial changes in parking that have taken place since the last time this issue was addressed by the AC, the consensus of the ACEC is that this item should be removed from the list of Pending Items.

Items H through L

Recommendation: The ACEC recommends these all remain on the list of Pending Items.

Rationale: These are all straightforward items for the future, for example, items calling for the usual future review of recently approved programs.
To: Rona, Irene, Paul
From: Rick
Date: 12/21/10
Re: Notes and materials on AC pending items

[Note: The memo below is a shortened version of the 12/21/10 memo.]

This document contains background information for most of the pending items. Here are a few preliminary notes.

- The pending items are labeled as they appeared on the agenda for the 11/1/10 AC meeting.
- The initial sections below contain summaries of the background materials. The background materials themselves are in Appendices A through G at the end of this document.

[Note: The full memo, with appendices, runs about 60 pages and will be available electronically. The version below does not include the appendices.]

Pending Item A

Recommendations in report in spring 2002 from Faculty Athletics Committee concerning (i) amounts of time student-athletes are absent from classes for trips/athletic activities, (ii) demands placed on student athletes for year-round training, (iii) number of scheduled athletic events that conflict with the University’s final exam schedule, and (iv) amount of money spent on various athletic programs. (See agenda and attachments for 12/4/02 AC meeting; item 6.b of 3/3/03 meeting.)

I Notes on minutes, etc. relevant to Item A.
   A. 12/2/02 AC meeting. (Note: the 12/4/02 date in the description of Item A should be 12/2/02.)

   See Appendix A for the final report from Faculty Athletics Committee to the Academic Council.

   Summary: In fall 2000 the AC requested the FAC investigate the four issues referred to in the description for pending Item A. The report from the FAC was an agenda item for
the 12/2/02 AC meeting, and the report was included in the packet for this meeting. The AC did not get to the item at this meeting or the next (2/3/03) AC meeting, but did get to it at the 3/3/03 AC meeting, and notes on that meeting are below.

B. 3/3/03 AC meeting.

See Appendix A for an excerpt of the AC minutes where this item was discussed.

Summary: The AC chair suggested the ACEC distill the recommendations in the FAC report to a smaller number of relevant recommendations, and the Council agreed. These smaller number of recommendations were considered and voted on at the 5/3/03 AC meeting, and notes on that meeting are below.

C. 5/3/03 AC meeting.

See Appendix A for an excerpt of the AC minutes where this item was discussed.

Summary: The ACEC distilled the recommendations from the FAC report down to two motions, which were discussed at the 5/3/03 AC meeting. Here are the motions and outcomes of votes on the motions:

- A motion that the AVP / SVP should give a report to the AC each semester on approved exceptions to the policy of not scheduling athletic events that conflict with final exams. This motion passed unanimously, and is now one of the AC’s ongoing items. Since then, the AC has received such a report most if not all semesters.

- A motion that the FAC should include the Director of Recreation and a representative from FUSA and SAAC as ex officio members. This motion was tabled by a vote of 10-1.

---

Pending Item B

Issues raised at the 10/4/99 AC meeting concerning faculty participation on the finance/budget committee. (See minutes of AC meeting of 11/4/99; 10/29/99 letter from Phil Lane attached to 5/1/00 AC agenda; excerpt of GF minutes of 11/13/92 attached to AC 5/1/00 agenda; AC motion of 11/6/00.)

I. Notes on minutes, etc. relevant to Item B.

A. 10/4/99 AC meeting

The minutes of the 11/1/99 AC meeting refer to a discussion at the 10/4 AC meeting
involving Item B, though nothing is reflected in the minutes for the 10/4 meeting that is relevant to Item B.

B. 11/1/99 AC meeting. (Note: the reference in the description for Item B to the 11/4/10 AC meeting is a typo–that meeting was on 11/1/99, and the item was 6.d on the agenda.)

See Appendix B for the discussion of this item as recorded in the minutes.

Summary: The Council discussed the issues raised by members of the Budget Committee, including the issues noted in the memo to the AC from Phil Lane dated 10/29/99. See below for notes on Phil Lane’s memo. No recommendations were made or motions passed at the 11/1/99 AC meeting relevant to pending item B.

C. 10/29/99 letter/memo from Phil Lane to AC attached to 5/1/00 AC packet.

See Appendix B for a copy of this memo.

The Budget Committee met on 10/29/99, and this memo reflects the minutes of that meeting (see reference to this in 10/4/99 AC minutes). The memo does not appear to have been included with the packet for the 11/1/99 AC meeting, but the minutes of that AC meeting suggest the AC members had a copy of the memo.

The memo was attached to and discussed at the AC agenda of 5/17/00. See notes below for the motions made at the 5/17/00 meeting.

D. Excerpt of GF minutes of 11/13/92 attached to AC agenda of 5/1/00

See Appendix B for the excerpt of the GF minutes of 11/13/92

The minutes record these two motions relevant to the Budget Committee, both of which passed unanimously.

a. One motion is that the BC should coordinate their efforts with other committees (Salary Committee, AC, FWC/AAUP, etc.)

b. The other motion directs the faculty members on the BC not to consent to a final budget or tuition rate until the Salary Committee has completed successful negotiations.

E. AC motion of 5/17/00. (Note: The current list of pending items has this motion coming in the AC meeting of 11/6/00. But there is nothing of this sort discussed at the 11/6/00 AC meeting. In digging through old agendas and minutes I found that at some point the correct reference, 5/17/00, was replaced with the incorrect 11/6/00 reference.)

See Appendix B for an excerpt from these minutes.
These three motions, relevant to pending item B, were made at the 5/17/00 AC meeting:

a. MOTION: that those concerns (reported in Academic Council minutes of meetings on October 29 and November 13, 1999, and in his [Phil Lane’s] letter and in an excerpt from General Faculty Minutes of November 13, 1992, attached to the agenda for the May 1, 2000 meeting) be presented to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, with the request that they be forwarded to the full Board.

b. MOTION: to table the motion [i.e., the motion above].

c. MOTION: that the Academic Council request the current and past members of the finance/budget committee to provide their views regarding procedures for determining the charge of the committee.

Motion (b) passed, effectively killing motion (a). Motion (c) passed, but seems never to have been acted on. Looking at the agenda of AC meetings going out 3 years, there is no record of any input of the sort called for in the motion, nor is this item ever put back on the agenda.

Item C

Distance learning issues. (See item 7 of AC minutes of 5/5/03.)

I. Notes on minutes, etc. relevant to Item C.

A. 5/5/03 AC meeting.

See Appendix D for an excerpt of the AC minutes where this item was discussed.

Summary: The AC had an extended discussion of this item, ending with a vote on the following two motions:

- A motion to create a subcommittee to look into distance learning. This motion failed by a vote of 2-8.

- A motion that the AC Executive Secretary ask the chairs of Ed Tech and UCC, and the Director of Academic Excellence, to meet with the AC to discuss distance learning. This motion passed unanimously; however, there is no indication the ES contacted the people referred to in the motion.
Item D

Report from the Educational Technologies Committee on security, long-term feasibility, potential for integration, ownership, accessibility, etc. of servers containing faculty data. (See AC minutes of 2/5/2007; AC 4/2/07 3b; AC 12/3/2007 7b).

I. Notes on minutes, etc. relevant to Item D.

A. 2/5/07 AC minutes.

See Appendix D for relevant excerpt of minutes, including motion passed by AC.

Summary: the AC had a lengthy discussion, and passed a motion directing the ETC to study the issues and report back to the AC. The ETC completed its charge from the AC when it reported on 12/3/07. See notes below for summary of the 12/3/07 AC meeting.

B. 4/2/07 AC minutes.

This is listed in the description of pending Item D, but there is nothing on the AC agenda or in the minutes for this meeting that is relevant. The closest thing is a piece of correspondence in the packet from Curt Naser, but it is not really relevant to the issues in item D. A search of the agendas for the remainder of this year and start of the next year showed the topic did not come up again until the 12/3/07 meeting.

C. 12/3/07 AC minutes. (Note: the reference to agenda item 7.b in the pending items is a typo. This was agenda item 6.a.)

See Appendix D for the report from the ETC and for an excerpt from the AC minutes for this meeting.

Summary: The ETC report noted that a security audit was underway, and recommended a joint ad hoc committee be formed to recommend policies involving access to and use of faculty data. The AC acted on this recommendation by passing a motion to form the Faculty Data Committee (see pending Item E).

Item E

Faculty Data Committee (AC 12/3/07).

I. Notes on minutes, etc. relevant to Item E.

A. 12/3/07 AC meeting.
See Appendix E for excerpt of minutes of 12/3 meeting, including the motion forming the Faculty Data Committee.

Summary: The AC discussed the report from the ETC and passed a motion forming the Faculty Data Committee.

B. 10/6/08 AC meeting. (Note: This meeting is not referenced in the description of pending Item E, but the packet and minutes contain the materials most relevant for this item.)

See Appendix E for an excerpt of minutes from this meeting, and also for the Faculty Data Committee report containing the recommendations from the committee.

Summary: The Faculty Data Committee made 7 recommendations, of which the first 5 were action items (but not action items for the AC). Billy Weitzer’s statement in the minutes sums up the situation well: “Weitzer said that progress is underway on recommendations 1 through 5 and perhaps he could make a summary report on that progress at the end of the year.”

Item F

Subcommittee (Nantz, Mulvey) to consider ways of ensuring that faculty policy is correctly stated in official documents. (See AC minutes 10/1/2007)

I. Notes on the minutes, etc. relevant to Item F.

A. 10/1/07 AC minutes

Background: for several years we had been encouraging the AVP’s office to assure that university documents contained accurate statements. With the motion below, the AC gave the task to an AC subcommittee.

MOTION: A subcommittee of two, including the Faculty Secretary, should be appointed to consider ways of ensuring that faculty policy is correctly stated in official documents.

B. 3/9/09 AC meeting

MOTION: The Council charges the existing subcommittee of Professors Mulvey and Nantz (See Pending Item F) to work to ensure that our approved academic grievance procedures are accurately stated in university documents

C. 5/3/10 AC meeting

MOTION: that the Academic council endorse the recommendation that all University
documents that contain the Non Discrimination and harassment Policy be changed to substitute the amended policy. (see page 13, #3, to end of sentence). Further, the Academic Council directs the existing AC subcommittee (see AC pending item F) that is charged with considering ways to ensure that academic policy is correctly stated in official documents, ensure that the newly approved language on the harassment policy be accurately reflected in all University documents.

Item G

Issues related to parking on campus; faculty on University parking study (AC 2/5/07 7c; AC 3/5/07 6a; AC 4/2/07 6a; AC 9/10/07 3bi; AC 10/1/07 6c; AC 2/4/08 3bi).

I. Notes on minutes, etc. relevant to Item G.

A. 2/5/07 AC minutes

See Appendix G for excerpt of minutes.

Summary: This motion was made: “MOVED: That the Academic Council calls on the administration to restore faculty access to all parking lots which were open to faculty in academic year 2004-2005.” A vote on the motion was postponed until the next AC meeting.

B. 3/5/07 AC minutes

See Appendix G for excerpt of minutes.

Summary: There was a brief discussion of the parking issue, and the motion above under (A) passed.

C. 4/2/07 AC minutes

See Appendix G for excerpt of minutes.

Summary: No substantive discussion took place.

D. 9/10/07 AC packet, correspondence under agenda item 3.b.i

See Appendix G for this correspondence.

Summary: These are pieces of correspondence from me (as AC ES) to Mark Reed (the appropriate administrator for parking issues). I passed on the motion above (under (A)) and the relevant minutes, and Mark responded. One of the main points of his response was to say that a large study of parking would be undertaken, so it was not a good time to
initiate changes in the parking situation.

E. 10/1/07 AC minutes

See Appendix G for excerpt of minutes.

Summary: The Council was notified that there would be a study of parking by a committee with faculty representatives, and the Council was given a brief update on the parking situation.

F. 2/4/08 AC packet, correspondence under item 3.b.i

See Appendix G for this correspondence.

Summary: There are two pieces of correspondence, one from Irene with an update on the parking situation, and one from Billy Weitzer announcing the selection of a firm to conduct a parking study and expressing he would like a faculty representative to join a group overseeing the study.