MINUTES
Academic Council Meeting
April 30, 2012
CNS 200
3:30 – 5:00 PM

Present: Professors Bayne, Boryczka, Dennin, Greenberg, Keenan, Nantz, Mulvey (Faculty Secretary), Petrino, Preli (Chair), Rakowitz (Executive Secretary), Sapp, Shea, Strauss, Tromley, Vinekar, Walker; Deans Crabtree, Franzosa; Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs (SVPAA) Fitzgerald, S.J.

Student Representative: Nicolette Richardson

Guests: Professors DeWitt, Dohm, Bucki, Downie

Regrets: Professor Lane; Deans Beal, Campbell

Absent: Professor Zera, Dean Gibson

The meeting was called to order by Chair Professor Preli at 3:35 p.m. She suggested that recessing the meeting and reconvening was a possibility if the Academic Council (AC) does not get through the agenda.

1. Presidential courtesy

SVPAA Fitzgerald stated that he had two things to report. He has asked the deans to encourage the faculty to include core pathways in their syllabi. Some faculty members have done it and some have not. He would like faculty to be more intent on knitting together the curriculum and be more purposeful in including these pathways.

He reported the current enrollment figures for the class of 2016. There were 716 deposits last year at this time, and there are 806 deposits this year by today’s mail. The figures are tracking about 100 ahead, day to day. It looks good, and we will continue to work on this, but these figures are before the summer melt. Things are looking quite positive.

Professor Sapp asked to what extent we have used the wait list. SVPAA Fitzgerald responded that we have accepted about 70% of the applicants to the College of Arts and Sciences, the Dolan School of Business and the School of Engineering but only 40% to the School of Nursing. At this point, 25 people have been offered admission off of the wait list, 13 of whom accepted so far, and there will probably be more wait list activity in May.

Professor Bayne stated that on February 8 the AC made a motion that all part-time students be charged at a credit hour rate lower than full time students. It appears that the administration and the Board of Trustees decided not to accept our recommendation. Did the administration consult
with faculty or Handbook Committees before making this decision, and did they tell the Executive Committee prior to implementation?

SVPAA Fitzgerald responded, “no” but that he had conveyed the information as that decision was being made, he had consulted with Julie Dolan, and he had sought input from the academic deans and enrollment management. We are keeping summer rates and most part-time rates quite competitive with the local market. He said that he certainly conveyed the AC’s recommendation and his own slightly different recommendation but that he had not subsequently consulted with the Executive Committee of the AC about tuition rates.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

Professor Mulvey announced the following events as a reminder:

• Meeting of the General Faculty on May 3 at 10 a.m.-12 p.m., DSB Room 110A and B, preceded by a breakfast sponsored by the Faculty Welfare Committee at 9:30 a.m.

• Annual address of the President at the General Faculty Meeting on May 9 from 4:30-5:30 p.m. in Gonzaga Auditorium, followed by a reception for retiring faculty in the lobby of the Quick Center from 5:30-7:30 p.m. The retiring faculty are: Professors Jerry Sergent, Winston Tellis, Elizabeth Dreyer, Orin Grossman, and Ed Deak.

Professor Mulvey noted that we are determined to get through all of the work this meeting and not to recess so that we can be done. In the event that occurs, Professor Mulvey would like to thank all of the faculty and administration, as they worked really hard this year, with many extra meetings. She would like to thank every member of the AC.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary

a. Approval of minutes

Professor Rakowitz requested motions to approve three sets of minutes.

i. Meeting of 3/26/12

Professor Keenan requested a correction on page 6, fourth paragraph, to delete the last sentence: “It has been a basis on negotiation, contractual commitment, historical impact, and so on.”

MOTION [Shea/Walker]: To approve the minutes of March 26, 2012 as corrected. 
MOTION PASSED: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.

ii. Meeting of 4/2/12

MOTION [Walker/Keenan]: To approve the minutes of April 2, 2012. 
MOTION PASSED: 13 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.

iii. Meeting of 4/16/12
MOTION [Vinekar/Sapp]: To approve the minutes of April 16, 2012.
MOTION PASSED: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.

b. Correspondence: none

c. Oral reports: none

4. Council Subcommittee Reports

Professor Preli indicated that there are two Council subcommittee reports.

MOTION [Mulvey/Sapp]: To reorder the agenda to do item 4c first since we have guests, followed by item 4a.
MOTION PASSED: 13 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention.

c. Subcommittee re: Workers’ Bill of Rights

Professor DeWitt thanked the other members of this subcommittee, Professors Dohm and Bucki, who are at the meeting today, and Professor Rosivach and Vice President Mark Reed, who are unable to attend. He read the charge of the subcommittee, “That the Academic Council direct the AC Executive Committee to form a subcommittee of 3 faculty and 2 administrators to write policy language in the spirit of the Workers’ Bill of Rights language that the General Faculty endorsed on 4/17/98, and to recommend where this policy should be housed.” Professor DeWitt described the background of custodial worker unrest many years ago, including the suicide of a worker and a student occupation of Bellarmine Hall, that culminated in the Workers’ Bill of Rights at the end of the 1990s and in the same year the University Guidelines for Contracted Services (attached on page 28). The endorsement of the Workers’ Bill of Rights as passed by the faculty for the Journal of Record (JOR) appears on page 24.

The subcommittee discussed whether the existing language of the Bill of Rights should be expanded to include minimum wage or a minimalistic reworking into policy language. The subcommittee felt the minimalistic approach was the only one compatible with the charge and is also the better way to go, as there is a great deal of variability around campus with subcontractual workers, and it wouldn’t be possible to write language that would cover it all. So the subcommittee rewrote policy language for the JOR. The second thing the subcommittee decided was where this should be housed. The Handbook requires it to reside in the JOR where policy decisions go.

Professor DeWitt then presented recommendation one, a motion that the AC approves for the JOR the policy below (page 26 of the packet) concerning the Workers’ Bill of Rights:

Workers’ Bill of Rights

All campus workers, including those employed under subcontracting or outsourcing agreements, have the following inalienable rights as defined by Catholic Social Teaching:
• The Right to a Living Wage
• The Right to Working Conditions Suitable to Health, Safety, and Human Dignity
• The Right to Benefits Suitable to Human Dignity
• The Right to Organize

He provided as the rationale that this would be preferable since it is unequivocal policy language and is in the spirit of the original Workers’ Bill of Rights. His second recommendation was that there should be some sort of recourse in case there is a violation of the Workers’ Bill of Rights (described on the bottom of page 26 to the top of page 27 of the packet for this meeting):

**Oversight Committee on Worker’s Rights**

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

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

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

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

Professor DeWitt explained that the Oversight Committee may want to review those reports of complaints. It would be a board that would exist but would be seldom if ever convened, like the Academic Dishonesty Review Board, which would only be brought into play if a complaint hasn’t been resolved through various preliminary channels. This committee would exist as a last recourse in case other means didn’t resolve the issues.

Professor Rakowitz stated that she is confused by the assertion that this is unequivocal policy language. Policy language is clearly implementable, like all workers will be paid at x% over minimum wage. This doesn’t seem to her to be policy language.

Professor DeWitt opined that the language at the beginning, through Catholic Social Teaching, is clearly policy language. At the top of page 24 of the original Workers’ Bill of Rights was a broad based articulation of rights.
Dean Franzosa agreed with Professor Rakowitz. An example of policy language is that “all policy follows the following principle.”

Professor Nantz had a question on the oversight board. She is concerned that no outside members are specified. If she were asked to serve on such a board, how would she have any clue what the normal (for example, Sodexo) practice is according to the industry. Her concern is that there is not enough structure to it.

Professor DeWitt responded that one would expect that conscientious faculty would research and write annual reports and, similar to the Academic Dishonesty Review Board, would have a fair amount of information available to it if it ever a complaint got to them. It seldom if ever would happen and would be fairly easy, as they would be able to initiate their own investigation.

Professor Boryczka had a few questions regarding the oversight committee: (1) how will the committee communicate to workers to let them know that this committee exists to redress their grievances?; (2) would this committee have access to complaints that are filed with other competent bodies but were not filed with this committee? It’s a matter of transparency. How would they know that information, and would there be a process for information sharing?; and (3) what obligation does the administration have to follow the recommendations of the committee?, what would be the standing of the remedy, the jurisdiction of the committee, and why would the administration follow its rulings?

Professor DeWitt commented that the first question is a good question. We would have to work out some process to communicate to workers. This is an unresolved issue but not in the subcommittee’s charge. The third question – what obligation does the administration have – none. It is difficult to imagine a situation that would fall into the faculty purview. One would hope that the administration and faculty members of the committee would find a good faith solution and follow it. He professed that he did not understand the second question.

Professor Boryczka clarified: how does it get to the committee if not through the administration, when the administration doesn’t bring it to the committee because the administration thinks the issue is resolved but the worker doesn’t think it’s resolved.

Professor DeWitt answered that the answer is, communication.

Professor Bucki stated that this structure was part of the original plan students thought was formed after the Bellarmine sit-in (in the Spring of 1998 or 1999), and it looks like this never was formed but rather fell through the cracks.

Professor Walker asked, is the concern that it was in the JOR, and what potentially negative scenario do you envision if this disappears from the JOR. What might happen if this wasn’t there. He is not quite understanding the concern: good ethical behavior versus policy? How would it manifest itself?

Professor DeWitt said this is fairly common. It is hard for a Jesuit Institution not to have one.

Professor Bucki observed, this could be like the last time that the students gathered, thought there was unethical administrative action, and what got resolved was negotiated between the
students and the administration as a settlement that the faculty supported. There now would be a mechanism to address it, not a dramatic event.

Professor Walker said he doesn’t understand how this protocol would prevent that sort of action.

Professor DeWitt explained that there was a gutsy worker who gave her pay stub publicly. This might give a remedy.

Professor Vinekar suggested that, in addition, there should be an annual information session with campus workers to inform them of the process and check whether they have any issues still unresolved.

Professor DeWitt thought this was not a bad idea.

Professor Bucki stated this is beyond what we had envisioned. This would encourage and seek out problems.

Professor Vinekar responded that, no, this would just be informative.

Dean Crabtree asked how this is academic policy. The JOR is for academic policy. If the AC might consider reaffirming this because it was removed from the JOR and even forward it to Human Resources, to add to its mission statement, she doesn’t understand why this would be in the JOR. She believes the AC should affirm the value of these things but not that it should be in the JOR.

Professor Mulvey raised a point of order that Professor DeWitt responds to every speaker as opposed to the Chair calling on speakers.

Professor DeWitt insisted it is the duty of the Faculty Secretary to maintain the JOR for all policy decisions, not just academic policy.

Professor Rakowitz read out loud another section of the JOR and opined it is not clear whether we have the right to make recommendations when it is not academic policy, but if we do, it should appear in the JOR.

Professor Nantz is in favor of supporting this but questioned how to define a living wage. If this is implemented as policy, what does it mean, how has the committee defined “living wages?”

Professor Bucki explained that the subcommittee had decided that to expand with definitions would go beyond our charge. The oversight committee would canvass the region to find other living wage examples.

Professor Bayne wanted to address whether only academic policy is in the JOR. He thinks this is false.

Professor Preli asked him to hold his comment until there is a motion to debate.

Dean Franzosa asked, if the AC votes this down, does that mean there will be no recognition of this concept?
Professor Preli explained that a member of the AC can make a motion to forward this to Human Resources. There is no reason that it would disappear.

Dean Franzosa asked whether, in terms of University records, this affirmation of solidarity with the Workers’ Bill of Rights is the only place it appeared?

Professor Preli answered yes, and it already is out because it was removed from the JOR.

Professor DeWitt responded that aside from the University Guidelines for Contracted Services passed by the Board of Trustees, we couldn’t find any other place it appeared.

Professor Dennin questioned, where can we find these documents?

Professor DeWitt said that he found them in his own personal files, and Dr. Mark Reed confirmed that they exist and were correct.

Professor Shea asked, where do these policy statements exist in other universities?

Professor DeWitt replied that he doesn’t know and would have to check on that. Only we have the JOR.

Professor Preli thanked the subcommittee and explained that this is now a discussion for this body.

Professor Shea stated that she would feel more comfortable if she knew where else this can be housed; while she supports the concept, she is not sure that this is the most effective way or place.

**MOTION [Bayne/Vinekar]: (on the top of page 26 in the 4/30/12 packet) That the Academic Council approves, for inclusion in the Journal of Record, the policy below concerning the Workers’ Bill of Rights:**

**Workers’ Bill of Rights**

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

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

Professor Bayne spoke in favor of the motion. He stated that the JOR is not only for academic policy. It has governance not just academic policy, for example the newly passed harassment policy a couple of years ago.
Professor Greenberg was opposed to the motion. He declared that, unfortunately, he hates to speak against this, and he is in favor of the spirit. The JOR was a mish-mash of things, some of which didn’t belong there, which gave the administration an excuse to ignore the JOR as not appropriate. We went through a long process to clean up the JOR so as to include only those things the faculty had purview over. There are many good ideas, but this is not appropriate for the JOR and will come back eventually to bite us when we need the JOR for faculty rights and governance issues.

Professor Dennin was a little concerned the workers wouldn’t know it is in the JOR or even that the JOR exists. This belongs in an employee handbook that every employee would get, although he doesn’t know if employees do get a handbook when hired.

**MOTION FAILED:** 3 in favor, 7 opposed, 5 abstentions.

**MOTION [Mulvey/Fitzgerald]:** To refer this matter to the Academic Council Executive Committee to look into where Workers’ Bill of Rights are housed at other universities.

Professor Petrino spoke in favor of the motion. She feared the Workers’ Bill of Rights would be buried. It should be put front and center.

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

a. **Subcommittee for considering remaining items from ad hoc JOR committee recommendations**

Professor Mulvey continued to present the remaining items from the October 25, 2011 report of the subcommittee, noting that Professor Greenberg is correct in pointing out how conscientious the work of the ad hoc JOR subcommittee was. The AC has already considered items 16, 19, 22, 23, and 36. Drawing the AC’s attention to item 44, page 5, line 5, the ad hoc JOR group suggested the revision that begins on line 16 but the AC sent it to the “JOR 9” subcommittee to revise the language. The new proposed language appears on page 5 at lines 25 to 31.

The rationale is that it originally didn’t mean what the JoR group meant it to say and was not in policy language. This makes clear that all work must relate to tenure and promotion. Professor Mulvey would like to make a motion to replace the current entry in the JOR (lines 8-13) with the new revision that begins on line 25.

Professor Dennin would like to add to line 29 tenure “or promotion” because it is consistent with the statement at the beginning of the paragraph. Professor Mulvey will be happy to do that when she makes the motion.

Professor Greenberg is concerned about the “reasonable confidence” language as a loophole if there is a mean-spirited committee. He recounted a past example of such an instance.
Professor Mulvey explained that the Handbook has that language already (line 39) and that they are not trying to make new policy, just to fix the language. Prior service is what it is supposed to be about.

Professor Greenberg asserted that he would like to change the Handbook but that is not in consideration here.

**MOTION** [Mulvey/Tromley]: That the Journal of Record entry on consideration of prior service for promotion and tenure be replaced with lines 25-31 with the addition of “or promotion” at the end of line 29:

**Consideration of prior service for promotion and tenure:**
Evaluation for promotion or tenure should be based on a faculty member’s performance in the academic career starting with his/her initial appointment at the rank of full-time instructor or higher at an institution of higher learning. While promotion and tenure are based on performance in the academic career, the committee shall not recommend tenure or promotion unless it has reasonable confidence that such performance will continue at Fairfield University.

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

Professor Mulvey introduced items 50 and 51 on pages 5-6. She read the rationale on the bottom of page 6, lines 46-48. Items 50 and 51 deal with particular benefits for faculty. The JOR may not be an appropriate place for entries on benefits for faculty as most benefits for faculty are now delineated in the Faculty Handbook, the Memorandum of Understanding and the Benefits Plan Overview. In light of current circumstances, the “JOR 9” is deeply concerned at this period of time to move any benefits to the Benefits Plan Overview. They would like to ask the Faculty Salary Committee to work with the administration to reach an agreement on language for the JOR and/or the Handbook that would protects benefits in the Benefit Plans Overview from unilateral change by the administration or trustees.

**MOTION** [Mulvey/Nantz]: On page 7 of the memo, lines 13-16: The Academic Council asks the Faculty Salary Committee to work with the administration to reach agreement on language for the Journal of Record and/or the Faculty Handbook that would protect benefits in the Benefit Plans Overview from unilateral change. Draft language should be vetted by the Faculty Welfare Committee/AAUP.

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

Professor Mulvey presented the last one, item 52 on page 9. The JOR group felt the computer usage guidelines were out dated. They found five documents where policies were passed in documents but not entered into the JOR, but the policies were replaced by Appendix IV and V. They recommended that the AC should review and approve Appendix IV and V as technical and sensible policies that belong in the JOR.

Dean Crabtree asked if these reflected the most recent changes.
Professors Mulvey and Bayne confirmed that they did incorporate the updates in 2004 and 2011.


**MOTION PASSED**: 16 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions.

Professor Preli thanked the committee for its hard work to unanimous applause.

Professor Mulvey will update the Journal of Record for September 2012 and will be happy to sell copies!!!!

5. **Petitions for immediate hearing**: none

6. **Old Business**: none

7. **New business**

   a. **3 items from the Committee on Committees**

   Professor Preli announced that there were three items from the Committee on Committees (COC). Professor Mulvey referred to pages 30-31 of the packet. The COC met and got the ballots together. They collected the names for the General Faculty Secretary and the COC but it would be a conflict of interest for the COC to set those ballots. Those volunteers must be approved by the AC for the ballot for the election. Item 1 is the General Faculty Secretary. Professor Mulvey is stepping down from this position and two candidates have volunteered: Susan Rakowitz and Rick DeWitt.

   **MOTION** [Greenberg/Keenan]: To approve the ballot for General Faculty Secretary.

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

   Professor Walker asked if it is possible to have nominations from the floor. Professor Mulvey answered yes - at any time. These are just the names that came in to be put on the ballot. Professor Mulvey introduced item two, the ballot for the COC, which has two names: Cheryl Tromley and Joan van Hise for the DSB/Behavioral and Social Sciences slot; these were the only volunteers.

   Professor Tromley asked if it would make sense to move her to the at-large slot. Professor Mulvey answered no, she must remain in the Dolan School of Business (DSB) slot, and explained that if one of the candidates is not elected that person is eligible for the at-large vote.

   **MOTION** [Walker/Shea]: To approve the ballot for Committee on Committees as contained in the packet (on page 30).

   **MOTION PASSED**: 15 in favor; 0 opposed; 1 abstention.
Professor Mulvey indicated that the COC looked at Handbook Committee slots for University College. There are three slots on Handbook Committees reserved for University College administrators: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, FDEC, and the University College Committee has the Dean of University College or the Dean’s delegate. The committee recommends a one year fix during this transitional year. They felt the UC slot on the UCC should be filled by appointment of the SVPAA. The FDEC should decide whether and how its slot should be filled next year and should make a recommendation to the Council on the permanent disposition of this committee membership slot. For the Committee on University College slot, they suggest the immediate past Dean of University College or the immediate past Dean’s delegate.

MOTION [Walker/Petrino]: To approve the Handbook Committee slots for University College as set forth on the bottom of page 30 to the top of page 31:

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

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

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

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

Dean Crabtree suggested the FDEC should consider whether part-time faculty might be the representative. She asked that the AC share this suggestion with the FDEC. Professor Preli noted that it will be referenced in the minutes.

b. Arrange for faculty membership on search committees for Deans of DSB and SOE

Professor Mulvey introduced Item 7b. The SVPAA informed the AC at the last meeting that there would be a search committee for the Dean of the DSB and the Dean of Engineering. According to the Handbook, the AC decides the faculty representation. Typically the AC selects what the faculty representation should look like and asks the General Faculty Secretary to put out a call for nominations.
SVPPAA Fitzgerald listed as the designated members for these search committees the following: SVPPAA as chair plus 3 administrators, 1 community member or trustee, and 5 faculty members (2 from the school getting the dean, 1 from the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), 1 from neither CAS nor the school getting the dean, 1 at large with no restriction.

Professor Tromley asked, isn’t it usually more faculty representation from the school getting the dean?

Professor Shea responded that for the search for the dean for the School of Nursing, it was four but one was at large. There were 6 faculty members on that committee.

SVPPAA Fitzgerald said “I love faculty” but when the committee is larger, it is harder to meet. He suggested 3 from the school in question, 1 from CAS, and 1 from either school or at large.

Professor Mulvey questioned whether for the School of Engineering the faculty representation should be smaller for such a small school.

Professor Shea asked whether it could include part-time faculty. She supported it still being four.

Professor Dennin observed that with such a small school it puts pressure on the faculty to serve.

Professor Keenan asked how many tenure faculty of the School of Engineering are there?

SVPPAA Fitzgerald and Professor Mulvey calculated that the answer was five tenure faculty and four pre-tenure and one full-time faculty.

SVPPAA Fitzgerald wondered whether they could be untenured, and the consensus from Professor Mulvey and others was, yes.

Professor Boryczka believed they should want to undertake this work as it is important.

Professor Mulvey suggested more representation from the Mathematics and Computer Science Department, given the significant computer science offerings in the SOE.

Dean Franzosa suggested the School of Engineering be consulted.

Professor Nantz felt we should give it more thought as this was incredibly time intensive. She was worried about science faculty with their other responsibilities of labs.

Dean Crabtree normally would agree but she was very concerned to not have non-tenured faculty on it and the need to have women (the newer faculty) on it. She would like to see a representative from math and science to bring the School of Engineering to the Bannow Center. The need for collaborative integration of the curriculum is critical. The building project and other initiatives depend upon it.

**MOTION [Dennin/Nantz]: That the faculty for the Search Committee for the DSB Dean have the following representation: 3 from DSB, 1 from CAS, 1 from neither CAS nor DSB, and 1 at large with no restrictions.**

**MOTION PASSED:** 16 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions.
The General Faculty Secretary will send out a notice for nominations.

**MOTION [Greenberg/Dennin]:** That the faculty for the Search Committee for the School of Engineering Dean have the following representation: 2 from the School of Engineering, 2 from CAS of which one must be math or natural science, 1 from neither CAS nor School of Engineering, and 1 at large with no restrictions.

Dean Crabtree had questions about the math/natural science representative that Professor Mulvey clarified would be natural science not physical science.

Professor Walker asked whether it was a problem that the School of Engineering might be outnumbered.

Professor Dennin shared this concern. Was the one at large not to be from the School of Engineering? No, the maximum engineering representatives could be three.

**MOTION PASSED:** 7 in favor; 5 opposed; 4 abstentions.

At 5 p.m., Professor Preli had to leave to give an exam and Professor Mulvey took over as Chair. She introduced Professor Downie as a guest to present Item 7c.

**c. Proposed Handbook amendment from the Advancement Committee**

Professor Downie explained that the Advancement Committee for two to three years has been discussing possible changes in its membership. This proposal comes from a need to get more members, especially in the next several years of the capital campaign. They want to have a broader representation, more expertise, including a representative from the DSB, and to insure that we have members from different schools and departments. Advancement no longer looks at community affairs; with the reorganization that part is factually inaccurate.

Professor Bayne asked whether the committee considered rather than the sentence about “no restrictions” that there should be a least 1 member from specifically designated schools.

Professor Downie stated that they want DSB, CAS, and sometimes Nursing but that the committee is agnostic about the language. He noted that there is not a lot of consistency in the language of membership of committees. He doesn’t care about the language as long as it results in the representation they seek.

Professor Nantz observed that there is a new committee on arts, culture, and community engagement.

SVPAA Fitzgerald noted that it is connected to the Public Lectures Committee.

Professor Nantz responded “never mind.”

Professor Sapp, as former chair, indicated that in discussions over several years, maybe greater than three years, some of this language was an effort to keep it simple.
Professor Downie continued in his presentation, highlighting that in the second-to-last line in the bold section, the Vice President for University Advancement as ex officio is automatically a non-voting member, so this language is in keeping with Stephanie Frost’s lack of a vote. The committee is agnostic on this point and that sentence could be eliminated. There are not many votes.

Dean Crabtree asked how many meetings there were.

Professor Downie responded that they meet roughly twice a year.

Dean Crabtree noted that, generally speaking, growing this committee is a fantastic set of events, increasing faculty service, but she would like to see the committee commit to a certain number of meetings, particularly as the campaign heats up.

**MOTION [Sapp/Tromley]: To adopt the new language in bold on page 32 of the 4/30/12 packet to amend the Faculty Handbook.**

Professor Sapp was in favor.

Professor Tromley supported the motion.

Professor Walker questioned, are we sure these schools will be represented.

Professor Mulvey responded no, but we do this all the time.

**MOTION TO AMEND [Rakowitz/Keenan]: By deleting the phrase “keeping in mind a preference for broad faculty participation among members of the Committee” so it ends with “school.”**

Professor Rakowitz explained that this would be the appropriate Handbook language.

**MOTION TO AMEND PASSED unanimously.**

Professor Bayne wanted to offer another motion to amend because he wanted to further define the representation. Professor Mulvey stated the motion would need to be more specific.

**MOTION TO AMEND [Bayne/Walker]: That the representatives be: one member from the College of Arts and Sciences; one member from the School of Business; one member from neither the College of Arts and Sciences nor the School of Business; and two members at large without restriction as to curriculum area or school.**

Professor Bayne spoke in favor of the motion to amend because it is designed to capture with more precision the intention of the portion Professor Rakowitz deleted with her amendment.

Professor Sapp expressed frustration with the new restriction on membership because it has been predominantly School of Business representation.

**MOTION TO AMEND PASSED: 11 in favor, 3 opposed, 1 abstention. MAIN MOTION as amended PASSED: 13 in favor, 2 opposed, 0 abstentions.**
MOTION [Rakowitz/Boryczka]: to Recess the meeting to Senior Week to a day determined by the Executive Committee with the same agenda and a different recording secretary. 

MOTION PASSED unanimously.

The meeting was recessed at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Strauss
Recording Secretary