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


Invited Presenters: Michael Pagano, Bill Abbott

Regrets: Dean Don Gibson, Professors Jocelyn Borczyka, Don Greenberg, Cheryl Tromley.

Absent: Dean Susan Franzosa, Professor Debra Strauss.

The meeting was called to order at 10:07 a.m. AC Executive Secretary Susan Rakowitz proposed Summer meeting dates June 4th, June 18th, July 16th.

Motion [Rakowitz/Keenan]: To reorder the agenda for the Academic Council meeting on May 14th 2012 to get through items 7e and 7d, and then return to item 7b.

Motion passed: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

7e. Proposal to close the M.A. in Organizational Communication Cohort Program

Professor Mike Pagano reported on the M.A. in Organizational Communication Cohort Program. Prof. Pagano said that this Cohort Program was started in 2003 and ran through 2009. It graduated 50 to 60 students in six years, and then the funding dried up. Because of these limitations, they would like to close the cohort program and keep the on-campus program.

Motion: [Lane/Keenan]: To close the MA in Communication Cohort program.

Professor David Sapp spoke in favor of the motion because of the limitations it faces; but added that he was sad to see it go.
Motion passed: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

7d. Report from FDEC evaluating ongoing use of IDEA and yellow sheets (Pending Items D and E)

Professor Bill Abbott, chair of the Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee reported on the faculty feedback on online versus paper IDEA forms. He said that there were compelling arguments on both sides. Some faculty are busy and cannot take 40 minutes out of class time for a paper-based IDEA form and would prefer the students to do online evaluations outside class time. Other faculty want to use the paper IDEA forms in class as they get a higher response rate. A number of faculty got a very high response rate online; for example, Professor Sara Brill used the online IDEA form and had a very high response rate. The FDEC recommends that Fairfield University continue using both the paper and online options for IDEA. Dr. Abbott said that both options cost around the same, although paper has more people involved.

Professor Bayne asked why the response rate for online has gone down. Dr. Abbott replied that in the first semester the default option was paper IDEA student evaluations, while in the second semester the default option was online IDEA student evaluations. There were 246 courses at Fairfield University with the paper IDEA option in March 2012, slightly above 216 from the previous semester (Fall 2011). It may be that some faculty did not respond to the choice between online and paper, and hence they may have unintentionally chosen online.

Professor Keenan asked whether students could get an incentive to fill out the online evaluation. For example, students who have not yet filled out their evaluation could have their grades withheld until they fill out their online IDEA evaluations. Professor Bill Abbott replied that Dr. Mary Frances Malone said that this may be illegal. In addition, this would involve lots of work to implement this on our computer system. Dr. Keenan said that other schools do this, withhold students' grades until they fill out their evaluations.

Professor Kathy Nantz said that junior faculty should use paper. She also said that the IDEA forms force us to recognize that if sample size is small, reliability is a concern, by specifically stating sample size and reliability on the forms. Dr. Abbott said that he'll talk to the FDEC about these issues. He added that IDEA's suggestions for small classes is that a professor who teaches these should look at a trend after teaching several of these classes.

SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald asked about IDEA evaluations for graduate and summer courses. Dr. Abbott replied that these courses are all online. In addition, the faculty pass out the yellow evaluation sheets in class. SVPAA Fitzgerald replied that response is abysmal for short summer courses. He added that these courses should use paper to get a better response rate.
Dean Suzanne Campbell stated that evaluations for adjunct faculty has been an issue for deans. Dr. Abbott replied that Jay Rozgonyi of the CNS said every faculty gets a URL that they can give the students. It’s a matter of contacting the adjunct faculty.

Professor David Sapp asked about the IDEA FIF (Faculty Information Form). He said that some faculty were leaving this form blank. Professor Abbott said that the percentage of filled Faculty Information Forms has risen to an acceptable level. In addition, the online version requires the faculty to fill out and send constant reminders.

Professor Rona Preli asked whether the option to opt-out of FUSA survey has been discontinued? Professor Abbott said that Dr. Malone had said that this was a mistake.

A concern was raised that in graduate schools, comparisons to disciplines is a problem. Some faculty could have selected the wrong comparison groups on the Faculty Information Forms.

Dean Jack Beal spoke about the issue of contacting adjuncts. He stated that University Policy is that adjuncts can only be contacted through their Fairfield University email address, but many adjunct faculty use their organization’s or personal email.

**Motion [Bayne/Lane]: Both paper and online IDEA student evaluations be offered to faculty until 2014. The default should be paper IDEA evaluations. This should be reevaluated in Spring 2014.**

Professor David Sapp said that we need to know cost difference between online and paper. Professor Steve Bayne said that cost is an issue, but data is a bigger value. Valid data is more important than the monetary costs. Professor Phil Lane says that with online IDEA evaluations, we need to give students a lot of incentive to fill them out. Professor David Sapp suggested all paper evaluations except for online classes. Professor Joyce Shea said she objects to this because paper can have an environmental impact; therefore, the option to do evaluations online should be there. Professor Brian Walker said that online IDEA evaluations worked well in labs. SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald said that many people took many hours sorting, boxing and mailing the paper student evaluations. In addition, one of the four original boxes fell off of a truck, onto the road, causing a loss of data. As they have to be sent to Kansas, IDEA paper forms can be insecure. Our earlier paper student evaluation forms were run on campus and were therefore secure. However, IDEA requires paper forms to be sent to Kansas, which is where the problem lies with IDEA paper student evaluations. Junior faculty need to have increased student response rates, and they can have an option to chose online or paper evaluations for this. Tenured faculty also need feedback, but after 30-40 years, they may have a
lesser need to increase student response rates and may choose between online or paper based on other factors.

Dean Jack Beal commented that adjunct faculty members sign a contract to teach for one semester. Chairs, deans and adjuncts need to have a sense of teaching evaluations of adjunct professors. Professor Irene Mulvey stated that this comment was not relevant to the motion on the floor.

Motion Passed: 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

Motion [Lane/Dennin]: To have FDEC consider:
Junior faculty should be encouraged to use paper evaluation
An incentive for students to do online evaluations
Maximizing response rates
Evaluations for summer and graduate classes
Online courses should use yellow sheets
FIF (Faculty Information Forms) not filled in
FUSA questions opt-out
Course designations on IDEA
Evaluations for independent study classes

Professor Abbott stated that the yellow sheet data do not translate very well to the IDEA system. The qualitative answers from IDEA forms cannot be matched between students. The results list all your answers for Question 1, and then all the answers for Question 2.

Professor Sapp asked whether we knew how many professors used yellow sheets. Professor Abbott replied saying that in a study years ago, 16-20% of classes never had an evaluation submitted. It is possible that these may have been independent study classes.

Motion [Walker/Shea]: To continue use of yellow forms for two years, reevaluate in 2014.
Motion Passed: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

The AC thanked the FDEC for all its work on IDEA.

7b. Arrange for faculty membership on search committees for Deans of DSB and SOE

Professor Rakowitz said that a couple of questions have been raised about administrators with faculty status running for faculty seats on the search committees. She has discussed their eligibility with Professor Mulvey and both agree that it’s murky. Before finalizing the ballots and voting, the Council should rule on whether administrators with faculty status are eligible to run for faculty seats on these committees. Next year, the Council may want to consider making a
clear policy statement on the broader issue of how such people fit into our governance structures.

Professor Mulvey said that there is nothing in our documents that says they cannot be elected, but these faculty slots should be filled by regular faculty.

**Motion [Lane/Second]: Administrators with faculty status are ineligible for faculty slots on the search committees.**

Professor Sapp asked for clarification on what we mean when we say ‘administrators with faculty status’. Professor Mulvey replied this is well-defined on the faculty rosters that the Faculty Secretary gets from the SVPAA’s office and that chairs are not listed as administrators with faculty status. SVPAA Fitzgerald said that faculty are listed by department. There are about 17 individual administrators with faculty status. In addition, there are temps who bring the number to 22 or 23 administrators with faculty status.

**Motion Passed: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions**

Professor Rakowitz said that she had been asked to have the Council reconsider the composition of the SOE search committee. There were 3 slots for DSB faculty on the DSB search committee, but because there are so many fewer faculty in SOE, there were 2 SOE slots plus 1 CAS-Math/Science slot for the SOE search. In light of the contrasting composition of the two search committees, a member of the SOE faculty has asked that "the School of Engineering be permitted to have a majority of members representing the engineering faculty on the selection committee". Engineers have particular expertise that will be valuable for this search.

Professor Lane said that he agrees with the SOE that they may need more engineering faculty on this search committee.

**Motion [Nantz/Lane]: to add a SOE faculty member to the search.**

Professor Dennin asked how many faculty are in the SOE. Dean Beal replied that there are ten faculty, five tenured faculty.

Dean Beal spoke for the motion, and wanted to discuss the expertise of each of the SOE faculty. Professor Mulvey suggested that the Council suspend the rules and allow Dean Beal to discuss the composition of the search committee. There were no objections. Dean Beal spoke about the differences engineering faculty would bring to the table and described the broad range of expertise of the SOE faculty who were willing to serve on the committee.

Professor Nantz asked Dean Beal what changes he would like to the SOE Dean's Search Committee. Dean Beal replied that the SOE search committee should have the same composition as other schools' search committees.
Professor Lane spoke in favor of the motion, saying that the SOE has the right to have the same number of members on their search committee as the DSB search committee.

Professor Dennin asked if we are adding one faculty to the committee. Professor Nantz replied yes.

Professor Walker then spoke against the motion, saying that this motion would make this search committee larger than the DSB Search Committee. He said that the AC should remove the at-large slot to have the same number of people on the committee as the DSB Committee. Professor Nantz said that she just wants to vote for three SOE faculty on the SOE Dean Search Committee.

Professor Keenan asked SVPAA Fitzgerald if he was ok with having another person on the committee. He said that the Academic Council does not set the number of people on the search committees. SVPAA Fitzgerald replied that he will be ok with as many as the Academic Council decides, but the more people, the more difficult it gets to coordinate meetings. He would be happy if the two committees have the same number of people.

Professor Nantz spoke in favor of the motion. She said that proportionally business has more faculty.

Professor Mulvey also spoke in favor of the motion.

Professor Keenan spoke in favor of the motion. He said that important extenuating circumstances exist in this case. Dean Beal should have three faculty from the SOE. In addition, there's interest in having Math and Science and Engineering work together.

Professor Walker spoke against the motion again because there is a possibility of having four faculty from SOE.

**Motion passed: 10 in favor, 2 opposed, 2 abstentions**

The AC voted on the ballot for the SOE search committee. The following faculty were elected on the first ballot:
- Shanon Reckinger, Ryan Munden, and Shah Etemad from SOE
- Shelley Phelan, Dave Winn from CAS
- Carl Scheraga from DSB/SON/GSEAP
- Nancy Dallavalle (At Large)

The AC then voted on the ballot for the DSB Dean Search Committee. The following were elected on the first ballot:
- Cheryl Tromley, Cathy Giapponi, Walter Hlawitschka from DSB
- Phil Lane for CAS
- Anne Campbell from GSEAP/SON/SOE
The following faculty were elected on the third ballot:
Chris Huntley

7f: Questions from UCC and proposed answers from ACEC.

Professor Rakowitz presented the questions from the UCC. The UCC asked whether every time there is a change in a major requirement, does that come under the UCC’s responsibility to review?

Professor Rakowitz said that degree requirements are at the level of the school or the university. Major requirements are at the level of the department or school; they should not go to UCC for review. Interdisciplinary programs require UCC review. Although the Department of Modern Languages is not an interdisciplinary program, it allows courses from other majors to count towards its majors.

Motion: [Rakowitz/Dennin]: We therefore propose the following changes to Item 7 of Appendix 2 in the 11/09 edition of the JOR (additions underlined, deletions struck through):

7. Changes in School or University Degree Requirements:

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

Motion Passed: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

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

Motion [Rakowitz/Lane]: Women’s Studies name change to be recorded in the Journal of Record.

Motion Passed: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

7h. Question about investigating costs and savings of changing athletic divisions

Dr. Sapp made the following remarks to the Academic Council about Agenda item 7h:

“Fairfield University currently competes in NCAA Division I Athletics. The University supports 20 athletic teams in 12 sports: 9 men’s teams and 11 women’s teams. These 20 teams include more than 400 student-athletes (sharing approximately 100 full scholarships) and over 60 coaches. The total annual expense to support these 20 athletic teams in the NCAA Division I is over $15 million.”
During the spring 2012 semester, presentations by the VP of Finance on the University’s budget and the President’s address to the faculty revealed that the budget for varsity athletics has doubled from just over $7 million in 2007 to over $15 million currently. Given the seriousness of the budget crisis described by the President and the VP of Finance, I wonder if the time is right for the University to consider reducing the financial support we spend on varsity sports by moving Fairfield University from NCAA Division I athletics to NCAA Division III athletics.

There are 450 colleges and universities currently competing in NCAA Division III Athletics (including many top-tier academic institutions with enrollments ranging from 500 to 20,000 students). The NCAA Division III requires universities like ours to support only 12 teams (including at least 6 women’s teams), instead of the 20 teams we currently support at Fairfield University. The NCAA Division III does not allow student-athletes to receive financial aid scholarships specifically for athletics. Thus, athletes are only eligible to receive financial aid based on academic qualifications in competition with the entire student body. To enforce this philosophy, the NCAA requires that, to maintain Division III status, the percentage of scholarship aid received by student-athletes must be roughly equivalent to the percentage of scholarship aid received by the entire student body.

As an (admittedly extreme) example of potential savings if Fairfield University moved to NCAA Division III athletics, note that our 12 least expensive teams are Men’s and Women’s Cross Country, Men’s and Women’s Golf, Men’s and Women’s Rowing, Men’s and Women’s Tennis, Men’s and Women’s Swimming, Women’s Field Hockey, and Women’s Softball. The total annual expense for Fairfield University to support just these 12 athletic teams in the NCAA Division III would be approximately $2 million. Thus, the potential maximum savings in annual expenses by moving to NCAA Division III Athletics and funding only the least expensive athletic teams is approximately $13 million per year, funds that could be used to support additional need- and merit-based financial aid, as well as other necessary budgetary expenses.

Given the current budget climate, I believe that the Academic Council should be better informed regarding this as one of many options for the University. As such, I make the following motion.

**MOTION:** I move that the Academic Council Executive Committee appoint a five-member faculty ad hoc committee charged with gathering specific information regarding costs related to our NCAA Division I athletic programs. The committee will gather information relevant to this issue and reporting back to the Academic Council during the fall 2012 semester. The committee is instructed to correspond with the Budget Committee, as well as other relevant faculty committees and administrators (e.g., Admissions and Scholarships, Advancement, VP of Finance, Athletics, and anyone else who has knowledge and expertise related to this inquiry). Specifically, the committee is instructed to gather information to answer to the following three questions:
1. What is our current annual budget related to all varsity athletics (including coaches’ salaries, student scholarships, equipment/facilities, team travel, and everything else)?

2. What would be the total cost savings if Fairfield University moved from NCAA Division I to Division III (including possible reduction of the number of teams required, salaries of coaches/staff, student scholarships, maintenance of facilities, and everything else)?

3. What would be the anticipated--negative or positive--impact on fundraising/advancement, student admission/recruitment, and campus morale if the University moved from NCAA Division I to Division III athletics?

End of motion.

Sapp continued: To be clear, I am not yet advocating that the University move from NCAA Division I to Division III athletics; however, given the current and very serious budget climate, I feel that it would be wise for the Academic Council to be better informed regarding this as one of many options.”

Professor Dennin said that we should investigate whether anyone would want to play us.

Professor Sapp asked which teams should we keep? If we keep men’s basketball, which costs 2.5 million for 15 students and 7 coaches, we won’t be saving a lot of money. Women’s track costs 66 thousand per year

Professor Nantz asked if there a division III league for us? Professor Sapp replied yes, there is.

Professor Nantz asked how does this impact admissions? Professor Sapp replied that should be what the committee should investigate.

Professor Nantz said that the trustees trump whatever we do, and she hesitates to engage a large number of faculty in a useless effort. We should engage the trustees from the beginning.

Professor Walker stated that students tell him ‘if I'm not on this team, I'm out of Fairfield’. Professor Sapp replied that we could reposition scholarships.

Dean Crabtree asked, why is an athletic strategic plan unfolding outside the normal strategic plan?
SVFAA Fitzgerald said that seven sports were chosen for special emphasis. The athletic strategic plan includes scholarship money. The coaches sometimes divide the whole scholarships among more than one student athlete. In addition, athletes have a higher than average GPA. Athletes also have lower incidents of binge drinking, as well as better time management practices. The proposed Health sciences complex, the renovation of the Rec-Plex, and a new Lacrosse stadium are in the comprehensive campaign as gift opportunities. Nor should we ignore the benefit to Fairfield of having 12 televised basketball games last year.

**Motion [Sapp/Walker]:** That the ACEC appoint members of an ad-hoc subcommittee to investigate issues 3 things:

1. Current annual budget on varsity athletics
2. Costs savings if Fairfield move to Division III
3. What would be the impact on morale?

Professor Preli asked where the members would come from. Professor Sapp replied that they will be comprised of AC members and a few other people, five faculty in all. They will consult with committees that have some of this in their purview. They will report back in Fall of next academic year.

Professor Shea spoke in favor and strongly encouraged there will be at least one female member or more.

SVFAA Fitzgerald spoke against the motion. He said that the handbook charges the Athletics Committee with this, and the AC should send this to the Athletics Committee. Professor Sapp replied that it goes beyond as the Athletics Committee as it involves Finance. Professor Lane said that the Athletic Committee cannot do this as they have a full agenda.

**Motion Passed: 13 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.**

**7i. Memo from FDEC regarding final exam policy**

The JoR and the Instructional Handbook state that 1/3 of the total grade is the final exam. We should send this to UCC to look at the whole issue of final assessments.

Dean Crabtree said that the instructional policies should be looked at; the structure of grading does not track well across disciplines. There is no enforcement of these policies. Most faculty are in violation of this policy as such; most of this is pedagogically sound, some is dereliction. The final exam time period should be used for pedagogy.

Professor Sapp said that exceptions include written notification. The syllabus counts as a written notification.
SVPAA Fitzgerald commented on how this affects us. Half of the professors did not have a final. We should reflect on current pedagogy.

Professor Nantz said that new faculty see this and assume that this should be done.

Professor Rakowitz said that most of us do responsible things with the final exam. Default in the policy is that there should be a final exam.

Professor Petrino said that English has moved to papers instead of an exam. The Policy puts emphasis on 1/3 of the grade to this.

**Motion [Rakowitz/Nantz]: Ask UCC to consider final exam policies, and if appropriate, make recommendations for changes to the JOR.**

**Motion Passed: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.**

Kathy thanked the AC executive committee for their work this year.

Move to Adjourn at 11:51.

Respectfully submitted,
Vishnu Vinekar