Approved by the Academic Council on November 7, 2011.

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

Administrators: SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, S.J.

Invited Presenters: Professors Betsy Bowen, Giovanni Ruffini.

Regrets: Deans Jack Beal, Robbin Crabtree, Suzanne Campbell, Don Gibson, Professor David Sapp

Absent: Dean Susan Franzosa

1. Presidential courtesy.

SVPAA Fitzgerald reported that they are working hard to close the 4.3 million dollar gap in the budget. The academic affairs division has trimmed some operating budgets, is delaying a few capital purchases for a year, has had eight or nine retirements (not all of which will be filled), and has some unallocated faculty salary money. SVPAA Fitzgerald said he would be happy to receive any additional suggestions for savings.

This summer the university will institute a program for rising high school seniors and will hope to attract them to coming to Fairfield. Additionally this summer there will be more online courses.

The Faculty Salary Committee met on Friday with SVPAA Fitzgerald and the Vice President of Finance Julie Dolan. According to SVPAA Fitzgerald, VPF Dolan mentioned that the university could possibly find savings by looking into whether the tuition remission benefit could be means tested. SVPAA Fitzgerald stressed that she is not talking about eliminating the benefit. The possible means testing for tuition remission will be discussed this year with the FSC, and any decision would need to be voted on by the General Faculty.

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

Professor Mulvey asked who is on the administrative salary team this year, and SVPAA Fitzgerald replied that it was himself, VPF Dolan, and Director of Human Resources Mark Guglielmoni. Professor Mulvey noted that given the giant budget gap, the talk of the administration lowering the university’s contribution to retirement accounts, and with the health insurance increase cap expiring, she is concerned with the administration’s commitment to maintain the 95th percentile in faculty compensation. She said that faculty were willing to make changes to our benefits over the last few years only because of the administration’s commitment to the 95th percentile, but if that commitment is not maintained, the administration will have committed a “bait and switch”.
Professor Nantz asked about whether the 8 to 9 retirements came from faculty lines. SVPAA Fitzgerald replied that they did not come from faculty lines, but from staff in the academic division.

Professor Lane asked about the reason for all of this reshuffling, and SVPAA Fitzgerald said it was a combination of our enrolling only 910 instead of the 950 students that the budget was based on, the fact that some members of the junior and senior class simply have not returned, and shortfalls in some graduate enrollments.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty.

As chair of the Committee on Committees, Professor Mulvey reported that three new members had been appointed to the AC, Vishnu Vinekar, Kathy Nantz, and David Sapp (who was unable to attend today), and she welcomed them to the AC. She also noted that all other committee vacancies have been filled and that all but one Handbook committee has elected a chair.

Professor Mulvey gave an update on the SON dean search committee composition. The faculty members elected to the search committee by the Academic Council are Brian Walker, Dee Lippman, Kate Wheeler, Rona Preli, and Sally Gerard.

Professor Mulvey drew our attention to page 13 of the AC packet, and noted that in her opinion the situation does not require any follow up. Council agreed.

Professor Mulvey discussed the new portal for the university. This new portal will replace and update stagweb, and C&NS is looking for faculty input as to what should be included in the portal. Professor Mulvey wants the AC to be involved with this process and would like our input via email.

SVPAA Fitzgerald mentioned that this is taking the place of stagweb without the overcrowding of stagweb. Professor Vinekar asked about the time line for this new portal, and SVPAA Fitzgerald replied at the end of this semester or early next semester.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary.

MOTION [Tromley/Walker]: To approve the minutes of the Academic Council meeting of 9/12/2011.
MOTION PASSED: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions.

Professor Rakowitz directed our attention to the correspondence included in the AC packet.

Professor Rakowitz noted that after soliciting volunteers, the ACEC had formed the subcommittee they were charged with forming at the 9/12/2011 AC meeting to propose policies and procedures for part-time undergraduate students in the College of Arts and Sciences and the Dolan School of Business, and 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. The subcommittee consists of Professors Mulvey, Preli, Godbole, Ruffini, Munden, Campbell, and Deans Crabtree and Perkus.

4. Council Subcommittee Reports.
Professor Mulvey reported that all subcommittees are working, but none are ready to report at this meeting.

5. **Petitions for immediate hearing.**

None

6. **Old Business.**

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

Professor Ruffini, a member of the UCC, briefly reminded the council of the background of this proposal. He reported that there has been an occasional problem for faculty that want to offer courses for core credit in areas outside their own departments. In the past faculty have petitioned UCC, which then consulted with the appropriate chairs and made a decision on an ad hoc basis. The motivation for formalizing a process is that sometimes some courses fell through the cracks, and some faculty thought it was unfair because there was not a clear process with a process of appeal.

The floor was opened for questions.

Professor Nantz wondered whether this was the best mechanism for carrying out this task. Isn’t there a check box for this purpose on the A&SCC New Course Proposal Form? Professor Ruffini noted that would apply only to new courses not pre-existing ones.

Professor Petrino mentioned that with new course proposals, it is clear cut when a new course within a core area is proposed, but we need a mechanism for approving core credit for new courses from outside a particular core area.

Professor Greenberg asked whether we have a set of criteria for determining whether a course meets the objectives necessary to merit core credit in a particular area? Professor Ruffini answered that the proposal calls for core areas to formulate appropriate learning objectives and to submit them to UCC.

Professor Mulvey asked how often does this situation come up? She stated that it seems like a lot of structure for something so rare. Professor Ruffini mentioned that the process is really to account for that one professor who falls through the cracks.

SVPAA Fitzgerald mentioned that the case of courses in Applied Ethics are examples of courses for which the core approval process is an issue, and these courses need a clear path to approval for core credit.

Professor Bayne asked whether this core approval would be on a per course basis or on a per course and instructor basis. He pointed out that a core area may be willing to approve a particular course taught by a particular professor, but if the new process grants approval to any course with the same number regardless of who teaches it, then this takes too much control away from the core area. The core area should have the right and responsibility of determining the instructors qualified to teach the courses that receive core credit its area. Professor Ruffini said the process would just be on a per course basis.
Professor Rakowitz stated that is how things work now with the core science committee.

Chair Preli asked Professor Ruffini to speak about the motions.

Professor Ruffini outlined the three-step process found on page 18 of the AC packet.
Chair Preli asked the Council what they would like to do?

**MOTION [Fitzgerald/Nantz]: that the Academic Council adopt the motions on page 18 and 19 of the October 3, 2011 AC Packet.**

Professor Rakowitz spoke against the motion because it is an incredibly burdensome process. She noted that the proposal for social science courses seems to be based on the core science process, but that process was developed by the science departments working with national organizations on science education, whereas this one would be imposed on social science departments.

Professor Greenberg voiced his agreement with professor Rakowitz.

Professor Lane supports motion and thinks it is a good vetting process.

Professor Mulvey said that she is grateful for the work of the UCC, but she thinks the proposal is too burdensome, so she is against it, but hopes to be able to suggest a less burdensome procedure later in the meeting.

Professor Shea was in favor of the motion. She said that this would allow UCC members to make an informed judgment based on the input of the appropriate core area.

Professor Nantz is in favor of the motion. She thought that one of the problems is that core areas are trying to protect their turf, so when someone from outside that area wants to teach a course for credit in that area, there is resistance. As a result this process will make things more accessible for people outside a particular core area.

**MOTION [Walker/Lane]: to call the question.**
**MOTION FAILED**: 4 in favor, 11 opposed.

Professor Greenberg said he thought this does not add anything to the vetting process of courses and it will be a burdensome Rube Goldberg contraption.

**MOTION [Rakowitz/Dennin]: to amend the motion by striking the last four sentences of bullet point two on page 18 of the AC packet and amending the end of the first sentence of bullet point two to read "...to review which courses from outside the social and behavioral sciences should be designated for social-science core credit..."**

**MOTION [Nantz/Lane]: to call the question.**
**MOTION to call the question PASSED unanimously**

**MOTION to amend PASSED**: 13 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstention.

**MOTION [Nantz/Lane]: to call the question on the amended motion.**
MOTION to call the question PASSED: 12 in favor, 2 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

MOTION as amended PASSED: 9 in favor, 6 opposed, and 1 abstention.


a. Election of faculty to the Honorary Degree Committee.

MOTION [Tromley/Dennin]: that the slate of candidates provided by the Committee on Committees (Rajasree Rajamma, Evelyn Lolis, and Anibal Torres) be elected to serve as the faculty representatives on the Honorary Degree Committee.

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

b. 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).

Professor Bowen, Chair of Committee on Conference, reported on the last meeting with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees on June 2, 2011. She said that she, and Professors Bernhardt and McFadden met with the committee in NY. They were told that the BOT would be voting on the proposed Handbook Committee on Sustainability, they were also instructed by the AC to inform the Board of the problems the faculty see with merit pay. At the meeting, there was a presentation concerning the first year of the use of the IDEA form, and she will forward the report to the AC Executive Committee. There was also a presentation from a consultant with Invision, which is a marketing firm working with focus groups of students on campus to get their impressions of what is happening on campus. The firm reported that students’ satisfaction with their academic experience at Fairfield was high and that this was a difference between Fairfield and other universities. On the other hand, only 71 percent of students would recommend Fairfield to other students. It was also reported that among students who reported not being happy at Fairfield, this unhappiness set in early in their careers.

Professor Bowen reported that the next meetings of the BOT are 10/6, 12/1, 3/29, and 6/7.

The floor was opened for questions about the last meeting.

Professor Lane commented that it sounds like you did not have a lot of time in the meeting. You should have more time in the meeting to express faculty concerns rather than devoting so much time to consultants.

Professor Bowen agreed that the Committee on Conference would like to be able to take a bigger role in presenting faculty concerns to the BOT.

Professor Nantz asked whether there was an agenda for the next meeting, and Professor Bowen reported not yet.
Professor Mulvey said that is part of this agenda item: to give instructions to the Committee on Conference for the next meeting with the Academic Affairs Committee of the BOT.

Professor Nantz said it just seems as if the timing is off, the meeting is on Thursday, how would the committee have time to prepare?

Professor Bowen responded that this item had been on the September AC agenda but that there wasn’t sufficient time to get to it.

A discussion ensued with regard to the Conference Committee’s upcoming meeting with the board followed by

**MOTION**: [Strauss/Tromley]: that the AC ask the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees to request information on how they are focusing their efforts on fund raising and generating other sources of revenue.

**MOTION PASSED**: 13 in favor, 2 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

**MOTION** [Dennin/Walker]: to adjourn

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

Respectfully submitted,
Steven M. Bayne

Approved by the Academic Council on November 7, 2011.