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Approved by the Academic Council on February 6, 2012.

Present: Professors: Steve Bayne, Joe Dennin, Donald Greenberg, Dennis Keenan, Phil Lane, Irene Mulvey (General Faculty Secretary), Elizabeth Petrino, Rona Preli (AC Chair), Susan Rakowitz (AC Executive Secretary), David Sapp, Joyce Shea, Debra Strauss, Cheryl Tromley, Vishnu Vinekar, David Zera.

Administrators: Deans Robbin Crabtree, Susan Franzosa, Don Gibson, SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald.

Guests: Professors Qin Zhang, David Crawford, Mark Scalese.


Chair Preli reconvened the meeting at 3:35 and the AC took up the 11/7/2011 agenda where we left off with item 7.c.

7.c. Two proposed motion from the Rank and Tenure Committee.

The motion is from the memo from the R&T committee to the AC Executive Secretary, dated 11/7/2011 and handed out at the AC meeting.

Motion [Tromley/Fitzgerald]: That the Faculty Handbook be amended in II.A.3.b.(3) additions boldface, deletions in strikethrough: That at the time of submitting the dossier, the candidate for tenure shall have normally completed served a probationary period of not less than five years in a full-time position in the academic profession, not less than two of which years shall have been served at Fairfield University. No one can be a candidate for tenure at Fairfield more than once.

SVPAA Fitzgerald spoke in favor because (1) the current language is ambiguous and this clarifies that the candidate must have five years when submitting the application and (2) ‘normally’ allows for exceptional early cases.

Motion to Amend [Bayne/Lane] Delete the last sentence.

Professor Bayne spoke in favor because (1) normally one can only come up in the 6th year which would be once and (2) someone who presents an extraordinary case and gets turned down may be normally acceptable but could not apply again.

Professor Tromley spoke against saying it would open the door to candidates applying multiple times thinking they were extraordinary.
Professor Mulvey spoke in favor expressing the concern that the consequences of leaving the sentence in would be that some people with bad advice would apply inappropriately and be done.

Professor Petrino spoke in favor for the same reasons as Professor Bayne. Professor Rakowitz spoke in favor saying people would get the idea that fifth year applications would now have a higher threshold, and there would be very few extraordinary applications.

**Motion to Amend Passed:** 7 in favor, 6 opposed.

**Motion to Amend** [Mulvey/Greenberg] remove the word ‘normally’.

Professor Mulvey spoke in favor

Professor Greenberg spoke in favor saying we already have mechanisms for exceptions to normal requirements.

**Motion to Amend Passed:** 14 in favor, 0 opposed.

**Motion to Amend** [Mulvey/Lane]: insert the word ‘teaching’ between full-time and position.

Professor Mulvey spoke in favor saying that all full-time teaching, including as a visiting professor, counts based on AAUP guidelines

**Motion to Amend Passed:** 13 in favor, 0 opposed.

**Pending Motion** (as amended) That the Faculty Handbook be amended in II.A.3.b.(3) additions boldface, deletions in strikethrough: That at the time of submitting the dossier, the candidate for tenure shall have completed served a probationary period of not less than five years in a full-time teaching position in the academic profession, not less than two of which years shall have been served at Fairfield University.

Professor Bayne spoke against the motion saying that in the current situation with merit raises, accepting the motion means that there would be no raises for new faculty until the beginning of their seventh year.

Professor Dennin observed that there are raises, just not above the cost of living.

**Motion Passed:** 13 in favor, 1 opposed.
The next motion is also from the memo from the R&T committee to the AC Executive Secretary, dated 11/7/2011 and handed out at the AC meeting.

**Motion: [Lane/Keenan]:** That the *Faculty Handbook* be amended in II.A.1.b.(3) additions boldface, deletions in strikethrough: The normal requirements for appointment to the rank of Associate Professor are […] (b) five six years experience in the rank of Assistant Professor. **An extraordinary petition for an early consideration of a tenure petition would require the support of two-thirds of the candidate’s appropriate faculty.**

Professor Greenberg spoke against asking if there were a contradiction here with previous language.

SVPAA Fitzgerald responded that there is no contradiction, it is a question of when one can apply vs. when one is appointed. The application is after five years; but the appointment is after six.

Professor Bayne spoke against the motion saying it would be inappropriate to insert the last sentence of the motion into section II.A.1.b.(3) of the Handbook due to the fact that this section of the Handbook concerns promotion not tenure.

**Motion to Amend: [Mulvey/Fitzgerald]:** Delete the last sentence.

Professor Mulvey spoke in favor of the amendment, saying that two-thirds of a small department could be problematic, particularly in GSEAP. Also the previous motion makes this redundant.

Dean Crabtree spoke in favor with the same concern as Professor Bayne. She also asked, if one goes up for early tenure, is one eligible to apply for promotion at the same time?

SVPAA Fitzgerald answered that the practice is to apply for both together.

Professor Keenan spoke in favor for the reasons stated.

**Motion to Amend Passed: 14 in favor, 0 opposed.**

**Main Motion as Amended Passed: 14 in favor, 0 opposed.**

Professor Mulvey expressed thanks to the Rank and Tenure committee and looks forward to a solid presentation at the faculty meeting.

7.d. **Proposal from the UCC on incompletes.**

Questions:  (1) What is the problem?
(2) How does the proposal address the problem?
Two concerns: (1) the JOR policy on Incompletes says nothing about why to give an incomplete. No language about procedure. Want to formalize what is in the University catalog and make consistent across schools (2) The time frame for completion of an incomplete is inconsistent from semester to semester.

**Motion:** [Rakowitz/Petrino]
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.

Professor Rakowitz spoke in favor although the language is not appropriate for the JOR, the ACEC will clean it up.

Professor Greenberg spoke enthusiastically against the motion saying it was a huge mistake. Formalizing bureaucratic decisions can’t cover all possibilities. This area belongs to the individual faculty member and student and should be handled at the department level if abuse occurs.

Professor Petrino spoke in favor, wanting to put more burden on the student because students do not take requests for incompletes seriously.

Dean Crabtree spoke in favor saying faculty can always change a grade but now there is no clear document of what is expected of the student. A student can always negotiate after the fact.

Professor Greenberg spoke against saying he can’t conceive of a responsible faculty member not working the details out with a student.

Professor Tromley spoke against saying an organization does a disservice with a policy rather than guidelines; guidelines should not be a rule.

Professor Preli spoke against saying that incompletes are used differently in professional schools, for example to complete clinicals.
Motion to Call the Question\[Lakeland/Tromley\]
Motion failed 6 in favor, 8 against.

Professor Keenan had a Point of Information: What policy is left in the Journal of Record?

Professor Mulvey responded that the JOR talks about the time frame for incompletes, but not why they might be given. She is against the motion.

Professor Strauss spoke against because 30 days can be too burdensome and ignores individual circumstances.

Professor Preli was against because there still was a problem with the schedule.

Motion failed: 2 in favor, 12 opposed, 2 abstentions.

Motion \[Mulvey/Greenberg\] Insert the following in front of the existing JOR text on completion of incompletes:
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.

Motion passed.

7.e. Recommendations from ACEC re Pending Items.

Professor Mulvey pointed out that there are a large number of items carried over from previous years and that ACEC has addressed the issue both last year and this year with drafted recommendations.

Motion: \[Mulvey/Keenan\] That items A, C, D, and F be removed from the list of Pending Items on the Academic Council agenda.

Professor Bayne asked if there was a committee for item F (parking).

Professor Mulvey replied that there were 2 faculty members on an administrative committee about parking but it was not a subcommittee of the Academic Council.

Motion Passed.

Professor Mulvey asked if the Council should drop item B from the list of pending items. She felt it should be kept and Professor Lane agreed. The Council agreed to keep it on the agenda.
Similarly the Council agreed to keep item E on the agenda with Dean Crabtree pointing out that the Department of Labor says we need to keep better records.

The Council thanked Professor DeWitt for his work on these issues.

7.f. Proposal for a Minor in Anthropology.

Professor Crawford presented the proposal for a minor in Anthropology.

Dean Crabtree noted that there was a minor in Sociology but not in Anthropology and that this would appeal to Sociology majors with an interest in anthropology.

Some questions followed.

Professor Bayne: What courses count for what?

Professor Crawford: For Sociology majors with a minor in Anthropology, one course would double count so that 10(major) + 5(minor) = 14.

Professor Greenberg: Do you have the people to teach the courses?

Professor Crawford: For all except one course which an adjunct from Yale now teaches.

Professor Tromley: Why not double count any course?

Professor Crawford: There is double counting in many places because student love labels and so double counting tends to grow like weeds.

**Motion:** [Lane/Keenan] To approve the minor in Anthropology.

Professor Zera asked if Professor Crawford should stay.

Chairperson Preli responded that he was welcome to.

Dean Crabtree spoke in favor of the motion saying it comes out of the external review and self-study by the department and the department is enthusiastic about it.

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

Professor Rakowitz suggested reordering the agenda to consider 7.h. next which suggestion was accepted.

7.h. Five-Year Review of New Media Program.

Professor Mark Scalese summarized the report in the packet.

Professor Mulvey asked if the program was as successful as predicted?
Professor Scalese replied that it was estimated that there would be 75 majors and now there are 92 majors and 8 minors.

Dean Franzosa commented that all previous committees have endorsed it and it has fulfilled its responsibility excellently.

Professor Mulvey asked if there is a cap on the number of students.

Professor Scalese replied that there was a cap of 125 students but their target was about 20 per year or 80 to 100 overall.

SVPAA Fitzgerald said they had a strong faculty and students, good facilities and that the media center was also useful as a source of adjuncts.

**Motion:** [Greenberg/Keenan]: To endorse the report.  
**Motion passed:** 14 in favor, 0 opposed.

**Motion to Adjourn:** [Dennin/Tromley].

Submitted by,  
Joe Dennin

Approved by the Academic Council on February 6, 2012.