Motion: The Academic Council moves that representatives from the Dolan School of Business, the Department of Modern Languages and Literature, and the Academic Council Executive Committee meet to try to find a mutually acceptable resolution to the DSB's concerns regarding the language core requirement, and report back to the AC at its April meeting. (Rakowitz/Dennin)

D. Gibson spoke in favor of the motion and read the following statement:

In supporting this motion, the DSB would like to emphasize that our proposal pertaining to the language requirement arose because of the actions of another department that drastically affects our students. We are not interested in “changing the core,” but in following patterns that were already in place prior to this change. We tried to reach a mutually acceptable resolution to this issue four years ago when it first arose, and have been available for discussion of ideas ever since. Our proposal, which specifies a higher foreign language requirement than Fairfield’s other professional schools and is highly consistent with our peer competitive institutions, Jesuit and otherwise, was developed and approved in the DSB Curriculum Committee; went to the DSB full faculty where it was unanimously approved; went to the University Curriculum Committee where, after over three hours of discussion spanning three meetings, it was approved. It was the understanding of the UCC and SVPAA that the decision of the UCC was sufficient to implement the proposal. The Journal of Record stipulates under “Changes in Core Requirements,” that “Included here also are those situations where groups of students are to be excused from some part of the Core requirements...,” which is what the DSB is proposing, and the routing requirements are listed as from 1) Curriculum Area Chair(s) to 2) UCC (see JOR, p. 65, #6).

We understand that the Executive Committee and the Academic Council has the right of review of policies passed by the UCC, and needs to approve changes that will be entered into the Journal of Record, but it would be helpful if it was made clearer which kinds of decisions will go to the AC and General Faculty and which will not.

This is especially germane because substantial changes to the core routinely pass the UCC and are implemented immediately with no decision or review required of the Academic Council or General Faculty. To encourage the credibility and legitimacy of Fairfield’s governance structure and the processes necessary for changes to the curriculum, we recommend that the AC clarify these issues.”

S. Rakowitz agreed that there is some confusion in the JOR regarding routing and suggested that clarification might be made.
C. Tromley spoke in favor of the motion. She wondered why the recent changes in the Philosophy Department core courses went only to the UCC. It seems to her like policy has not been applied equitably across the schools.

I. Mulvey said that the Philosophy Department changes were a little different in that they were proposed by the core-offering department as opposed to the kinds of changes in core requirements asked for in this current case by the DSB.

R. Crabtree said that regarding core curriculum revisions, the changes in Modern Language Department core courses were the outcome of major departmental review processes resulting from comments and input from outside reviewers. We have to be flexible about fitting the review process to the significance of the changes and the student learning outcomes that are being addressed. Dean Crabtree supports some version of the DSB proposal, but wants to be clear that changes in Modern Language Department bring an antiquated curriculum up to date. The changes reflect current best practices in language instruction at the college level.

The motion passed, 15 in favor/0 opposed/0 abstentions.

2. Item 7.b. Registration proposal from Faculty Athletics Committee.

G. Ruffini, representing the Faculty Athletics Committee, reported that on occasion students show up for class saying they didn’t know what classes they were registered for. It came to light that someone else was registering some of our student athletes for their courses. After good conversations with administrators in the athletics department, the committee learned that there are often travel conflicts during the registration time period. However, FAC was concerned about the broader issue of students getting PIN codes without proper advising. The committee wants to address the student athlete problem by getting at the broader issue of students more closely adhering to the advising process that results in obtaining their PIN codes. At very least, student athletes will be required to have face-to-face conversation with someone in the academic area before they select courses.

D. Keenan asked how the students get their PIN without seeing advisor. G. Ruffini answered that there are a variety of methods; students tell the registrar things like, “I met with my advisor, but forgot to get my PIN” or “I can’t find my advisor, can you give me my PIN.” Some departments have lists of PINS and distribute them as needed by students.

Motion: That use of a student’s PIN not be activated to allow for registration until the student’s faculty advisor, department head or dean has used his or her own Net ID login to verify that he or she has consulted with the student, issued the student’s PIN, and approved the student’s proposed course of study. (Mulvey/Greenberg)

The motion passed, 15 for/0 against/0 abstention.

Reordered agenda (15 in favor/0 opposed)

3. Item 4a. Subcommittee on University College matters.

Motion: The Academic Council recommends to the General Faculty that University College be closed. (Greenberg/Shea)

The motion passed, 14 in favor/1 against/0 abstentions.

I. Mulvey said the General Faculty will vote on this motion on at its next meeting. The Academic Council has authority to decide other details. P. Fitzgerald said in item #6 the specific dollar figures would not go into the Journal of Record. I. Mulvey said bullets at bottom concerning the Center for Continuing Education are still being discussed.
B. Walker asked if the Handbook Committee on Continuing Education was still needed. I. Mulvey said there is still a Handbook committee that has business to discuss. R. Crabtree said that there is still work to do through transition, but that we may want to change the specific charge of the committee over time as its role changes.

R. Crabtree thanked I. Mulvey for the clear and concise document she put together that represents the work of many people over two years. Warm applause from the Council followed.

4. Item 4b. Subcommittee on voting rights.

Rick DeWitt, Steve Bayne, and Doug Lyon constituted the sub-committee charged with investigating the issue of voting rights. The sub-committee wanted to define voting rights across campus mirroring rights on the Academic Council. Full-time faculty are those who spend more than 75% of their time on teaching and research. The Faculty Handbook states that the faculty of each school should determine voting rights within that school. The sub-committee recommends that the Academic Council pass along recommendations to schools that they bring their own governance documents in line with the Academic Council rules for voting.

The recommendations are as follows:

1. That all schools review their governance documents to ensure that the document incorporates the following principle: Each school’s governance document should clearly define a full time faculty member as a member of the General Faculty who is under a full time faculty contract with the rank of Instructor or above.

2. That all schools review their governance documents to ensure that the document incorporates the following policy: Only full time faculty members who devote more than seventy five percent of their academic year’s duties to teaching and/or research have voting rights at faculty meetings of the school, standing faculty committees of the school (for example, school Curriculum Committees), departmental meetings or meetings of faculty in a curriculum area, departmental faculty committees (for example, search committees), and other faculty bodies within the school or department. Exceptions: General exceptions to this policy may be made within school governance documents in accordance with the emendation procedure specified in the school governance document. Individual exceptions to this policy, such as exceptions for a faculty committee within a school, department, or curriculum area, may be approved by a vote of the faculty body that formed the committee.

3. That all current exceptions to the principles and policies in Recommendations 1 and 2 within school governance documents be reviewed and voted on by the full time faculty members of the school.

4. That the ACEC in fall of 2012 inquire of the Deans of each school as to changes made to the school’s governance documents in light of the above recommendations, review the governance documents of the schools, and report back to the Academic Council.

Questions were asked about the recommendations: B. Walker asked about tenured faculty members who are part time faculty members? R. Dewitt said this would be an exception. P. Fitzgerald suggested that faculty on phased retirement should maintain voting rights. C. Tromley asked about all chairs of DSB departments on course reduction and so on 66% teaching time. I. Mulvey said it is up to each school to decide the policy. She said that these recommendations make it sound like the Academic Council is trying to dictate policy to the schools. R. DeWitt said that the committee is suggesting that the schools come in line with the Handbook with their policies. I. Mulvey asked if committee considered the definition of full-time faculty on page 1 of the Handbook, along with the later description. R. DeWitt said the committee did consider this. There are full-time faculty members who are members of General Faculty, but also some administrators with faculty status who have voting rights. The sub-committee wants to distinguish between these two groups.
D. Sapp asked if the recommendations are followed, how many folks would lose voting rights? R. Dewitt answered that this is really about school policies. He guessed that twenty or so administrators with faculty status would lose voting rights. D. Greenberg asked why we need this specificity, when schools already have the ability, according to Handbook, to set their own voting standards. Technical issues such as those raised here are too hard for the Academic Council to resolve for all of the schools. We should continue to allow schools to make their own policies. R. DeWitt said that this committee had been formed by the ACEC, and the committee is reporting back that there are lots of places where policy is unclear and unevenly defined across the schools.

I. Mulvey asked how these recommendations would be implemented. The General Faculty Secretary doesn’t have information about the different types of contracts that individual faculty members have. R. DeWitt said the SVPAA would clarify these alternative contract types for each faculty member. I. Mulvey said it seems odd to her that all this information would be distributed to school officers.

R. DeWitt continued the sub-committee report. He was puzzled by the resistance to these recommendations. Why the negativity towards sub-committee’s work when that work had been commissioned by the Council itself?

R. Crabtree asked why there was a goal of keeping administrators with faculty status from voting in schools, since they have great interest in what’s happening within their own schools. Schools should be able to fine-tune voting rights to deal with anomalous circumstances. R. DeWitt said that schools can of course fine-tune their own policies. These recommendations ask schools to think this through and make their own decisions. He reiterated that these recommendations mirror voting rights on the Academic Council. Administrators with faculty status on AC don’t have voting rights, except for the SVPAA.

J. Dennin suggested that maybe what we want is for schools to look at governance documents and make sure that voting rights are functioning efficiently for the school. R. DeWitt said that the recommendations reflect the committee’s work.

**Motion: The Academic Council thanks the subcommittee for their work. The Council decides to take no action on the recommendations at this time.** (Greenberg/Sapp)

S. Bayne spoke against the motion. He argued that the problem that led to the charge for the subcommittee still remains. If the Academic Council takes no action, they haven’t solved the original problem.

S. Bayne made a motion to give R. DeWitt speaking privileges. (Nantz) (The motion passed, 10 in favor/1 opposed/4 abstentions.)

R. DeWitt argued that the sub-committee was put in place by the Academic Council and they did lots of work. Not voting on their recommendations doesn’t seem right to him.

**Motion passed: 5 in favor/3 opposed/7 abstentions.**

5. Item 7d. Proposal from the FWC/AAUP on language on academic freedom and freedom of expression.

R. DeWitt presented background on the Garcetti Supreme Court decision. In 2006, the Garcetti decision restricted free speech rights of public employees. The Garcetti decision did not address faculty speech, but soon after, courts began applying the Garcetti Rule to academics. The precedent seemed to be that universities can have unfettered discretion in disciplining faculty members. The Garcetti language has had negative impacts on academic freedom and freedom of expression in colleges and universities. The national AAUP is encouraging campuses to beef up their academic freedom language. Proposed language from the national office intends to expand the umbrella of academic freedom coverage to take into account what faculty might say in classrooms, committee meetings, as elected members of governance bodies, in meeting with students, etc. R. DeWitt wrote language after conversations with AAUP experts, and then
incorporated suggestions from the SVPAA. He thinks it needs to go into the JOR, and then maybe into other documents upon further consideration. The following motion was suggested:

That the Academic Council approve for inclusion in the JOR the following academic freedom language (changes to current language in bold):

The statement on academic freedom, as formulated in the 1940 Statement of Principles endorsed by the AAUP and incorporating the 1970 interpretive comments, is the policy of Fairfield University. Academic freedom and responsibility are here defined as the liberty and obligation both in and outside the classroom to study, to investigate, to present and interpret, and to discuss facts and ideas concerning all branches and fields of learning. Academic freedom also encompasses the freedom to address matters of institutional policy or action whether or not as a member of any agency of institutional governance. Faculty have the freedom to address the larger community with regard to any social, political, economic, or other interest, so long as they do not represent themselves as official spokespersons of the University. Academic freedom is limited only by generally accepted standards of responsible scholarship and by respect for the Catholic commitment of the institution as expressed in its mission statement, which provides that Fairfield University “welcomes those of all beliefs and traditions who share its concerns for scholarship, justice, truth, and freedom, and it values the diversity which their membership brings to the university community.”

P. Fitzgerald agreed that he did discuss this, but he had not agreed on this final language. He has some concerns about this. First, the new language does not “fix” something that is “wrong” at Fairfield. Second, the second sentence, as it reiterates 1st Amendment rights, is not needed.

C. Tromley asked if we should pass this if the SVPAA has reservations. It would be better to agree on language, and then approve it. R. DeWitt said it was his understanding that the SVPAA had agreed to this language.

**Motion:** That the ACEC form a subcommittee to work out mutually agreeable language on this matter consulting AAUP experts, as needed. (Dennin/Nantz)

The motion passed, 13 in favor/0 against/1 abstention.

6. Item 6a. Proposed JOR language to implement AC-approved UCC proposal re core credit approval for courses outside a particular core area.

S. Rakowitz reported that the ACEC turned motions on core courses outside core areas, approved at the last meeting, into acceptable JOR language. They also incorporated language from the core science course approval process that has been in place for a number of years.

K. Nantz suggested that we leave dates out for JOR language to make it more flexible, and that the ACEC could make those adjustments without bringing the text back to the AC.

**Motion:** That the GFS put the following language into the Journal of Record. (Keenan/Tromley)

Core Credit Approval for a Course Taught Outside a Core Area.
A department or faculty member may seek core credit approval for a course taught in a discipline outside a particular core area of the Core Curriculum. This procedure applies only to courses currently unapproved for core credit.

In order to have a course considered for core credit in the natural sciences* or in any core area outside of the offering department, a department or faculty member must submit a Core Credit Application, consisting of (1) a course syllabus and (2) a Core Course Review Form, available from the UCC, to the respective Core Reviewing Unit and the chair of the UCC by October 1 for fall applications and February 15 for spring
applications. The *Core Course Review Form* should describe in detail how the proposed course fulfills the learning objectives for the respective core area, available from the UCC.

The Core Reviewing Unit will review the application and submit to the UCC its Core Course Recommendation Form and minutes of the relevant meeting of the Core Reviewing Unit in which it describes why the course should or should not be granted core credit. Deadlines for this step are November 25 for fall applications and April 25 for spring applications.

The UCC reviews the *Core Credit Application* and the *Core Course Recommendation Form* and makes a decision by voting to either Accept or Reject the recommendation in the *Core Course Recommendation Form*. In the event of a negative outcome, the Core Reviewing Unit will work with the department or faculty member toward proposing a new course for a successful outcome whenever possible.

<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>Core Science Course Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science (Area II)</td>
<td>Social Science Core Review UCC Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Core Science Course Review Committee:* The Core Science Course Review Committee (CSCRC), using guidelines available from the UCC, makes recommendations to the UCC regarding which natural science courses should be designated for natural science core credit. Courses designated for science majors automatically earn natural science core credit. Science courses for non-science majors, science courses offered outside of the natural science departments, and science courses offered through study abroad programs, are all reviewed by the CSCRC. The CSCRC consists of one member from each of the natural science departments (Biology, Chemistry, and Physics), along with one faculty member from outside of the natural sciences.

**The Social Science Core Reviewing UCC Subcommittee:**
The Social Science Core Reviewing UCC Subcommittee makes recommendations to the UCC regarding which courses from outside a social science department should be designated for social science core credit. This UCC Subcommittee consists of one faculty member from each of the social science departments (Politics, Economics, Psychology, Sociology and Anthropology, and Communication) and one faculty member from outside these departments. Each social science department nominates at least one of their faculty members to serve, and members are elected to three-year terms by the UCC each year. Members may serve consecutive terms.

The Academic Council approves amending the Journal of Record Appendix 2 “Routing for Approval of Undergraduate Course/Program Revisions in the Undergraduate Divisions” routing described in number 6 from:

1. Curriculum Area Chair(s) to
2. UCC

...to:
1. Curriculum Area Chair or faculty member to
2. Core Reviewing Unit to
3. UCC
The motion was unanimously approved.


I. Mulvey provided background on this item. The President and GFS want to print a new edition of the Faculty Handbook. The AC charged the ACEC with reviewing the Handbook for clarity and consistency before a new edition is printed. The ACEC prepared a detailed report which she will introduce briefly in our remaining time.

The items have been divided into four sections: I = most trivial of changes (punctuations / typos / amendments added); the Academic Council can accept these changes and inform the Trustees. II = practical matters/information. III = more serious items, need discussion and debate. IV = no recommendations, really substantive issues that the Council will need to decide whether or not to take up.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathryn Nantz

Kathryn Nantz