ACADEMIC COUNCIL
Minutes of Meeting
Monday, February 6, 2012
CNS 200
Approved by the Academic Council on March 5, 2012

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

Administrators: SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, Deans Suzanne Campbell, Robbin Crabtree and Don Gibson
Regrets: Dean Jack Beal

FUSA representative: Nicoletta Richardson

Guest: Alison Kris

Preli called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.

FUSA representative Nicoletta Richardson was welcomed to the meeting.

1. Presidential Courtesy

MOTION [Fitzgerald/Rakowitz]: That the Academic Council go into executive session.
MOTION PASSED: 15 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention

FUSA representative Richardson was asked to leave the room, and the Academic Council went into executive session until 3:45 p.m. At that time, Richardson was welcomed back to the meeting.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

Mulvey reported that there was a collegial meeting of the General Faculty on 2/3/2012 and announced the next scheduled meeting is on March 2.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary

MOTION [Lane/Walker]: To approve the minutes of the 11/21/2011 meeting of the Academic Council.

Bayne made the following correction: On p. 2 of the minutes [p.4 of the packet] about two thirds of the way down, the sentence reads: “Professor Bayne spoke against the motion saying that in
the current situation with merit raises, accepting the motion means no raise until one gets promoted.” It should read: “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.” On p. 3 of the minutes [p. 5 of the packet] at the top, the sentence reads: “Professor Bayne spoke against saying the issue is about tenure not promotion.” The sentence should read: “Professor Bayne spoke against the motion saying it would be inappropriate to insert the last sentence of the motion into section II.A.I.b.(3) of the Handbook due to the fact that this section of the Handbook concerns promotion not tenure.”

**MOTION PASSED:** 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstentions

**MOTION [Zera/Walker]: To approve the minutes of the 12/5/2011 meeting of the Academic Council.**

**MOTION PASSED:** 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions

Rakowitz noted correspondence from Mary Ann Palazzi (Coordinator of Programs for Student-Athletes) reporting “Spring 2012 Semester Conflicts with Final Exams and Scheduled Athletic Contests,” and correspondence from Qin Zhang (Chair of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee). Rakowitz noted that the ACEC was in the process of trying to come up with a proposed response to the UCC’s question. Rakowitz reported on the membership of various subcommittees of the Academic Council:

- Subcommittee on the Workers’ Bill of Rights: Bucki, Dewitt, Dohm, Reed, Rosivach
- Subcommittee on a Center for Continuing Studies: Bowen, G. Campbell, Perkus, Robert, Schmidt
- Subcommittee on Community-Engaged Scholarship: Boryczka, Calderwood, Keenan, O’Shea, Quan, Rusu, and VanHise

Lane asked if the correspondence from Palazzi required any action of the part of the Academic Council. Mulvey said that it was an ongoing item of the Academic Council and it was accepted that there would always be conflicts, but that this was an acceptable way to deal with the issue.

**4. Council Subcommittee Reports**

**a. Subcommittee on University College Matters**

Preli noted that the Academic Council needs to approve the “Agreed-upon underlying principles on part-time students and the BPS” recommended in the report to the Academic Council by the Academic Council Subcommittee on University College Matters.

Crabtree noted that the College of Arts and Sciences faculty had not yet voted on whether to adopt the Bachelor of Professional Studies (BPS) in the College of Arts and Sciences. The issue will be considered at the 2/10/2012 meeting of the College of Arts and Sciences faculty.

**MOTION [Mulvey/Shea]: To approve principles 1, 2, and 3 of the “Agreed-upon**
underlying principles on part-time students and the BPS”:
1. Each school is entitled to decide whether or not to admit part-time students.
2. For a school that decides to admit part-time students, part-time *degree-seeking* students must be subject to the same admission criteria and curriculum requirements as their full-time counterparts.
3. Part-time *non-degree-seeking* students need not be required to meet regular admission criteria and should be allowed to take courses on a space-available basis. Part-time *non-degree-seeking* students must meet course prerequisites or have permission of the appropriate department chair. Part-time *non-degree-seeking* students may take up to two courses per semester.

Nantz could speak neither for nor against the motion. She was “struggling.” She said it seems as though we want part-time students, but we treat them like 2\textsuperscript{nd} class citizens. She said we need a mission statement regarding part-time students.

Mulvey reported that the subcommittee thought that part-time students should *not* be treated like 2\textsuperscript{nd} class citizens. She argued that the underlying principles of admission are pretty straightforward.

Campbell reported that the School of Nursing does not currently admit part-time students. She argued that perhaps the principles in question would not make it feasible for students who occasionally take courses.

**MOTION PASSED**: 15 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstention

**MOTION** [Mulvey/Rakowitz]: To approve principle 8 of the “Agreed-upon underlying principles on part-time students and the BPS”:
8. Advising for part-time *degree-seeking* students should be based in the relevant department. Part-time *degree-seeking* students should be assigned a faculty advisor in the same way as full-time students.

Crabtree reported that for the last few years we have been moving toward implementing principle 8. It is almost fully operational.

Nantz said that she was concerned about undecided students.

Fitzgerald stated that the office of exploratory academic advising, now directed by Jessica York, was designed to address this issue.

**MOTION PASSED**: 18 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

**MOTION** [Mulvey/Lane]: To approve principle 12 of the “Agreed-upon underlying principles on part-time students and the BPS”:
12. The BPS is the only degree in which students would have a modified core.

Dennin asked if other students don’t already have a modified core.

Crabtree responded that certain majors have exceptions to the core.

Mulvey pointed out that principle 12 is meant to convey that students pursuing a BPS will continue to have the modified core as defined for BPS students in the Journal of Record.

**MOTION TO AMEND [Nantz/Lane]: To amend the motion to read:**

12. Only BPS students will have the modified core defined in the Journal of Record.

**MOTION TO AMEND PASSED:** 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

The question was called on the amended motion [Nantz/Lane]. The motion to call the question passed: 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

**AMENDED MOTION PASSED:** 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

**MOTION [Mulvey/Rakowitz]: To approve principle 9 and the first sentence of principle 10 of the “Agreed-upon underlying principles on part-time students and the BPS”:**

9. Part-time degree-seeking students may switch to full-time status at any time.

10. Permission of the appropriate dean is required for a full-time student to switch to part-time status.

Mulvey pointed out that this was current policy. She also noted that the second sentence of principle 10 (as it was written in the report to the Academic Council by the Academic Council Subcommittee on University College Matters) was intentionally left out of her motion because she did not think the principle was meant to be that strict.

Nantz asked: What if the appropriate dean did not give permission?

Dennin asked: Is permission routinely given?

Fitzgerald responded that a reasonable accommodation is always made.

Greenberg asked: Why is this principle even necessary? Isn’t simply a meeting with the appropriate dean sufficient?

**MOTION TO AMEND [Nantz/Greenberg]: To amend the motion to read:**

9. Part-time degree-seeking students may switch to full-time status at any time.
10. Consultation with the appropriate dean is required for a full-time student to switch to part-time status.

Crabtree spoke against the motion to amend because it was not strong enough to encourage students to follow through and actually meet with the appropriate dean.

**MOTION TO AMEND PASSED:** 15 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstentions

**AMENDED MOTION PASSED:** 16 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstentions

**MOTION** [Mulvey/Boryczka]: To approve principle 4 of the “Agreed-upon underlying principles on part-time students and the BPS”:

4. For day and evening classes, registration for part-time *degree-seeking* students is based on tuition rates in that students who pay a discounted tuition rate register after full-time students. Part-time *degree-seeking* students register first for online and ASAP (seven week) courses for the fall and spring semesters. Part-time *non-degree-seeking* students register after all other students on a space-available basis.

Nantz spoke against the motion arguing that we say we want diversity and then we discourage diversity.

Greenberg spoke against the motion arguing that the principle discriminates against part-time students.

Lane argued that all students should be treated equally.

Tromley spoke in favor of the motion arguing (1) that when you pay more, you get more, and (2) that part-time students have more flexibility in their schedules.

Richardson stated that it was unfair that all part-time students would have to register after full-time students.

Mulvey argued that she is for treating part-time students the same way as full-time students, but asked: When would they register, with what class?

Greenberg responded that Mulvey’s concern could easily be remedied. He also noted that if we follow Tromley’s logic (“when you pay more, you get more”), then we should merely auction off registration slots.

Nantz spoke against the motion speaking for a fully integrated rationale for registration.

Fitzgerald noted that there are already a number of prioritizations given in registration. He asked: Can we agree that we prioritize in a way that’s fair to the part-time students?
MOTION [Mulvey/Fitzgerald]: To send principle 4 to a subcommittee of the Academic Council. The Executive Committee of the Academic Council will form the subcommittee.

Greenberg spoke against the motion saying that there is a difference between reasonable and invidious discrimination. He argued that principle 4 did not need a subcommittee. It needs to be voted down.

Mulvey argued that someone needs to figure out what the principle for registration for part-time students should be.

Dennin said that the principle 4 seemed to be discriminatory.

The question was called on the motion [Lane/Dennin]. The motion to call the question passed: 15 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention.

MOTION PASSED: 16 in favor, 2 opposed, 0 abstentions

MOTION [Mulvey/Strauss]: To approve principles 5 and 7 of the “Agreed-upon underlying principles on part-time students and the BPS”:

5. Part-time students should continue to have a per-credit tuition rate (currently $595/credit) that is competitive with other part-time programs in Fairfield’s market.

7. Rules (and their financial implications) for movement from full-time to part-time status should be clear at the time of matriculation.

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

Mulvey suggested that the Academic Council recess until the following Monday to consider other agenda items.

Gibson noted that there would be a problem with recessing until the following Monday given that the School of Business would be engaged in a reaccreditation meeting at that time.

Lane suggested that the Academic Council move forward.

MOTION [Lane/Sapp]: The Academic Council recommends to the General Faculty that the University College be closed.

MOTION PASSED: 11 in favor, 3 opposed, 4 abstentions

MOTION [Bayne/Petrino]: The Academic Council recommends that all undergraduate part-time students pay the same per credit hour rate.

Crabtree noted that when a student is in his/her 4th year, they have already benefited from a
variety of programs offered during their first three years at Fairfield University.

Sapp spoke against the motion arguing that this was not part of the purview of the Academic Council.

Dennin spoke in favor of the motion arguing that we should (as much as we can) treat part-time students the same way as full-time students.

**MOTION PASSED: 8 in favor, 3 opposed, 7 abstentions**

A motion was made to reorder the agenda. The motion was passed unanimously. The next item considered was:

7. New Business

a. UCC motion on core language requirement for DSB

Alison Kris was invited give a presentation. Kris first reported the main points of the School of Business:

Changes in core language placement by the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures necessitated a revisiting of the core language requirement for School of Business students.

The changes to the language placement generated substantial increases in the number of School of Business students being placed into “basic” level. The change increased the number of students placed in “basic” level language from less than 10% to more than 60%. This, in effect, increased the core requirement for many School of Business students from 2 semesters to 4 semesters.

In order to remain competitive as a school, competitive with its peers, and competitive with employers, the School of Business needs to amend the core language requirement. Several peer institutions with 2 semester language requirements were cited including Marquette, Gonzaga, St. Joseph University, Xavier, and Holy Cross.

Waiving the “intermediate level” requirement would encourage students to begin a new language, perhaps a non-traditional language.

Changes to the language requirement would allow greater flexibility in terms of double majors and minors.

Kris then reported on the main points of the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures:

The Department of Modern Languages and Literatures asserts that the changes to the language placement and leveling were necessary and responsive to accreditation bodies. The point was made that the language placement scores differentiating beginner from intermediate levels were, in fact, in-line with peer institutions.

It was suggested that the credit burden faced by School of Business could be eased in many other ways, such as:

- Re-examining the need for other areas of the core instead of focusing on the language core.
- Encouraging students to take two semesters of a language over the summer prior to entering Fairfield.
- Trimming requirements within the major.

It was asserted that two semesters at a basic level is of limited utility as it would not allow someone to be conversant in a meaningful way.

Kris then reported on the response of the School of Business:

Asking students to take language courses the summer prior to beginning at Fairfield would contribute to “summer melt.”

It was the change in definition of what constituted “intermediate level” which necessitated the change, which is why attention was focused on this area of the core.

Trimming requirements within the major would make students less competitive in the job market and would risk problems with accreditation.

Greenberg asked: Why weren’t other core courses considered?

Nantz noted that some majors have a higher core burden.

Rakowitz asked Kris if other possible alternatives were considered.

Kris reported that other alternatives did not come up.

A MOTION [Greenberg/Shea] TO RECESS the meeting until 2/27/2012 PASSED unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Keenan

Approved by the Academic Council on March 5, 2012