Approved by the Academic Council on October 3, 2011

**Attendance**

**Faculty:** Steven Bayne, Jocelyn Boryczka, Joe Dennin, Don Greenberg, Dennis Keenan, Phil Lane, Irene Mulvey (General Faculty Secretary), Elizabeth Petrino, Rona Preli, Susan Rakowitz, Joyce Shea, Debra Strauss, Cheryl Tromley, Brian Walker, David Zera. (There are 2 CAS At Large vacancies and 1 DSB vacancy to be filled.)

**Administrators:** Senior VP for Academic Affairs Paul Fitzgerald, S.J., Deans Jack Beal, Suzanne Campbell, Robbin Crabtree, Susan D. Franzosa, Don Gibson.

**Invited Guests:** President von Arx, S.J., Professors Gerry Campbell, Ryan Munden, Associate UC Dean Aaron Perkus

**FUSA Representative:** Not yet appointed

**Observer:** Rick DeWitt

0. **Select a recording secretary. Election of Executive Secretary. Election of Chair.**

David Zera's name was randomly drawn by Pres. von Arx to be the first Recording Secretary of the year. Secretary of the General Faculty Irene Mulvey announced that the next order of business was to elect a Chair. Dennis Keenan nominated Rona Preli. Brian Walker nominated Phil Lane. Ballots were distributed and Rona Preli was elected (14 votes in favor of Rona Preli and 2 votes in favor of Phil Lane.)

Chair Preli nominated Susan Rakowitz as Executive Secretary, and she was unanimously elected to serve in that position.

Introductions were made by all in attendance.

1. **Presidential courtesy**

President von Arx, S.J., briefly discussed the restructuring of senior management as announced to the University community a few weeks ago. He made three points: (1) the intent was to enable the Vice Presidents to focus on their core responsibilities and, as a result, some reporting responsibilities would change. (2) the new position of SVP for Strategic Initiatives would enable us to focus our attention on key priorities of the institution – enrollment management, marketing and communications and business initiatives – in order to take advantage of the synergies and close connections among these priorities. (3) that it is the President’s intention that this restructuring would be budget neutral.

He explained that the Executive Vice President’s request for a sabbatical was the opportunity for undertaking this administrative restructuring; that the proposal the EVP had presented to him for his sabbatical, viz., a study of the comparative advantage of masters level comprehensive universities in the current economic environment, was very advantageous to Fairfield; and that the EVP would continue to advise the President on issues having to do with strategic planning, as he had advised regarding the administrative restructuring.
President von Arx shared that the Senior Vice-President for Strategic Initiatives will be hired by the end of the first semester to get into place for the beginning of the second semester. He also noted that the U.S. News ranks Fairfield University as #2 in the northeast region of comprehensive universities.

The floor was opened for questions or comments.

Prof. Lane referred to the letter sent by three faculty members to the Academic Council (see agenda item 3.b.vii) regarding the EVP’s unprecedented sabbatical and commented that people return to work after a sabbatical.

President von Arx responded by saying that the EVP is welcome to return to Fairfield following his sabbatical, but he explained that the EVP would like to move on to be a University President and was a finalist in two searches last year. His present position is being restructured. He further commented that EVP Weitzer’s sabbatical is not unprecedented, and is in the best interest of the university.

With regard to budget neutral, Prof. Lane said that he would like to see numbers regarding the EVP’s sabbatical. The President said that the EVP is not being paid his full salary.

Prof. Rakowitz acknowledged the logic of linking admissions to marketing given that recruitment is largely a marketing issue, but asked whether decisions about admissions standards and the appropriate balance between need and merit based aid would still be made in the academic division. Pres. von Arx responded that the new SVPSI would work in close coordination with the SVPAA on these decisions, and that's why the SVPAA was going to be on the interview committee for the SVPSI.

Dean Robbin Crabtree wondered about the creation of a second SVP position and asked for clarification of the relative rank of the two SVP’s, wondering if other positions should be in deference to Academic Affairs. Her concern is that Academic Affairs is now just part of the system and that it is worrisome that it is now 1 of 8 vice presidents. She asked if there might be a Provost some day?

President von Arx said that the primacy of academics is paramount but that with two VPs reporting to him or her, this new person had to be called a Senior VP. The relations between the SVPAA and the new SVPSI through academic initiatives is critical. The new SVP must understand nonprofits, but will have a background in business.

Prof. Lane asked who will take over the 5th year NEASC accreditation. The President said that the EVP will advise him and that Associate VP Mary Frances Malone will author the report.

Prof. Rick DeWitt, in attendance as an observer, asked if he could be given speaking privileges.

MOTION [Lane/Bayne]: To give Prof. DeWitt speaking privileges for this agenda item.

MOTION PASSED: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.

Prof. DeWitt queried President von Arx about the Board of Trustees’ feelings regarding the EVP being welcomed back after his sabbatical to which President von Arx responded that the matter never came up with the Board; it was the President’s decision.

Prof. DeWitt queried again about the reorganization being budget neutral since there is a net gain in administrators. The President affirmed that the reorganization is budget neutral, stating that he made that commitment to the Budget Committee. He went on to explain that: those moving up generally start at a
lower level than an outgoing person; there have been minimal raises, and several hundred thousand dollars has been saved by others who have left their positions in administration.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

Professor Irene Mulvey reported that:

a. A number of people emailed President von Arx regarding the awarding of a sabbatical to the EVP to which he responded cc’ing GFS Mulvey. She intended to explain the situation today but since the President had already done so, she would skip over this.

b. The Board passed the latest 2 Handbook amendments regarding a Faculty Committee on Sustainability and terms for faculty on the Student Life Committee at their June meeting. Irene asked to be designated by the AC to review the inserts to be prepared by the SVPAA and distributed to the faculty electronically, and there were no objections.

c. Since the Academic Council is the executive arm of the faculty, faculty need to be kept informed as soon as possible as to the decisions of the AC. There were no objections to her request for unanimous consent to distribute draft minutes (approved by the Recording Secretary and the AC Executive Committee) prior to Academic Council’s final approval.

d. The Committee on Committees will, in a thoughtful and contextual way, fill the available openings for handbook committees. She asked for the Council to authorize the Committee on Committees to appoint members to the Faculty Committee on Sustainability at this time with staggered terms so that this committee can have its new members elected routinely with all other HB committees beginning in May 2012.

**MOTION [Lane/Keenan]: For the Academic Council to authorize the Committee on Committees to appoint members with staggered terms to the Faculty Committee on Sustainability.**

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

The Journal of Record states that members are to be elected to the Faculty Panel for Student Conduct Board and the Student Academic Grievance Board at the GF meeting in May. It was stated that doing so essentially elevates these boards to Handbook Committee-level status, and Irene Mulvey asked that members be appointed to these committees by the Committee on Committees in anticipation of changes being proposed to the JoR regarding how members are selected for these boards. Each Board is composed of nine people with three-year staggered terms, and so there are three vacancies each year as three individuals cycle off. Prof. Greenberg queried if we are violating the handbook for convenience by doing so to which Prof. Mulvey responded that it is not entirely for convenience.

**MOTION [Lane/Second]: The Academic Council authorizes the Committee on Committees to appoint 3 new members each to the Faculty Panel for Student Conduct Board and the Student Academic Grievance Board at this time in anticipation of proposed Journal of Record changes for how faculty are selected for these boards.**

Prof. Greenberg stated that he was not in favor of this and believes that the Council should do what the Journal of Record says should be done. Prof. Dennin noted that what the JoR calls for is elections in May.

**MOTION PASSED:** 10 in favor, 4 opposed, 1 abstention

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
a. Approval of minutes
   i. Minutes of AC meeting of 5/2/11 (attachment)

      MOTION [Walker/Shea]: For the Academic Council to approve the minutes.

Chair Preli asked if there were any corrections to which Prof. Bayne stated that he was not in attendance and thus could not have made the comment attributed to him on page 4. On p. 10 the minutes should read “what are” as opposed to “what of.”

      MOTION PASSED: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 5 abstentions.

ii. Minutes of AC meeting of 5/9/11; reconvened from 5/2/11 meeting (attachment)

      MOTION [Bayne/Walker]: For the Academic Council to approve the minutes.
      MOTION PASSED: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 5 abstentions

b. Correspondence
   i. Memo from ACEC with roster and meeting dates (attachment)

      MOTION [Mulvey/Boryczka]: The Academic Council approves meeting dates for the 2011-2012 academic year [on page 21 of the packet for today’s meeting] with April 16th to be used only if necessary.
      MOTION PASSED: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention

4. Council Subcommittee Reports
Irene Mulvey stated that none were ready to report at today’s meeting.

5. Petitions for immediate hearing
There were no petitions for immediate hearing.

6. Old Business
   a. Proposal from CUC to close University College (attachments)

      Prof. Gerry Campbell (out-going CUC Chair), Ryan Munden (incoming CUC Chair), Associate UC Dean Aaron Perkus, and UC Dean Crabtree presented the proposal.

      Prof. G. Campbell stated that work was done during the summer, and he briefly reviewed the 6-part motion presented to the AC last spring. Associate Dean Perkus referenced page 47 and noted that research found that UC is “adrift” in its mission: there are younger students, taking more daytime courses, and the students no longer look like the target group. The rolling open admissions process has been questioned. Students are getting good advising and education, but full-time faculty need to be more involved in curriculum and advising. Prof. G. Campbell summarized the events/timeline on page 50-52. He emphasized that this is a faculty-driven proposal; joint meetings took place with EPC and the AC Executive Committee and the proposal has been through the JoR routing to its final stop, the Council.

      Dean Crabtree discussed the information in Appendix A, noting that the list of issues to be resolved was generated through conversations with administrative offices that handle these matters. She said we need the policy issues resolved before we close UC but that we can’t move forward with proposals for resolving policy issues unless we decide that we intend to close UC. The decision to either close or not close UC must be made, then appropriate policies need to be clarified or established.
An extensive conversation ensued regarding the sequence of events that should occur to address all concerns regarding UC and its potential closing. The quandary that existed and was discussed was the concern about which should occur first: close UC and then approve policy changes and recommendations, or approve policy changes and recommendations prior to closing UC.

Prof. G. Campbell referenced the new Memorandum on p. 93, stating that General Faculty Secretary Mulvey was the primary author and noted that it was discussed at last week’s CUC meeting. Prof. Ryan Munden, 2011-12 CUC Chair, affirmed that the memo was discussed at the CUC meeting, that there was unanimous support for the memo and for its presentation to the Academic Council.

GFS Mulvey explained that Dean Crabtree, Associate Dean Perkus and she had worked over the summer via email and in one meeting and that the memo was a result of their work (which Dean Crabtree shared with Prof. Campbell and got his approval). She stated how important it is that “to resolve issues, we need to know where we’re going.” She further commented that, in her opinion, a “compelling case to close University College” is made in the documents and that the memo (page 94) suggests ways for the AC to proceed. As on page 94, the AC could agree, in principle, to close UC and set up two subcommittees to propose policies to move us forward.

The floor was opened up for informational questions.

Prof. Bayne asked if keeping UC open was seriously considered. Were options to keep UC intact but restructure it considered? Prof. Campbell said that a thorough consideration of all options, pros and cons was undertaken. The CUC moved slowly and was even criticized for that.

Prof. Walker referenced p. 68 and asked why we are proposing closing University College which generates 3 to 4 million dollars annually. Dean Crabtree commented that the calculation of expenditures and the interfacing with other colleges is not reflected in the revenues; the cost of administration, managing programs, costs borne by DSB and CAS are not included and that the revenues look better than they actually are. Prof. Walker countered that page 68 indicated that faculty and administrative salaries and expenditures were included in the revenues and asked about the truthfulness of the statement on page 68 to which Dean Crabtree, supported by Dean Franzosa, commented that “it’s unclear the degree to which that statement is wholly accurate.”

Phil Lane commented that he is opposed to closing University College and is concerned about the views of the outside/wider community and serving them. SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald stated that print ads, advertising, etc. signal to the community that we are continuing to serve part-time students. We do plan to continue in this market and must continue to market this.

Robbin Crabtree noted that during the summer of 2010, the University College staff was hit hard with the fallout from a proposed UC closure and worked with then current students and aggressively supported their matriculation, got new enrollments and centralized the advertising budget.

SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald said there is one major matter to be resolved by the faculty: what is the core requirement for these degree-seeking students? Until we settle this and make that public, we are in limbo.

**MOTION [Mulvey/Rakowitz]: The Academic Council in principle agrees to close University College.**
Dean Franzosa asked what does “in principle” mean? Prof. Mulvey responded that it means it is our intent to do so. Joe Dennin said it means: we think it’s a good idea to close the school assuming all the practical details can be worked out.

Dean Franzosa suggested taking out “in principle” and putting in a date.

Prof. Tromley concisely summarized the quandary noting that the Academic Council cannot recommend closing the school without policies in place but can’t make policies until it has been decided to close the school.

Debra Strauss wondered if the words “in principle” can be removed and replaced by language such as “subject to approval of final report and the development of policies.”

**MOTION TO AMEND:** [Strauss/Petrino]: To amend the main motion by substitution to read, “The Academic Council will recommend to the General Faculty that University College be closed subject to approval of final reports [from subcommittees to be formed] and development of policies.”

Discussion ensued on the motion to amend.

Prof. Shea wonders how students might experience this and commented on the importance of developing a plan and then determining the details, not the other way around.

Chair Preli asked if she is speaking in favor of or opposed to the motion to amend to which Prof. Shea said that she might be speaking against the motion.

Robbin Crabtree spoke in favor of the amended motion commenting that more direction makes it easier to develop the policies.

Dennis Keenan spoke in favor of the amended motion.

**MOTION** [Greenberg/Walker] To call the question.

**MOTION to call the question PASSED:** 11 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstention.

**MOTION TO AMEND PASSED:** 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention

**MAIN MOTION:** The Academic Council will recommend to the General Faculty that University College be closed subject to approval of final reports [from subcommittees to be formed] and development of policies.

Further discussion on the main motion ensued.

SVPAA Fitzgerald spoke in favor of the motion and the importance of students being reassured.

Prof. Walker spoke against the motion. He is opposed to closing a school that has a rich history and was profitable.

Steven Bayne spoke against the motion because he is not sure if enough time has been spent on the issue, and his concern is wondering if closing the school is the best course of action for our students.

**MOTION** [Greenberg/Dennin] To call the question
MOTION to call the question FAILED: 4 in favor, 12 opposed, 0 abstentions

Dean Crabtree made a clarifying point. We have a Director of Lifelong Learning and that noncredit programs are served; we may not have talked about that aspect here. She spoke in favor of the motion.

Prof. Tromley spoke in favor of the motion and stated that she believes that we must trust the committees who have explored this issue over many months, that we trust our colleagues, and that they were the experts to make these recommendations.

Prof. Petrino noted that she first saw this some time ago in UCC and that it has been carefully thought through. She shared Tromley’s perspective, spoke in favor of the motion and commented on the advantage of reviewing a final report regarding the policy issues and keeping UC open in the interim. This provides us with more time and information.

Prof. Greenberg was strongly in favor of the motion. He commented that a variety of committees have reviewed the closing of University College, that Academic Council is not the final decision, and that the Academic Council will review the final report to make a recommendation to the General Faculty who will make the final decision. We’ve had 2.5 years of thought and effort, and this is where we’ve come. Are we going to be obstructionist or move it along?

MOTION PASSED: 12 in favor, 3 opposed, 0 abstentions

MOTION [Mulvey/Tromley]: That the Academic Council authorize the Executive Committee to set up the subcommittees as recommended on p. 94.
MOTION PASSED: 13 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention

Prof. Mulvey noted that the School of Nursing Dean’s Search is critical to discuss and asked for unanimous consent to address agenda item #7f.

7.f. Faculty Representatives for the SON Dean Search.

Prof. Mulvey noted the names of the nominees so far and suggested that voting be done via campus mail secret ballot on Wednesday after the Tuesday deadline for volunteers passes. There were no objections.

Joyce Shea informed the AC that the SON faculty would like as many nurses on the search as possible, to which Prof. Mulvey noted that a member of the School of Nursing may be elected in the at-large slot.

SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald stated that an outside firm will help with the search.

MOTION [Lane/Boryczka]: To adjourn
MOTION PASSED: Unanimous

Respectfully submitted,
David Aloyzy Zera
Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions
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