ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, November 5, 2012
CNS 200
3:30 – 5:00 PM

1. Presidential courtesy

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
   a. Approval of minutes of 10/1/12 (attached)
   b. Correspondence
      i. From Steve Bayne for the Philosophy Department on sexual harassment policy, and response from current and former General Faculty Secretaries (attached)
      ii. From Mary Ann Palazzi on Athletic conflicts with final exams
   c. Oral reports

4. Council Subcommittee Reports
   a. Subcommittee to consider proposing IDEA form for administrators
   b. Subcommittee on Community-Engaged Scholarship
   c. Subcommittee on broader academic freedom language for governance documents
   d. Subcommittee to consider the implications of moving to Division III athletics
   e. Subcommittee on the status of part-time faculty

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

6. Old Business
   a. Grievance procedure timeline (attachment)

7. New business
   a. Report from Committee on Conference on October meeting with Board of Trustees, and Academic Council input for December meeting
   b. IDEA evaluations for adjuncts (attachments)
   c. Academic advising and PINs for registration (attachment)
   d. Budget Committee membership (attachment)
   e. Repeat course policy (attachment)
   f. Standard merit for untenured and newly promoted faculty (attachments)
   g. Procedures governing faculty searches (attachment)

• Lists of Attachments, Pending, and Ongoing Items are on page 2
List of Attachments:
For item 3.a. Minutes from AC meeting of 10/1/12 (pages 3-11)
For item 3.b.i. Letter from Steve Bayne, Chair of Philosophy, and response from current and former General Faculty Secretaries (pages 12-14)
For item 3.b.ii Memo from Mary Ann Palazzi on athletic conflicts with final exams (page 15)
For item 6.a. Academic Council Executive Committee’s summary of academic grievance timeline issues (pages 16-17)
For item 7.b. E-mail from Emily Smith, Chair of FDEC, regarding IDEA Evaluations for part-time faculty, and memo from SVPAA (pages 18-20)
For item 7.c. Memo from SVPAA regarding PINs and list of staff with access to PINs (pages 21-22)
For item 7.d. Memos from General Faculty Secretary and President regarding composition of Budget Committee (pages 23-25)
For item 7.e. Memo from General Faculty Secretary regarding changes to repeat course policy (pages 26-27)
For item 7.f. Memo from Robbin Crabtree re: Standard merit for untenured faculty (page 28)
For item 7.f. FDEC proposal for streamlining merit pay applications, with relevant portions of FDEC minutes (pages 29-30)
For item 7.g. Guidelines for Faculty and Academic Staff Recruitment, developed by SVPAA and academic deans (pages 31-37)

Pending Items:
A. Issues raised at the 10/4/99 AC meeting concerning faculty participation on the finance/budget committee. (See minutes of AC meeting of 11/4/99; 10/29/99 letter from Phil Lane attached to 5/1/00 AC agenda; excerpt of GF minutes of 11/13/92 attached to AC 5/1/00 agenda; AC motion of 11/6/00.)
B. Faculty Data Committee (AC 12/3/07).
C. MFA in Creative Writing, Five-Year-Review due in 12/2012 (AC 12/3/07).
D. Re-evaluation of offering both paper and online options for IDEA forms, spring 2013 (AC 5/14/12)
E. Re-evaluation of continued use of “yellow sheet” qualitative evaluations, spring 2014 (AC 5/14/12)
F. AC revisits the accessibility of teaching evaluation data, Due spring 2012. (AC 4/19/10)
G. AC three year review of Merit Appeals Policy, fall 2013. (AC 11/1/10)
H. AC three year review of Intellectual Properties Policy, spring 2014. (AC 3/7/11)
I. MPA, five year review in 2017-2018 (AC 9/10/12)
J. Handbook items to be revisited (AC 4/16/12)

Ongoing Items:
1. Report by SVPAA to AC each semester to inform the council of any approved exceptions to the Athletic Department’s policy of not scheduling athletic events that conflict with final exams.
2. Report from the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees after each meeting with board members. At the end of each academic year, discuss items for the Conference Committee to put on the agenda for their meetings with members of the board the following year.
DRAFT MINUTES  
Academic Council Meeting  
Monday, October 1, 2012  
CNS 200  
3:30-5:30

Present: Professors Bayne, Bhattacharya, Dallavalle, Dennin, Downie, Epstein (Executive Secretary), Huntley, Keenan (Chair), Kelly, Kohli, Lane, Petrino, Rafalski, Rakowitz (General Faculty Secretary), Sapp, Shea, Tromley, Walker-Canton; Deans Babington, Beal, Crabtree, Gibson; SVPAA Fitzgerald, S.J.

Invited Guests: Professor Pat Calderwood and Melissa Quan, Director of Service Learning (item 4b), Professors Paula Gill Lopez (item 7b), Meredith Wallace Kazer (item 7c), Curt Naser (item 7e)

1. Presidential Courtesy  
   • SVPAA Fitzgerald congratulated the School of Nursing for winning a $700,000 HRSA grant.  
   • SVPAA Fitzgerald reported that the proposal for the MPA has moved to the state level.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty  
   Prof. Rakowitz reported that the committees are up and running.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary  
   a. Approval of minutes  
      i. Meeting of September 10, 2012

   Corrections:  
      • Professor Downie  p. 8 wanted to clarify his statement on page 8 of the minutes. “Prof. Downie stated that he wanted to make sure that we don’t prejudge the outcome and become an advocacy group.”

      • Professor Downie pointed out that on the ninth page of the minutes the statement “Prof. Downie stressed that we also need full-time faculty representation as some departments have very few adjuncts” needed to be changed to “Prof. Downie stressed that we also need to improve full-time faculty representation as some departments have very few adjuncts.”

   MOTION (Petrino/Dennin): To approve the minutes of September 10, 2012 as amended.

   MOTION PASSED: 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.
The subcommittee (4d) was formed to discuss moving to Division III athletics. Professors Sapp, Huntley, Rosivach, Bardos and Harriott sit on the committee. Professors Kathy Nantz and Elizabeth Hohl will arrange the first meeting of the new task force (4e) for part-time faculty.

b. Correspondence: None

4. **Council Subcommittee Reports**

b. Subcommittee on Community-Engaged Scholarship

Prof. Calderwood presented an overview of the development of this committee. The committee was formed in the spring of 2012 in response to a request from the Rank and Tenure Committee to the AC to explore possible changes in the rank and tenure guidelines. The report was submitted on September 18th. The committee is comprised of Jocelyn Boryczka (chair), Pat Calderwood, Dennis Keenan, Eileen O’Shea, Melissa Quan, Amalia Rusu, and Joan Van Hise. The committee was charged with considering ways to include language in the *Faculty Handbook* and/or *Guidelines and Timetable for Applications for Tenure and Promotion* that recognizes the significance of engaged scholarship. The committee recommended that changes be made to the *Guidelines and Timetable for Applications for Tenure and Promotion*. They do not recommend that changes be made to the *Faculty Handbook*.

Prof. Calderwood added that the committee found it impossible to only think about engaged scholarship without looking at engaged teaching. She and Melissa Quan attended a conference on service learning and engagement. She commented that faculty are already involved in engaged scholarship, but their work has not been acknowledged as part of what we do as scholarship. Newer faculty members are more adamant about putting forth this type of engaged scholarship as part of their dossier for rank & tenure.

Prof. Bayne raised questions about section VI. A in the document submitted to the AC. He wanted to know the rationale for moving the sentence “If a publication has multiple authors, explain your contribution to the publication” and the rationale for including the “Products of community-engaged scholarship” in the list of types of professional accomplishments.

Prof. Calderwood said that the change was made to clarify what counts as evidence of authorship. She pointed out that engaged scholarship with multiple authors has to be explained in a more robust way.

Prof. Bayne commented that it is important for people to explain their engaged scholarship. Having it as a separate line seems like a better idea. In reference to the Section VI. Part C of the document, Prof. Bayne wanted to know the rationale for moving sponsored research grants up on list from Part F to Part C.

Prof. Calderwood commented that the change was deliberately made to give more weight to sponsored research grants due to the amount of work that faculty put in writing the grants.
Prof. Bayne asked if the committee considered how the peer review process would work in assessing community-engaged scholarship.

Prof. Calderwood suggested that the peer review process would depend on the venue, the nature of process, the product to assess and its importance and value. Someone presenting community-engaged scholarship has to provide a much richer description of process and product and may need to include other material.

Prof. Dennin asked for a description of a typical product.

Dean Crabtree suggested that the creation of guiding principles for community development, organizational policies and executive structure could be an example of community-engaged scholarship.

Prof. Dennin expressed concern about moving Sponsored Research Grants from part F to part C in the Guidelines and Timetable for Applications for Tenure and Promotion. He proposed that if Sponsored Research (grants) is move to C, then the section should only be for successful grants. He noted that applying for a grant is no more important than submitting a paper. He asked about the difference between a paper rejection and a grant rejection.

Dean Babington pointed out that it is possible that grants can get accepted but not be funded due to lack of funds.

Prof. Dennin wanted to know why it is important to emphasize “without pay” for consultation services in the example in section F found on the last page of the submitted document.

Prof. Calderwood responded that there is a difference between providing consultation services for pay and for providing it as a free service.

Prof. Dennin commented that he didn’t see a difference and suggested taking the wording out of the document.

Prof. Crabtree pointed out that consultantships already exist in part G.

Prof. Dallavalle asked if community-engaged scholarship is the same as engaged scholarship.

Prof. Calderwood advised that community-engaged scholarship is an older term and that movement is toward using the term “engaged scholarship.” Engaged scholarship is supposed to be for the common good, and there is an expectation that the work is sustainable and for the mutual benefit of all at table.

Prof. Tromley wanted to know if the consultantships with which she has been involved are considered engaged scholarship.

Prof. Epstein suggested that what the committee is trying to address is the categorization of this type of work, and ways of evaluating our colleagues' engaged scholarship. The
committee is trying to make room for this type of work since it is not in realm of recognized scholarship in our rank and tenure process.

**MOTION (LANE/KOHLI): To accept the language of the document.**

**MOTION (SVPA A FITZGERALD/Second): To remand the document to the current Rank & Tenure Committee for feedback.**

Prof. Shea wondered if it would be wasteful for the AC to continue discussion now if we are remanding the document back to R& T to get their input.

Prof. Sapp asked if the chair would have more to say.

Prof. Keenan said that he didn’t think that the document needed to go back to R&T. He was on the subcommittee because he had chaired R&T when they brought the request for this subcommittee to the Council He is satisfied with the document as it is. He reminded the Council that the document is no more than a set of guidelines.

Prof. Kohli observed that the task force kept the changes within the realm of what already exists; the guidelines are already general. The changes still provide flexibility.

Prof. Dallavalle asked if the rank and tenure committee has seen the revised document.

Prof. Keenan responded that the committee has not vetted the text. The motion on floor suggests that the rank and tenure committee see the document first.

SVPA A Fitzgerald commented that there is no need to rush this issue because the changes would apply no earlier than for those applying for rank and tenure next year.

Prof. Dennin asked if the document would come back to the Academic Council and then would it have to go back to the Rank & Tenure Committee again.

Dean Crabtree agreed with Prof. Kohli that the language is not parsimonious.

**MOTION PASSED: 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention**

5. **Petitions for immediate hearing:** None

6. **Old Business:** None

7. **New Business**

   a. **Election of faculty to the Honorary Degree Committee**

   Prof. Rakowitz reported that the committee on committees nominated Professors Ron Salafia, Rick Dewitt and Dawn Massey to serve on the Honorary Degree Committee.

   **MOTION (LANE/DENNIN): To accept the nominated members to the Honorary Degree Committee**
MOTION PASSED: 16 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions

b. Committee on Conference with Board of Trustees

(Committee Members present at AC meeting– Professors Phil Lane, Wendy Kholi, Paula Gill Lopez)

Prof. Keenan opened the floor for discussion of points the Committee on Conference should make to the Board at their upcoming meeting.

Prof. Rakowitz stated that in following up on last year's issues, the Board should understand that the faculty was divided at the September 7 vote on the MOU only over how best to protect the 95th percentile, not about the importance of the 95th percentile.

Prof. Dennin commented that the faculty didn’t feel the MOU was a good deal financially.

Prof. Sapp wondered if no confidence comes up how do we want committee to react.

Prof. Epstein pointed out that just because members are on the Board does not mean that they have purchased shares in the university.

Prof. Lane reminded the council that the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees used to put together a joint agenda with the Board of Trustees. The direction of their discussions were supposed to be about academic matters. The committee would have an hour with the Academic Affairs committee from the Board of Trustees. Faculty should talk about a real strategic plan and where we want to go in the academic mission of the university.

Dean Crabtree mentioned that the committee only meets with academic affairs part of board and not with whole group. This particular group is more engaged with this section. She added that too much of the public discourse on cost containment focuses on the academic division and salary. The committee should work to preserve the academic division as opposed to seeing the academic division as a budget problem.

Prof. Shea commented that she senses that the Board of Trustees believes that the faculty does not understand the business component of running a university. She stated that the academic component is interested in partnering with the Board to address the issues. She asserted that the faculty are vital to achieving goals, but feel shut out of the discussion.

SVPAA Fitzgerald stated that the point of the committee is to put faculty in front of trustees to build their understanding of what faculty are doing. The administration and the faculty need to work together. We want the trustees to understand and to appreciate the academics of university. In terms of the academic portfolio review process, we need to show the trustees that we have a solid business model. Not every academic program has to have a lot of majors; some departments have few majors but work effectively and efficiently for the core. We do have to show that we are innovating and being good stewards.

Prof. Kohli proposed that we educate the Board about what we do. She noted that the Board needs to know the faculty as people for whom they should have respect. She senses
that there was a lot of contempt for faculty as a group. The hour spent with them needs to focus on educating them to see us more than as just an expense.

Dean Gibson suggested that the committee present data from alumni regarding the role of faculty in their experiences at the university.

Prof. Paula Gill Lopez remembers that the last meeting of the committee was tense because of the 95th percentile issue. They had frank discussions with President von Arx and Paul Huston in attendance. She felt like the committee was on the defensive. She would like a more collaborative discussion. They talked about how to engage with the trustees in more meaningful ways.

Prof. Huntley stated that the Board treats the faculty like an expense rather than using the faculty as a resource to learn about where the university needs to do. If the faculty is able to assert perspectives about the direction of the university, then we could make the argument that the university is unable to get where it needs to be with substandard faculty.

Prof. Tromley suggested that we create a larger mission to move away from defensiveness.

**MOTION (EPSTEIN): To reorder the agenda to address item 7d before 7c.**

**MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

d. IRB changes to Journal of Record

Prof. Naser reported that the IRB (Institutional Review Board) committee was asked to revise entries for the IRB. The committee observed that the Code of Federal Regulations should not be included in the Journal of Record. The committee developed a set of standard operating procedures. Those procedures should not be in the JOR since they must change if the law changes. The committee produced another document that should replace all of the entries in the JOR regarding IRB. Prof. Naser pointed out that since the IRB is in a unique position to stand in the way of research and academic freedom, the IRB should take minimal stances in reviews of research. The main point is to resist applying standards beyond the regulations to avoid making obstacles to undertaking research.

**MOTION (RAKOWITZ/FITZGERALD): To replace the section in the JOR regarding the IRB with the policies found in the document submitted by the IRB committee on pages 19 and 20 in the Academic Council Meeting Packet for October 1, 2012.**

Prof. Kohli spoke in favor of the motion providing more detail of procedure.

**MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

Dean Crabtree asked if Item 10 of the policies also include the Office of Institutional Research.
Prof. Naser responded that everyone has to submit something.

e. Calendar issues

Prof. Rakowitz suggested that we elect a two-person subcommittee to address calendar issues such as the pros and cons of having classes meet the same number of days during a semester, the Monday schedule for Tuesdays, and semesters of unequal length. This committee would be ongoing.

Prof. Epstein was concerned that another calendar committee from the AVP's office already exists. The SVPAA said he didn't think so.

Prof. Dennin asked if the policies are flexible. He wanted to know if commencement could be moved to Memorial Day weekend.

SVPAA Fitzgerald suggested that the committee also address timecodes.

Prof. Keenan commented that timecodes are not a calendar issue.

**MOTION (RAKOWITZ/DALLAVALLE):** That the Academic Council elects a two-person subcommittee from its 2012-13 faculty membership to:

1. Review all of Fairfield’s policies related to the academic calendar;
2. Examine how our academic calendar issues are addressed by other schools;
3. If appropriate, propose policy changes and/or guidelines for calendar construction to the AC.
4. Review any academic calendars proposed in 2012-13 before publication and report concerns to the AC.
5. Draft language for the Journal of Record that would articulate that a two-person AC subcommittee is appointed every year by the AC in September and is charged annually to review any academic calendars published that year and report concerns to the AC before they are published.

**MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

Profs. Epstein and Lane volunteered to serve as this year's subcommittee.

f. Grievance procedure timeline

Prof. Rakowitz reported that she was contacted by Prof. Laura Nash regarding the timeline for filing grievances due to a student submitting a grievance past the time outlined in the JOR regarding procedures for grievances. It was suggested that the wording in the JOR regarding procedures for filing grievances be revised to resolve possible contradictions between language that indicates how long professors should retain student work after the end of the course, and when a grievance should be initiated. Presently, the wording states that faculty should retain written assignments until the end of the following semester and that a grievance “must be initiated within a reasonable period (usually a semester) after the event … and for graduating seniors, no later than one semester after a degree is awarded.”
Prof. Dennin asked if semester also refers to the summer.

Prof. Rakowitz replied that semester refers to the fall and spring.

Prof. Sapp suggested that those situations should be spelled out more clearly.

Dean Crabtree added that if the procedure is not definitive, then issues may arise.

Prof. Kohli commented that students should have the opportunity to legitimately grieve a grade. The procedure needs to be specified as much as possible.

Prof. Lane pointed out that if this is a catalog policy, then it has to be approved.

**MOTION (DALLAVALLE): To amend the language of the “Time Limits” section of the grievance process to “The procedure herein defined must be initiated by the end of the fall or spring semester subsequent to the event that is the subject of the grievance.”**

**MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

Prof. Rakowitz continued the discussion to establish a timeline for filing a grievance by asking when the informal process begins.

Dean Crabtree stated that once a grievance is articulated, the next steps of the process would have to begin within the next few weeks.

Prof. Bhattacharya asked how will students know if the problem is resolved.

Dean Crabtree suggested that the faculty member will communicate with the student, but the resolution will come from the Dean’s office in the form of a letter.

Prof. Kohli asked if this policy is for all students at Fairfield University.

Dean Crabtree replied that the policy is for all students at Fairfield University.

Prof. Bayne suggested that in step 2 and step 3 of the suggested timeline, after meeting with the faculty member, two weeks is too short of a time for students to then meet with the department chair or program director. After the student meets with the department chair or program director, Prof. Bayne also thought that two weeks was too short of a time to have a meeting with the dean of the school.

Prof. Dennin suggested that step 2 doesn’t make sense without step 1, so we need to take care of Step 1 before handling steps 2 and 3.

Prof. Bhattacharya agreed that it may take more than 2 weeks for students to gather more evidence to support their grievance.

Prof. Keenan asked what would be a more reasonable amount of time.

Prof. Bhattacharya suggested one month.
MOTION (BHATTACHARYA/SAPP): To amend step two of the timeline for filing grievances to read, “Within one month of the meeting with the faculty member, the student consults with the chair or program director, bringing written documentation of the process to this point. If the student continues to assert that a grievance exists after attempted reconciliation, she or he advances to step three.

Prof. Dallavalle asked for clarification about the link between step 1 and step 2. What if the student’s materials are thrown out?

Prof. Rakowitz suggested that once a grievance is initiated, then the faculty member needs to know that she/he has to retain the student’s materials until the end of the process.

Prof. Petrino commented that she thought that it was commonplace for faculty to keep student work for one year.

Prof. Rakowitz replied that it is only required that faculty keep student work for one semester.

Prof. Petrino was concerned about the short amount of time allotted from the time that the grievance begins.

MOTION (LANE/PETRINO): To table the motion until the next meeting.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Roxana Walker-Canton
Recording Secretary
E-mail of 10/2/12:

Dear members of the Academic Council Executive Committee,

   At its meeting of 9/26 the Philosophy Department discussed the new Sexual Misconduct policy that has been adopted as part of the Student handbook by the Student Affairs division. The department faculty recognize the importance of the issues raised here. We are concerned that a policy that may directly impact the relationship between students and faculty was adopted by the University without direct consultation with the faculty through its normal governance procedures. We are particularly concerned that the policy would require faculty to breach the general parameters of confidentiality with which we treat our students in the context of individual discussions with them. The policy effectively mandates that faculty report on either our suspicions of sexual misconduct or explicit instances which students have divulged to individual faculty in the context of private conversations.

   Faculty who are not licensed social workers, nurses or counselors are not state mandated reporters in this area, yet this policy would require them to become such mandated reporters within the institution. This may be a good thing, it may not. It certainly represents a substantial change to the relationship between individual faculty and individual students. As we ourselves do not feel that we have the expertise to think through the implications of such a change that would affect all faculty, we would ask that the Academic Council address this issue by either referring it to an appropriate faculty committee or constituting an ad hoc committee to advise the Academic Council. There are faculty on this campus who may have expertise in these matters (counseling, clinical psychology, nursing, others perhaps) who could advise the faculty on these issues. It may be that the faculty needs to retain some outside expertise to guide us in thinking through the implications of the requirements set out in the new sexual misconduct policy.

   In any event, the policy promulgated in the Student Handbook appears to apply to all faculty and represents a material change in the expectations and norms governing how students and faculty interact both in the classroom and in private conversations. We thus request that the Academic Council take up this issue, study the implications and follow the normal procedures for instituting new educational policy.

   Sincerely, on behalf of the Department of Philosophy,

Steven M. Bayne, Chair
MEMORANDUM
Secretary of the General Faculty
Fairfield University

TO: Academic Council

FROM: Susan Rakowitz, General Faculty Secretary and Irene Mulvey, former GFS

DATE: October 8, 2012

RE: Philosophy Department’s email on reporting requirements re sexual misconduct

In an email dated 10/2/2012, Professor Steve Bayne reported that the Department of Philosophy had concerns about new reporting requirements in Fairfield’s Sexual Misconduct Policy. In our capacity as (current and incoming) Secretary of the General Faculty, Vice President Tom Pellegrino communicated with us last June about the changes to the Sexual Misconduct Policy, which were put into place in the wake of the sexual abuse scandal at Penn State University. The relevant reporting requirements for all University employees are below (the section on reporting requirements is at the end of this memo). In light of the memo from Professor Bayne, we ask the Academic Council to determine if there is any objection to these new reporting requirements that would necessitate putting the matter on the agenda for a future AC meeting.

In brief,

- Employees made aware of child abuse or neglect (as defined by CT statutes) involving a victim under age 18 must report that to Public Safety and Fairfield Police (and are strongly encouraged to report it to DCF hotline).

- Employees who witness or receive report of sexual misconduct involving a victim over age 18 must report the information they receive on the incident to Public Safety.


b. Reporting Sexual Misconduct

This policy on reporting is designed to assist the University’s Title IX Coordinator, in conjunction with the Department of Public Safety, in providing a comprehensive response to reports of sexual misconduct. It seeks to promote victim and campus safety, and a prompt and equitable resolution to incidents of sexual misconduct. In general, any employee who has reasonable cause to believe sexual misconduct has occurred, must comply with the University’s Sexual Misconduct Policy, regardless of the age of the victim.

i. Reporting by University Employees
When the victim is under 18: In instances where a University employee is made aware of child abuse or neglect as defined by Connecticut General Statutes Section 17a-101b, the first question the employee must ask herself/himself is whether she/he is a mandated reporter of child abuse or neglect as defined by Connecticut General Statutes Section 17a-101(b).

If the employee is a mandated reporter she/he must comply with Connecticut’s mandated reporting laws. When a mandated reporter is made aware of child abuse or neglect (as defined above and by Connecticut General Statutes Section 17a-101b), she/he must call the Department of Children and Families (DCF) 24-hour hotline for reporting suspected child abuse or neglect at 1(800) 842-2288. All employees, including mandated reporters, must also report the matter to the Department of Public Safety (ext. 4090) and the Fairfield Police Department (911).

All other University employees (i.e., those who are not mandated reporters) are strongly encouraged to report suspected child abuse or neglect to the DCF hotline listed above, and are protected under Connecticut law for good-faith reporting of such suspected child abuse or neglect, even if later investigation fails to substantiate abuse or neglect. Employees who are mandated reporters must still report instances of child abuse or neglect to the Department of Public Safety (ext. 4090) and the Fairfield Police Department (911).

When the victim is 18 or older: Any employee, except those who are empowered by law to maintain confidentiality, who witnesses or receives a report of sexual misconduct of a victim 18 or older, must report the incident (including the date, time, and location of the incident, the date the incident was reported to them, and the identities of the victim and, if disclosed, the alleged perpetrator) as soon as possible to the Department of Public Safety at ext 4090. The Department of Public Safety will notify the Title IX Coordinator and the Fairfield Police Department. While University employees must report information they receive, it is not their responsibility to investigate or confirm what is reported to them. University officials within the appropriate offices will determine the appropriate next steps, including ensuring that victims have been made aware of available on- and off-campus resources.

While a University employee may advise the victim of sexual misconduct that any conversation they have with the victim will be private (will not be shared unnecessarily with others), they may not tell a victim that the conversation will be confidential unless that employee is subject to privilege by law to maintain confidentiality of an adult victim.

The law extends to a limited number of University employees the privilege to offer confidentiality to the adult victim and not to disclose communications with the victim. Typically, these are clinical employees who work within the Office of Counseling & Psychological Services, the Student Health Center, or clergy within Campus Ministry. Others accorded this privilege include: 1. licensed marital and family therapists; 2. licensed social workers; 3. Licensed professional counselors; 4. licensed psychologists; 5. psychiatrists licensed as physicians and substantially acting as psychiatrists; and 6. physicians and other medical professionals acting within a medical professional/patient relationship, including those recognized by the Privacy Rule of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA).
To: Fr. Paul Fitzgerald, Senior Academic Vice-President  
From: Mary Ann Palazzi, Coordinator of Programs for Student-Athletes  
Re: 2012 Fall Semester Conflicts with Final Exams and Scheduled Athletic Contests

Men’s Basketball       Saturday, December, 16, 2012 vs. Drexel, Home- READING DAY- Time of game- TBA  
Women’s Basketball- No Conflicts  
Men’s Cross Country- No Conflicts  
Women’s Cross Country- No Conflicts  
Men’s Golf- No Conflicts  
Women’s Golf- No Conflicts  
Men’s Rowing- No Conflicts  
Women’s Rowing- No Conflicts  
Men’s Soccer- No Conflicts  
Women’s Soccer- No Conflicts  
Men’s Swimming- No Conflicts  
Women’s Swimming- No Conflicts  
Volleyball- No Conflicts  
Field Hockey- No Conflicts
Date: October 23, 2012  
To: Academic Council  
From: Academic Council Executive Committee  
Re: Summary of Academic Grievance Timeline Issues and Actions (Item 6a)

In a memo dated September 15, 2012 (included in the packet for the 10/1/12 AC meeting), Prof. Laura Nash brought to the Academic Council's attention a discrepancy between two Journal of Record policies.

**Retention of Final Examinations:**
That final examinations (blue books, etc.) and term papers or other written assignments used by the professor for determining the final course grade be retained by the professor until the end of the following term, so as to be available for student inspection.

And, from the Student Academic Grievance Process:

**Time Limits:**
The procedure herein defined must be initiated within a reasonable period (usually a semester) after the event that is the subject of the grievance, and for graduating seniors, no later than one semester after a degree is awarded.

The grievance procedure’s vague language of “usually a semester” allows for grievances to be filed long after the period during which faculty were required by the final exam policy to retain final assessment materials. Without those materials, it may be difficult, if not impossible, to adjudicate the grievance. Furthermore, the open-endedness of the grievance language effectively puts no limits on when a grievance can be filed. It doesn’t seem fair to the faculty involved that a student could return to challenge a grade years after the grade was issued.

At its October 1, 2012 meeting, the Academic Council approved the following revision of the Journal of Record text:

**To amend the language of the “Time Limits” section of the grievance process to “The procedure herein defined must be initiated by the end of the fall or spring semester subsequent to the event that is the subject of the grievance.”**

Nash's memo further suggested the following revisions (in bold) to the grievance procedure:

**Procedure - Informal:**
Step one: The student attempts to resolve any academic grievance with the faculty member, informing the faculty member and the appropriate academic Dean’s office(s) with written communication. This step must be undertaken in the semester after the event that is the subject of the grievance. If, following this initial attempt at resolution, the student remains convinced that a grievance exists, she or he advances to step two.
Step two: **Within two weeks of the meeting with the faculty member**, the student consults with the chair or program director, bringing written documentation of the process to this point. If the student continues to assert that a grievance exists after attempted reconciliation, she or he advances to step three.

Step three: **Within two weeks of meeting with the chair or program director**, the student presents the grievance to the dean of the school in which the course was offered, bringing to this meeting documentation of steps one and two. After conversation with the instructor of record and the department chair/program director, the dean will inform the student whether or not the grade shall be changed by the instructor of record. If the student is dissatisfied with the outcome, the dean will inform the student of the right to initiate formal review procedures.

Procedure - Formal:
Step one: **Within two weeks of meeting with the dean of the school in which the course was offered**, if the student still believes that the grievance remains unresolved following the informal procedures above, she or he initiates the formal review procedure by making a written request for a formal hearing through the dean to the SVPAA. Such a request should define the grievance and be accompanied by documentation of completion of the informal process. It should also be accompanied by the dean's opinion of the grievance.

In the discussion of these issues, Council members seemed to agree with the general idea of specifying a timeline (see the 10/1/12 minutes), but there was debate over what time frames would be reasonable.

The following motion was tabled:

**MOTION (BHATTACHARYA/SAPP): To amend step two of the timeline for filing grievances to read, “Within one month of the meeting with the faculty member, the student consults with the chair or program director, bringing written documentation of the process to this point. If the student continues to assert that a grievance exists after attempted reconciliation, she or he advances to step three.”**

The Academic Council Executive Committee, after discussion, suggests that rather than specifying a deadline for each step in the process, it might be clearer and more effective to add the following to the text the AC already approved:

**If the grievance moves forward, all subsequent steps of the informal process must be completed and the formal process must be initiated before the end of the second semester subsequent to the event that is the subject of the grievance.**
Dear Dennis Keenan, Chair  
Academic Council  

At the September 12th, 2012 FDEC meeting, the committee discussed the minutes of the 5-14-12 AC meeting wherein FDEC’s recommendations for the IDEA evaluations were discussed. In addition to discussing the passed motion: “both paper and online IDEA student evaluations be offered to faculty until 2014; the default should be paper IDEA evaluations,” we noted the list of items for FDEC to consider this year with respect to IDEA.

Through recent conversations with Tracy Immerso and AVP Fitzgerald [see email excerpt below], the FDEC learned that this motion will not apply to adjunct faculty members. For adjunct faculty (not full-time faculty who teach an overload), the default for IDEA evaluations will be online.

As this decision differs from the FDEC's interpretation of the motion (we assumed it applied to tenure track and adjunct faculty), we thought it appropriate to inform AC of this decision by the AVP’s office. We have been in touch with AVP Fitzgerald, who explained the financial reasons behind this decision.

Sincerely,

Emily Smith, Chair  
FDEC  

*****  

Excerpt from Email String:

Below is the AVP’s response to my [Emily’s] question about the online default for adjunct faculty:

AC accepted FDEC's recommendations about paper as the default option. My understanding was that the concern was principally about getting a high enough response rate so that tenure track faculty would have sound evidence of teaching effectiveness for the R&T process, and that continuing full-time faculty would have evidence for annual merit reviews.

Adjunct faculty teach about a third of our total sections. They are, as a whole, asked to provide some evidence of teaching effectiveness at the time of hire (or of rehire). They are often unmotivated to evaluate their
courses toward the end of the term, and we have to chase many of them down concerning course evaluations (or even to get them to turn in their grades on time).

I have set them up to default to on-line for this semester. I had requested that they be asked about this in their contract letter, but that didn't happen this fall. At this time, it would be a herculean task to change this over for the current term. Of course, they all have the option of choosing paper, but they rarely do so. Many don't even set up their objectives in IDEA.

So, I am trying to uphold the spirit of what FDEC and AC decided even as I am trying not to waste time and resources on tasks that have little or no actual value.

Paul

***********************
Emily R. Smith, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, English Education
Chair, Department of Educational Studies & Teacher Preparation
Graduate School of Education & Allied Professions
Fairfield University
1073 N. Benson Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
203-254-4000 x2396
esmith@fairfield.edu
To: Academic Council  
From: Paul Fitzgerald, sj  
Re: IDEA form default mode  

October 30, 2012  

At the May 14, 2012 meeting of the Academic Council, there was a lively discussion about the use of the IDEA form, response rates, on-line versus paper, and the continued use of the Yellow Sheets. The importance of meaningful data for junior tenure stream faculty was stressed, while the use of online versus paper for adjunct faculty was not considered in any substantive way.

**Motion [Bayne/Lane]:** Both paper and online IDEA student evaluations be offered to faculty until 2014. The default should be paper IDEA evaluations. This should be reevaluated in Spring 2014.

**Motion Passed:**
15 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

In the spring of 2012, 249 undergrad and grad sections were taught by adjuncts. Only 96 (39%) of these responded to repeated email requests to set up their objectives and choose between paper or online. Of those responding, 31% chose paper. The rest of the responders chose on-line, and all those who did not respond defaulted to online.

During the same term, full-time faculty taught 231 undergrad and grad sections. 146 (63%) registered online to set up their objectives and choose paper or on-line. 50% chose on-line. The 37% who didn’t respond defaulted to paper.

The challenge with adjunct faculty is that many do not respond to repeated e-mail requests to set up their IDEA forms. This summer, my office staff took the five different adjunct contracts in use in the five schools, standardized them (while leaving specific language in SON and SOE), included clear instructions about claiming one’s NetID, setting up the Fairfield.edu email account to forward all mail to a preferred off-campus email address, and invited them to choose between paper or online IDEA and Yellow Sheet evaluation, with on-line as the default option.

Processing many paper forms that are not really beneficial since they were not set up with specific learning outcomes diverts academic affairs resources away from other, more beneficial ways of supporting faculty (I bring in temporary help to process the paper forms). We have many fine adjuncts who have been with us for many years. We also have a steady number of new adjuncts. It is important that students have the right to evaluate all courses, and it is important for department chairs and deans to be able to ask adjuncts for some evidence of teaching effectiveness at the time of hire.

I request that AC modify the JOR to allow for on-line to be the default when adjuncts don’t choose an option; paper can remain the default option for fulltime faculty who do not choose an option, though this too merits further investigation by the FDEC.
To: Academic Council  
From: Paul Fitzgerald sj  
Re: PIN’s  

October 29, 2012

Responding to concerns from the Athletics Committee about the security of student PIN’s and the integrity of the process of faculty advising prior to registration, AC discussed the matter on 2/27/12. From the minutes:

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.

Responding to concerns from the Athletics Committee about the security of student PIN’s and the integrity of the process of faculty advising prior to registration, AC approved the following policy on 2/27/12, which I in turn approved for the JOR on 7/6/12:

Motion (Mulvey/Greenberg): 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.

On 10/8/12 I wrote the Registrar the following email:

From: Fitzgerald, Paul  
Sent: Monday, October 08, 2012 2:11 PM  
To: Russo, Robert  
Subject: FW: registration changes

Dear Bob,
Last spring the Academic Council passed a new policy intended to insure that students get some faculty advice before they register. Would this be something that Ellucian (Sungard) could do for us in the next few weeks? Or perhaps Jay R. could set something up? Your advice would be most appreciated.

Paul

the following policy approved by the AC 2/27/12 and by PJF for the JOR on 7/6/12:

Motion (Mulvey/Greenberg): 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.

On 10/9/12, Bob replied:

Paul- The faculty advisors give the students their pins after they advise them. It is part of the process to insure that students are advised….Bob

Robert C. Russo ’72 MA ’76
University Registrar

Subsequently, Bob and I met to discuss the situation. He was quite concerned that the mechanics of the procedure now in the JOR would lead to many situations where students would be blocked from registering – even if only for a few hours – by slow action or inaction on the part of the faculty advisors. This would be poorly received by the students. We then investigated to see who besides the faculty advisors have access to the PIN’s. I have attached the report. Only academic staff in Deans’ and the Registrar’s offices, academic staff advisors and appropriate members of Student Affairs have access to the PIN’s. No one in Athletics, for example, has access.

Bob further assured me that he enforces the policy that his staff only give PIN’s to students who bring in a form signed by a faculty advisor.

I therefore ask Academic Council to revisit the mechanics of the procedure even as we all work together to monitor the advising and registration process to insure its integrity.
Date: October 28, 2012  
To: Academic Council  
From: Susan Rakowitz, General Faculty Secretary  
Re: Changes to the University Budget Committee  

Below is an email exchange between President von Arx, S.J. and me about changes he's making to the University Budget Committee. The memo that accompanied his first email (and was sent to the Deans and Directors the next day) follows. It specifies that faculty will continue to be represented by the three faculty members who are elected by the General Faculty to serve on the Budget Committee. What is unstated is that for the last several years, the President had also extended an invitation to the Chairs of the Faculty Salary Committee and the Educational Planning Committee (or their designees) to attend the Budget Committee.

---

Dear Sue:

After getting input from a number of faculty who have served on the Budget Committee in recent years and after consultation with the relevant vice presidents, I have decided to streamline somewhat the membership of the committee. Faculty representatives elected by the General Faculty will, of course, continue to serve. Let me know if you have any questions.

Jeffrey P. von Arx, S.J.

---

Dear Jeff,

Thank you for sharing advance notification of this plan with me.

As GFS, it's not my position to comment on the non-faculty changes to the University Budget Committee, other than to note that the 5-year report we just sent to NEASC included as an example of an improvement in governance, "an increased role for students on administrative committees (e.g., the University Budget Committee now has two student representatives)." But I do have concerns about reversing the recent inclusion of delegates from the Faculty Salary Committee and the Educational Planning Committee. Faculty who are directly elected to the Budget Committee do an excellent job of broadly representing the faculty, and the issue isn't simply about whether there are two additional faculty voices in the room. The problem is with losing the direct link between the Budget Committee and those faculty committees that most often deal with budgetary issues. Having served on the Budget Committee as Chair of the FSC, I know that those two delegates may offer perspectives that the other faculty representatives don't have. Furthermore, as important as what the EPC and FSC delegates may bring to the Budget Committee, is what they bring back to their committees from the Budget Committee. It's to everyone's advantage if faculty who are discussing salary and compensation or assessing the resource implications of academic programs have a broader perspective on the university budget.
In light of these concerns, I respectfully ask you to reconsider the inclusion of faculty delegates from EPC and FSC on the University Budget Committee.

Thank you,

Susan

Dear Sue:

Streamlining the Budget Committee was at the suggestion of elected faculty reps who have sat on the committee. They argued that the Committee had become too unwieldy to conduct business effectively and I was persuaded by their argument, and since it’s a presidential committee, it’s up to me to make the change. Note as well that I have decreased the number of administrative reps. If the faculty want representatives of the EPC and the FSC on the Budget Committee, they are free to elect them. I note that Carl Scheraga, Chair of EPC, is a faculty rep to this year’s Budget Committee. If the FSC would like to send a someone to the Budget Committee meetings for this year they are welcome to do so, and we will provide schedules and agenda so that they can decide when they would like to attend. There will be times when the input of the Faculty Salary Committee will be explicitly invited. Since the Budget Committee is advisory and takes no votes, there is no question of voice versus vote, and whoever comes from FSC is welcome to participate in the discussions of the Committee.

Jeffrey P. von Arx, S.J.

Dear Jeff,

Thank you for your response.
I'll follow up with the FSC and see how they would like to proceed. I'll also apprise the Academic Council of the situation.

Susan
To: Deans & Directors Group  
From: President Jeffery von Arx, SJ  
Re: University Budget Committee

As you may know, the University Budget Committee has evolved since it was first formed some 20 years ago. Over the past several months, I have heard directly and indirectly from a number of faculty and staff with suggestions regarding ways to make the Committee function better and adapt it to the Fairfield of today. After careful consideration of these comments, I am writing to clarify the Committee’s charge and appoint its members.

Charge of the Committee

The University Budget Committee is appointed by the President to provide a forum for input from a variety of University constituencies into the overall budget process and the specific budget proposal presented by the President to the Board of Trustees for approval each year. The role of the Committee shall be to assist the Vice President for Finance in presenting an operating budget to the President that is not only balanced financially, but is optimal from a total University perspective. During the Fall semester, the Committee will normally focus on gaining an understanding of the revenue and expense drivers of the operating budget and the major academic, student and other programs provided across the institution, all within the context of the external environment and the University’s Strategic Plan. During the Spring semester, the Committee’s work will focus more on providing input and feedback on specific budgetary decisions that the President and Vice President for Finance will recommend to the Trustees.

Committee Structure

The University Budget Committee shall consist of the following members:

• Vice President for Finance (chair)
• Assistant Vice President for Budget & Financial Analysis
• 3 faculty representatives elected by the General Faculty with staggered terms. For this fiscal year, these are: Mike Coyne, Joe Dennin, Carl Scheraga
• FUSA President or his/her designee
• Staff representative appointed by the President for a 2-year term
• Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
• Vice President for Administration & Chief of Staff
• Vice President for Student Affairs
• 1 Dean, appointed by the President for a 2-year term, currently Robbin Crabtree

Other members of the administration, faculty and staff may be invited to attend particular meetings, make presentations, etc. as needed. Meetings will be scheduled by the Vice President for Finance. Her office will be in touch with Committee members shortly to schedule this semester’s meetings.

I appreciate the thoughtful input I received. Thanks to all who provided comments and suggestions.
Date: October 8, 2012
To: Academic Council
From: Susan Rakowitz, General Faculty Secretary
Re: Changes to Repeat Course Policy

It recently came to my attention that a longstanding academic policy, the repeat course policy, was changed in the Undergraduate Course Catalogue this summer without consultation with and approval of the faculty. The particulars of the policy and changes are presented below, but the breakdown in process must be addressed first.

Process

The Faculty Handbook makes it clear that academic policies fall under the purview of the General Faculty. ("...the area of competence most appropriate to the General Faculty is educational policy. It is the General Faculty’s special role to be concerned with excellence in this area which includes admissions, curriculum, courses of study, degrees, permanent educational policies, and other matters pertaining to the academic life of the University." I.A.1.) Most academic policies are contained in the Journal of Record (JOR), and the JOR charges the General Faculty Secretary with a reconciliation process entailing annual pre-publication review of drafts of University documents, including the Undergraduate Catalogue, for consistency with JOR policies.

The change in question was made after I reviewed a draft of the Undergraduate Catalogue this summer. It came to my attention through a question from a Dean last week. When I asked Associate Academic Vice President Mary Frances Malone how it happened that a substantive change was made to the Catalogue without appropriate faculty input, and after my mandated review of the draft, she said that, "...I did not view it as a substantive change. I did check the Journal of Record and found no reference to this so I assumed it was within our purview to adjust the practice…"

This response completely misses the point of the reconciliation policy. It is not up to administrators to determine what's consistent with the JOR or to judge what is a substantive change. Once the GFS has reviewed the documents, there should be no further changes other than corrections of typos and those revisions called for by the GFS. If other changes are considered, they should, of course, be sent to the GFS for review. To do otherwise (as was done here), is to subvert the reconciliation policy. Furthermore, the administration should be well aware that creating and promulgating a new academic policy without faculty approval is an egregious violation of faculty prerogatives as laid out in the Handbook.

Policy

It is true that the repeat course policy is not in the JOR. It has been in the Catalogue in its 2011 form since 2004 and in a slightly less clear form for as long as I can track. Given the murky origins of the policy, I don't know whether faculty had appropriate input initially; it's possible the policy pre-dated the compilation of the JOR. Nevertheless, the issue of grades and credits for repeated courses is clearly academic policy. As such, it should be decided upon by and approved by the Academic Council for inclusion in the JOR.

The unapproved Repeat Course Policy (which appears in the 2012-2013 Catalogue) is as follows. Changes to the longstanding policy are marked in bold.

Repeat Course Policy
When a student repeats a course that was failed, the new grade will be recorded. Grade point values will be averaged into the cumulative average, and the credits will count toward the
degree. The original grade will remain on the transcript and be calculated into the cumulative average. When a student repeats a course for which the student has previously obtained a passing grade, the new course and grade will be recorded on the transcript with the notation, repeat course. **The original grade and the repeated grade will be averaged into the GPA.** The credit for the repeat course will not count toward the degree. The original grade will remain on the transcript.

The longstanding Repeat Course Policy follows. Again the text that was unilaterally changed by the administration is marked in bold:

Repeat Course Policy

When a student repeats a course that was failed, the new grade will be recorded. Grade point values will be averaged into the cumulative average, and the credits will count toward the degree. The original grade will remain on the transcript and be calculated into the cumulative average.

When a student repeats a course for which the student has previously obtained a passing grade, the new course and grade will be recorded on the transcript with the notation, repeat course. **Neither the credits nor the grade will count toward the degree.** The original grade will remain on the transcript

**Recommendation**

The Council should decide what the repeat course policy will be and approve appropriate language for the *Journal of Record.*
Dear Bob,

I recently sent a series of issues for consideration to the FSC, and it has been brought to my attention that one issue is more AC business than FSC business. Here it is, excerpted from that other communication:

4. Revisions to the University Merit Plan should clarify/change the relationship between Standard Merit and pre-tenure faculty. Currently, the University Merit Plan indicates that pre-tenure faculty qualify for Standard Merit automatically during their first three years. But it does not specify whether this is the first three years on their tenure clock or their first three years at Fairfield. We hire a number of folks with time towards tenure and they begin at Fairfield in their second or third year on their tenure clock. I believe it would make more sense that ALL PRE-TENURE FACULTY AUTOMATICALLY QUALIFY FOR STANDARD MERIT WHEN THEY RECEIVE A RENEWAL OF THEIR CONTINUING CONTRACT (that is, as long as they continue on the tenure track). After all, pre-tenure faculty receive a thorough and rigorous annual review, and this requires materials both greater than and different from the University Merit Review process and this review is done on a different calendar (and these aspects are set by the Deans of the schools, not held common across the University). Pre-tenure faculty should submit merit applications only in years when there is funding for Additional and Extraordinary Merit. This change would be very straightforward, and I think would be strongly supported across the University.

Specifically, I propose amending JOR Appendix 12 as follows (deletions in strikethrough, additions in bold):

Because they are already extensively reviewed each year and they should be focused on longer-term, rather than annual, goals, untenured, tenure-track faculty members automatically qualify for standard merit in their first three years as long as their continuing (tenure track) contracts are renewed. In years when further merit is available, they may apply for it. In addition, the merit assessments for untenured, tenure-track faculty should recognize that they do not have as many opportunities for leadership in service as tenured faculty do.

Thank you,
Robbin
Robbin D. Crabtree, Ph.D.
Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences
Fairfield University
PROPOSAL TO STREAMLINE MERIT APPLICATION PROCESS.

On April 12, 2012, the FDEC accepted a proposal for the following recommendations regarding merit application procedures:

- If a faculty member is promoted in rank during the course of an academic year, that person automatically qualifies for standard merit and may apply for additional merit.

- If a tenure-track junior faculty member receives a positive recommendation for continuation in his/her probationary status, that person also automatically qualifies for standard merit and may apply for additional merit.

- All other continuing faculty (tenured people, Professors of the Practice, including phased and sabbatical folks) need to apply for merit using the forms supplied by his/her dean.

Faculty Development & Evaluation Committee (FDEC) Meeting

Thursday, April 12, 2012, 9:00 AM – 10:30 AM

Minutes

In attendance: Roben Torosyan, Emily Smith, Larry Miners, Mary Frances Malone, Shahrokh Etemad, Meredith Wallace Kazer, Joel Goldfield, Bill Abbott, Jessica Davis

Fr. Paul Fitzgerald has proposed to streamline the merit application process since the current merit system is too cumbersome. Suggestions include (1) if a faculty member is promoted in rank during the course of an academic year, that person automatically qualifies for standard merit and may apply for additional merit as well, or need do nothing more; (2) if a tenure-track junior faculty member receives a positive recommendation for continuation in his/her probationary status, that person also automatically qualifies for standard merit and may apply for additional merit; and (3) all other continuing faculty (tenured people, Professors of the Practice, including phased and sabbatical folks) need to apply for merit using the forms supplied by his/her dean. Meredith Wallace Kazer said that the GSEAP has agreed to this proposal and wants to make sure that the process includes additional merit. A clear ruling from administration on whether additional merit is available in any given year is needed. It was suggested that “years where no additional merit is available…” be added in. Mary Frances Malone commented that the timing may not work as the Memo of Understanding is not always approved before merit applications are due. Bill Abbott said that we may want to send this back because of timing issues. Larry Miners pointed out that the first suggestion of Fr. Paul
Fitzgerald makes the calendar year in which a faculty member comes up for tenure/promotion not represented for that round of merit review. Fr. Paul Fitzgerald joined the discussion. This request comes from a joint meeting of the board of trustees and concerns of faculty for what they need to do in a given year. The question arose: Is it necessary for a person who goes through the process of rank and tenure and/or given a positive recommendation for a continuing contract to apply for merit? Bill Abbot pointed out that if a person wants additional merit they would need to apply regardless of their situation. Fr. Paul Fitzgerald said that we need to have a way to apply for additional merit that is not addressed here. Larry Miners reiterated that the MOU is often accepted after merit applications are due. Meredith Wallace Kazer moved to approve as revised, Emily Smith seconded, and all approved.
Guidelines for Faculty and Academic Staff Recruitment

The hiring of the people who work at Fairfield University is one of the most important activity that we, as academics, perform. In our division particularly, the hiring and evaluation of faculty and staff is central to building a strong and vibrant university. Therefore, the process of conducting a search, of building a pool of applicants that reflects the diversity and richness of our profession, of bringing candidates to campus for interviews, of judging the appropriate match with Fairfield, and of negotiating with our preferred candidate are all matters of the utmost seriousness to us. As we seek faculty members who will enhance our educational mission, we also must treat each candidate with respect and consideration.

While the basic responsibility for conducting a search and recommending the appropriate persons to fill vacancies resides with the faculty and staff of the department or area in which the vacancy exists, and it is expected that Deans will provide significant leadership, oversight and judgment in this process. In addition, there exists an overriding priority to conduct searches in conformity with the University’s equal opportunity employment policy consistent with our desire to enhance the diversity of our faculty and staff. Also, a strong effort to locate and hire Jesuit candidates, where available, is an appropriate part of all searches in this division.

In order to conduct searches effectively, please note the following guidelines and procedures. Our intention is to conduct faculty searches in accord with the policy on appointment in the Faculty Handbook (II.A.1) and in conformity with the governance documents of the college and the schools. These present guidelines represent an elaboration of those policy statements.

As with all important academic matters that involve the peer review of colleagues’ professional accomplishments, strict confidentiality according to the norms of the academy is to be maintained before, during and after the completion of the search.

Starting the Process

- For all faculty searches, every attempt will be made to build a diverse pool of qualified candidates from the national market in a discipline. Searches for contract staff should also be conducted in as wide a geographic area as possible, although there may be times when a regional search is more appropriate. The choice of a regional market must be approved, in advance, by the Senior Vice President upon recommendation of the appropriate Dean. A position description shall be developed which should state the title or rank of the position, the duties to be performed, and any experience or minimal qualifications required of all candidates.

- The conceptualization and description of the position, done by the department or program as a whole, must take into account several factors: the enactment of the university’s mission, the disciplinary needs of the department or program, school or campus-wide initiatives,
interdisciplinary collaborations with other departments and programs, the further integration of the Core, and the diversification of our faculty. Not every new faculty member will do all of these things, but care should be taken that they will contribute significantly to several of them. All shall contribute to the university’s Jesuit mission and identity in some significant way.

• When a vacancy exists, the Chair/Coordinator, Director or Dean initiates the search by justifying the position to the SVP and getting an approval of the position description. This is captured on the Authorization to Hire form, which requires the accord of the CFO and the President.

• Once the search is approved, the Dean and relevant faculty members work collaboratively to establish a recruitment plan and a search committee. The Search Committee should never be so small that all the views and perspectives in the unit are not represented nor so large as to be unwieldy. It is normally expected that the Dean, Director, or Chair will head the Search Committee, although the Chair may delegate this responsibility to a senior member of the department upon consultation with the Dean or SVP.

• It is also normal procedure for at least one faculty member of the search committee to be from outside the department or program conducting the search. The dean of the school or college will coordinate the appointment of the external member. In the case of a joint hire by more than one department or program, the composition of the committee should be proportionate to the percentage shares of the joint appointment. In the case of a courtesy appointment, a member of the courtesy department should occupy the external chair on the search committee. The outside member shall have all rights and privileges of the other members, including being present for consideration of all applicants and having full voting rights on all policy, procedure and selection decisions and recommendations. The outside member should represent some significant potential interdisciplinary cooperation inherent in the new position.

Developing a pool of candidates:

• Once the Authorization to Hire has been signed by all parties and the Search Committee has been formed, the head of the committee will submit to the office of the Senior Vice President (directly, if the head is a Dean, or through the Dean, if the head is a department chair) the following items:

The recruitment plan should describe the composition of the Search Committee, a budget for the search, a calendar of the expected progress of the search, including the closing date for applications and the expected date for completion of the search, a list of the places where the position will be advertised or publicized, the professional meeting used for screening potential candidates, special efforts being made to bring minorities, women, Jesuits, Veterans or disabled persons into the pool of candidates and, finally, plans for notifying candidates of receipt of complete application dossiers, progress of the search and
the final results of the search. In general, all applicants should receive written notification that their applications have been received, whether any necessary items are lacking, and notification when they are no longer under consideration, even if the search is not final. Finalists should receive written notification of the results of the search.

**The position announcement.** This is a copy of all public statements about the position (newspaper, the Chronicle for Higher Ed, and discipline specific journal advertisements, on-line placements, e-bulletin boards, announcements sent to the graduate schools, etc.). The position announcement must be approved by both the Dean and the SVPAA before placement so as to capitalize on potential interdisciplinary collaboration and to advance strategic academic priorities.

The position description and the job ad must be carefully thought-through, for they must contain all the essential duties of the new faculty member. A candidate evaluation rubric shall be generated to score the applications, and said rubric shall be based on the specific hiring criteria as listed in the job description/position announcement.

To save money for ads in external venues, departments may use an abbreviated job ad. Abbreviated job ads may simply list the name of the university, the department, the disciplinary area of the vacancy, a reference to the URL of the university website where the full job ad may be viewed, and a notation that we are an AA/EO employer.

**All full job ads must:**

1. specify clear academic qualifications for the position and specific hiring criteria,
2. list a final deadline for applications,
3. state that Fairfield is a Catholic Jesuit university,
4. Steer the applicant towards the university URL where the ad is posted and EEO/AA and Clery Act language can be found

Since all search committees should evaluate candidates using the same basic criteria, the same materials should be asked of all candidates (other materials may be asked only of semi-finalists or finalists), and may include the following materials, listed in job advertisements:
(i) curriculum vitae, (ii) graduate transcripts, (iii) three letters of recommendation from qualified reviewers, (iv) sample syllabi of courses taught if available, (v) teaching evaluations if available, (vi) a personal statement covering teaching philosophy, research plan, and experience of - or interest in - working with people of diverse cultures and identities, and (vii) at least one example of representative scholarship, e.g. published article or book chapter, dissertation chapter, video or audio recording of an artistic performance,
etc. Electronic submission of materials and a paperless review process in a secure online environment is an option for all searches.

- The Senior Vice President shall be shown a position description and potential search plan in advance of approving an Authorization to Hire.

- Once there is agreement on the above matters, the office of the Senior Vice President will work with the Dean and the head of the Search to activate the search plan. All announcements, newspaper, and journal advertisements should be placed through the Office of the Academic Vice President well in advance of the desired deadline dates, and it is expected that all copy will be submitted via an email attachment to Laura Martin. Notices for professional conferences and on-line journals may be placed directly by the head of the search committee with the approval of the SVPAA. Frequency of placements will be determined by the SVPAA in consultation with the Dean and Chair of the search committee.

- When the Search Committee is organized, the head of the committee should schedule a time for a representative from the Office of Human Resources and the Dean (or her/his designee) to brief the committee on recruitment, hiring and selection procedures, including a rehearsal of what are appropriate and what are inappropriate questions, all in accord with the requirements of the University’s equal employment opportunity policy.

Selecting final candidates

- Every ethical opportunity should be taken to get as much information as possible about candidates before inviting a select few to campus for interviews. All faculty searches should, wherever possible, include the screening of potential candidates at an appropriate professional meeting, and this opportunity should be included in the search plan. The recruitment budget of the SVPAA will fund two faculty members for the purpose of conducting interviews. In cases where interviews occur at research conferences, departments may wish to fund additional faculty members.

- If a professional meeting does not take place until the late winter or spring, telephone or teleconference interviews should be employed. When narrowing the pool to the final few candidates, designated members of the search committee should call references and find out as much as possible about each candidate. No one should be invited to campus as a finalist without submitted letters of reference and/or telephone reference calls, with written notes shared by the faculty member(s) conducting the telephone interview.

- The Search Committee works with the dean to select the two or three finalists they wish to invite to campus for an interview. At this point, the equal opportunity compliance report must be completed with the requisite information and appended to the folders of all individuals who were deemed qualified for the position, whether they were selected for interview or not, if they had been identified as women or minority candidates. This package
of materials should be sent to the Dean by departmental or area search committees or to the SVPAA by search committees headed by Deans or Directors. To avoid delays, chairs should alert the Dean and coordinate this process to allow for speedy review. The Dean or the SVPAA will review the documentation for compliance with the University’s equal opportunity policies.

- Under normal circumstances, the number of candidates invited for an interview should be limited to at most three people. Additions above that number require SVPAA approval.

- In contacting candidates to arrange a campus interview, the head of the Search Committee should be careful not to discuss salary issues beyond our institutional commitment to pay at the 95th percentile. Any questions that come up regarding salaries should be referred to the Dean. Candidates should be sent as much information about the position, the department, and the University as possible in advance of their visit. Deans should work with the chair of the search committee to develop the appropriate materials.

**Conducting the campus interview**

- Departments must accept as finalists the candidates identified by the search committee and may not substitute their judgment for the judgment of the search committee. Once the search committee has identified three candidates for a campus visit, the process of submitting recommendations to the Dean normally shifts to the full department, area, or school. Any change from this policy should be clearly agreed upon in advance between the department and the Dean. Some departments, particularly larger ones, may wish to empower the search committee or some subset of the department that includes the search committee, to continue to take a leading role in the interview and selection of prioritized recommendations. In no case should faculty members who have not participated in the search and have not met all the final candidates be allowed to vote in the selection of prioritized recommendations to the Dean. Substitution of video taped interviews or presentations must be approved by the Dean.

- Interviews for faculty positions should normally encompass about a day and a half. Besides an extended interview with the Search Committee, candidates should be scheduled for interviews with department members who are not on the Search Committee, a group of student majors and/or minors (if possible), perhaps faculty members from other departments who might work with the individual, and the Dean. Forty-five minutes should be scheduled for the SVPAA to interview each candidate. Other interviews as appropriate could include library, CAE, or Advancement staff. Everyone meeting the candidate should have a copy of the candidate’s schedule, resume, and application letter. The Dean may request additional information from the candidate and circulate this in advance as well. The candidate should have a copy of his or her schedule with names and job titles of all interviewers well in advance of the campus visit. Various appropriate scoring rubrics, based upon the essential job features as described in the position description, should be made available to all the various groups and individuals who will be evaluating the candidates.
• Candidates for faculty positions should be asked to give a presentation of their research to a meeting of faculty (and, if apt, students), and to conduct a scheduled or mock class during their visit. Because of the centrality of effective teaching to our mission, some vehicle for observing and evaluating the candidates in this area must be part of each campus visit. Students must be given an opportunity to give feedback to the search committee through a written questionnaire or rubric. Student feedback must be part of the justification of the department in making a hiring recommendation to the Dean and SVPAA.

• Given the housing situation in this area, some attempt should be made to acquaint candidates with the realities and possibilities of living accommodations here during their visit. The Office of Human Resources can be helpful in assisting in this regard. Also, during the candidate’s interview with the Dean, there should be a brief discussion of interest, availability, fringe benefits and salary expectations to ensure once again that everyone has a mutual understanding about the position. Wherever possible, candidates should receive a campus tour and a tour of the local area.

• All finalist candidates should be given the opportunity to spend at least 30 minutes with the staff of the Office of Human Resources to discuss benefits, possible needs for reasonable accommodations, etc.

• Interviews for staff positions should normally encompass the better part of a day, but without the expectation that the candidate will spend the night in Fairfield. Again, besides the Search Committee, the candidate should be interviewed by the range of people with whom he/she would be working. Depending on the position, it would be wise to include some faculty members and a Dean (or, if relevant, two) in the interview schedule.

• In arranging an interview trip, the person responsible for the search should explain to the candidate that reasonable travel, lodging and meal expenses will be reimbursed to the candidate. The person responsible for the search must contact the Office of the SVPAA when a candidate is staying overnight, and said office will inform the chair of the search about room availability and make appropriate reservations.

• The entertainment of candidates can be an important part of the interview process. The head of the search committee can pick up a voucher from the SVPAA’s office for lunch in the Faculty Dining Area. Charges for all other meals should be processed through the standard University expense reconciliation procedure. The SVPAA’s Office will insert the recruitment budget number. All meals with candidates should be considered part of the interview process; they are both social and business occasions. Since conversation with the candidate is the prime purpose of the meal, a maximum of three Fairfield employees should accompany the candidate. A modest local dining venue is most appropriate. These opportunities to interact more informally with job candidates should be shared across the faculty.
Selecting the final candidate

- When all the interviews have been conducted, the Search Committee or department should obtain and share opinions from all people who met formally with the candidate. These judgments, as captured on the scoring rubrics or in narrative statements, shall be considered by all department members who by right are involved in the decision concerning whom to recommend to hire. Following appropriate discussion, the search committee or department should recommend, in writing, a rank ordering of the acceptable candidates, and a list of the unacceptable candidates, with a brief statement evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each. These statements should include a judgment as to the role the candidates may make to the Jesuit mission of the University, as expressed in the Faculty Handbook, and in the University’s strategic planning documents. Chairs should make their recommendations to the Dean, and Deans and Directors should make their recommendations to the SVPAA.

- If the Dean does not agree with the recommendations, or if the SVPAA disagrees with the Department, Area, Director or Dean’s recommendation, all parties will work together collegially to attempt a resolution. Only the SVPAA is empowered to extend an offer of employment. In the rare case where unresolved differences remain on faculty appointments, the procedure listed in the Faculty Handbook in II.A.1.a(4) shall apply. If none of the candidates are acceptable to the Search Committee, the members should discuss with the Dean and/or the SVPAA the options of extending, canceling and restarting the search.

- Once there is agreement on the candidate to whom we wish to make a job offer, the responsibility for communicating an offer to the candidate rests solely with the Dean. Deans are also responsible for notifying the Office of Human Resources that a candidate has signed a written offer of employment so that its staff may complete the necessary documentation for employment.

- Exceptions to any of these guidelines by individual schools or departments are welcomed when they are seen to enhance the procedure and enable us to achieve more effectively our fundamental objective, which is to bring to Fairfield University the best, the most intellectually vibrant, the most engaged and apt, and the most diverse faculty and staff that we can find who will enhance and further our Jesuit mission. Such variations must be approved in advance by the Dean and SVPAA.

Thank you for your efforts and your cooperation in these important matters.

Paul Fitzgerald SJ  
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs  
October 10, 2012