ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, December 3, 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 November 5, 2012 (attached)
   b. Correspondence
   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
   f. Subcommittee on Calendar Issues

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

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

7. New business
   a. Academic advising and PINs for registration (attachment)
   b. Budget Committee membership (attachment)
   c. Repeat course policy (attachment)
   d. Procedures governing faculty searches (attachment)
   e. Closure of Radio Concentration (attachment)
   f. Sexual misconduct policy (attachment)
   g. Standard merit for untenured and newly promoted faculty (attachments)

• Lists of Attachments, Pending, and Ongoing Items are on page 2
List of Attachments:
For item 3.a. Minutes from AC meeting of 11/5/12 (pages 3-9)
For item 6.a. Academic Council Executive Committee’s summary of academic grievance timeline issues (pages 10-11)
For item 7.a. Memo from SVPAA regarding registration PINs (pages 12-13)
For item 7.b. Memos from General Faculty Secretary and President regarding composition of Budget Committee (pages 14-16)
For item 7.c. Memo from General Faculty Secretary regarding changes to repeat course policy (pages 17-18)
For item 7.d. Guidelines for Faculty and Academic Staff Recruitment, developed by SVPAA and academic deans (pages 19-25)
For item 7.e. Proposal from VPA to close Radio Concentration, with minutes of relevant committee meetings (pages 26-35)
For item 7.f. Letter from Steve Bayne, Chair of Philosophy, and response from current and former General Faculty Secretaries (pages 36-38)
For item 7.g. Memo from Dean Crabtree re: Standard merit for untenured faculty and FDEC proposal for streamlining merit pay applications, with relevant portions of FDEC minutes (pages 39-40)

Pending Items:
A. Faculty Data Committee (AC 12/3/07).
B. MFA in Creative Writing, Five-Year-Review due in 12/2012 (AC 12/3/07).
C. Re-evaluation of offering both paper and online options for IDEA forms, spring 2013 (AC 5/14/12)
D. Re-evaluation of continued use of “yellow sheet” qualitative evaluations, spring 2014 (AC 5/14/12)
E. AC revisits the accessibility of teaching evaluation data, Due spring 2012. (AC 4/19/10)
F. AC three year review of Merit Appeals Policy, fall 2013. (AC 11/1/10)
G. AC three year review of Intellectual Properties Policy, spring 2014. (AC 3/7/11)
H. MPA, five year review in 2017-2018 (AC 9/10/12)
I. 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
ACADEMIC COUNCIL
Draft Minutes of Meeting on
Monday, November 5, 2012

Present: Professors Steven Bayne, Mousumi Bhattacharya, Nancy Dallavalle, Joe Dennin, Bob Epstein (Executive Secretary), Chris Huntley, Dennis Keenan, (Chair), Ginny Kelly, Wendy Kohli, Phil Lane, Elizabeth Petrino, Susan Rakowitz (General Faculty Secretary), Shawn Rafalski, David Sapp, Joyce Shea, Cheryl Tromley, Roxana Walker-Canton.


FUSA Representative: Robert Vogel.

Invited Guests: Professors Paula Gill Lopez, Meredith Kazer.

Regrets: Prof. David Downie, Deans Jack Beal, Robbin Crabtree.

Chair Keenan called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m., welcomed FUSA representative Rob Vogel, and had everyone introduce themselves.

1. Presidential courtesy.

SVPAA Fitzgerald expressed three mea culpas regarding three items on the agenda under new business: First, for not bringing the course repeat policy that Mary Frances Malone put together to the AC. Second, for the decision to have adjuncts default to online IDEA evaluation forms. Third, for not being able to construct a mechanism for dealing with student registration PINs in accordance with the policy approved by the AC last semester in time for this registration period.

SVPAA Fitzgerald mentioned that the ACEC had discussed revising the Handbook and he mentioned a few items he thought we might want to talk about revising: the section on faculty teaching load, fleshing out faculty obligations with regard to teaching, scholarship, service, and perhaps add something about collegiality. Finally, he mentioned maybe we should revisit the professor of the practice language, because the language does not fit how it has worked out in practice—perhaps creating a second category of senior lecturer.

Chair Keenan asked if there were any questions.

Professor Dennin said that he thought that the practice with professors of the practice should exactly follow what the Handbook describes.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty.

Professor Rakowitz mentioned the need for a new edition of the Handbook and made the following motion:

MOTION [Rakowitz/Second]: The Academic Council authorizes a subcommittee consisting of the current and immediate past GFS to work with the SVPAA’s office to put out the 11th edition of the Handbook.

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

3. Report from the Executive Secretary

a. Approval of minutes of 10/1/12

Corrections: Professor Kohli noted that her name was misspelled on the top of page 7.

MOTION (Lane/ Rafalski): To approve the minutes of October 1, 2012 as amended.
MOTION PASSED: 16 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

b. Correspondence

i. Professor Epstein drew our attention to the correspondence (on page 12 of the packet) from Steve Bayne for the Philosophy Department on the new sexual misconduct policy from the student handbook, and additional correspondence (on pages 13-14 of the packet) from the current and former General Faculty Secretaries.

Professor Rakowitz mentioned that the purpose of the memo from the GFSs was to provide us with the content of the policy referred to in Professor Bayne’s memo, and to let us know that VP Pellegrino contacted both GFSs about the change.

MOTION (Bayne/Lane): To make the changes to the sexual misconduct policy an agenda item at a future AC meeting.

Professor Dallavalle asked whether we wanted to gather facts first before putting this item on an agenda.

Professor Rakowitz mentioned that is why we would want to invite VP Pellegrino to the meeting when we discuss this issue.

Professor Keenan suggested that maybe we can collect together the relevant information and invite the appropriate people to the meeting.

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

ii. Professor Epstein then drew our attention to the memo from Mary Ann Palazzi on Athletic conflicts with final exams. He noted that the only conflict is a men’s basketball game scheduled for a reading day.

Professor Lane asked SVPAA Fitzgerald when this is going to stop. He emphasized that this is a direct violation of policy that there be no games scheduled during exams.

Professor Dennin said he agreed with professor Lane.

Professor Keenan asked whether the AC wants to take up this matter.

SVPAA Fitzgerald said he would forward this issue to the athletic director and, at Professor Lane’s urging, up the administrative chain of command.

4. Council Subcommittee Reports

Professor Epstein said there are no subcommittee reports ready, but he did describe an issue with the subcommittee on broader academic freedom language for governance documents. He noted that this is a three person committee, and one member is on leave this semester. Two subcommittee members want to suspend the subcommittee’s work until member on leave returns in spring. The third member of the subcommittee wanted the work of the subcommittee to continue and raised the issue with the ACEC. Since the subcommittee members were two to one in favor of suspending work, the ACEC decided to take no action.

Professor Bayne stated that this is an important issue and asked whether this means it will just have to wait until Spring.

Professor Rakowitz indicated yes.

Professor Kohli asked whether a replacement could be named.

Professor Rakowitz indicated that we typically do not replace members on subcommittees.
At this point, in order to deal with issues involving invited guests, Professor Epstein made the following motion:

**MOTION (Epstein/Fitzgerald): To reorder the agenda to deal with items 7a and 7b before returning to item 5.**

**MOTION PASSED: 17 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.**

7.a. Report from Committee on Conference on October meeting with Board of Trustees, and Academic Council input for December meeting.

Professor Gill Lopez, Chair of the Committee on Conference (CoC), said she thought the meeting with the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) of the BOT went well, and she emphasized the positive nature of the meeting. Faculty told the members of the Academic Affairs Committee that they were interested in developing a shared agenda and goals. The AAC seemed to be receptive to this idea. They discussed having faculty meet with BOT members over lunch and having faculty presentations. One item AAC members brought up were marketing goals.

SVPAA Fitzgerald agreed that the meeting went very well and thanked professor Gill Lopez for taking charge of this.

Professor Lane (a member of the CoC) noted that the President and the new chair of the BOT (William Atwell) were in attendance, and that this was out of character.

Professor Gill Lopez agreed that this was true prior to this past June. At this meeting she thought there was a collective sigh of relief, but she did not think they will be at the next meeting.

Professor Kohli (a member of the CoC) noted that the faculty’s discussion of a vote of no confidence in the President did not come up.

Chair Keenan asked whether the AC had any suggestions for the next meeting with the AAC.

SVPAA Fitzgerald noted that one of the next major items will be approval of the MPA proposal at the next AAC meeting.

Professor Rakowitz said concerning the MPA that she thought it was fine to inform the board of a new program, but she didn’t think it was wise to have them approve them.

SVPAA Fitzgerald stated that the BOT has always had to approve new programs.

Professor Lane stated that he thought he heard BOT members mention something about a new strategic plan, and he asked SVPAA Fitzgerald whether there was a new strategic plan.

SVPAA Fitzgerald stated that the President has began a conversation about refreshing our current strategic plan. It is on the agenda for the Senior Management Team (SMT) meeting. When asked about the composition of the SMT, SVPAA Fitzgerald noted that it was composed of senior administrators, deans, and select faculty leaders such as the ACEC. He noted, however, that the SMT is a group mostly about information sharing rather than deliberation or decision-making, but he did state that they hope to make it more about in-depth discussion in the future.

Professor Lane stated that the faculty and AC need to have input into any strategic plan.

Professor Kohli returned to the issue of marketing, and she mentioned that there was some grumbling around the table at the meeting with the AAC that we don’t do marketing so well. Professor Kohli said that she hears it from every one of our schools at Fairfield, so that is an issue that should be taken up with the BOT—especially since they brought it up.

Professor Gill Lopez stated that there was consensus that marketing is an issue that we should jointly attend to.
Professor Epstein asked Professor Gill Lopez to let the BOT know that we faculty would be glad to participate in marketing.

Professor Tromley noted that we have a Marketing Department in the School of Business, but university marketing never seems to tap into the Marketing Department’s expertise.

SVPAA Fitzgerald mentioned that we ended up having a surplus last year and some of that money has been used for increasing travel and other funds to support faculty scholarship, but he has also offered faculty expertise to VP for Marketing and Communication Sudhakar, and she seemed receptive.

Professor Epstein noted that faculty would have some ideas about how to spend surpluses.

Chair Keenan thanked Professor Gill Lopez and the rest of the CoC.

7.b. IDEA evaluations for adjuncts.

Chair Keenan called the AC’s attention to pages 18 and 19, and called on Professor Kazer (FDEC representative) to explain the situation.

Professor Kazer said that last year the FDEC was charged with making a recommendation about whether to continue offering both the yellow qualitative evaluation forms and paper IDEA forms along with the online IDEA forms. Their recommendation was to continue both paper and online forms, but they did not make a recommendation concerning which would be the default. The Academic Council accepted the recommendation, but also decided, to her disappointment, to make the paper the default for the IDEA form. Professor Kazer noted that this year the default went back to paper IDEA forms for full-time faculty, but the administration made online IDEA forms the default for part-time faculty.

Professor Epstein asked Professor Kazer why she was disappointed that the default went back to paper.

Professor Kazer said that going back to paper sets us back environmentally. She recognizes that there are concerns over response rate, but she thinks that the paper forms require a lot more paper generation than faculty really want.

SVPAA Fitzgerald noted that his recollection of the AC discussion on this is that especially for pre-tenure junior faculty it is really important to get a high response rate and so we would want them either to use paper or develop methods to raise online response rates. He continued that we try to work with part-time colleagues, but a lot of them never respond to the email prompts to set up their IDEA forms, so for them any data collected is meaningless. Finally he stated that students have a right to evaluate every class, and departments need to have them evaluated.

Professor Bayne asked whether part timers using paper IDEA forms produce any higher rate of the faculty member filling out the IDEA Faculty Information Form (FIF).

SVPAA Fitzgerald said that when part timers use paper IDEA forms, the forms very often never are taken out of their mailboxes.

Professor Sapp said that looking at the data, it seems as if over half of our classes taught by adjuncts, and he wondered whether this was right.

SVPAA Fitzgerald said yes, but that includes a lot of small professional school clinical sections.

Professor Sapp said he was concerned with how this is skewing our data. Since we have so many people not turning in their FIF, their scores will be low, and this data is skewing our overall ratings.

Professor Kohli stated that this is part of a bigger issue with our relationship with our part time faculty, and she wondered whether this is something that will be addressed by the subcommittee on the status of part-time faculty.
Professor Kazer said that faculty own their own data, unless faculty choose to share their data. We have aggregate data, but this does not go into the NEASC accreditation report.

Professor Tromley asked whether the population we are compared to is all universities in the IDEA database, so if our part-timers don’t fill out evaluations, they are not being included.

Professor Kazer replied that if faculty receive paper forms, but don’t distribute them, then there is no data generated at all. The problem is with faculty that don’t fill out the FIF. In these cases, when the evaluations are online, students still get the email notifying them that their evaluations are ready to be filled out, but if the instructor has not filled out the FIF, then they will receive lower scores, which does bring our scores down.

Professor Epstein mentioned that some adjuncts actually get great guidance and take the forms seriously like with EN 11 and 12. The point at hand, he continued, is that faculty said the default was to be paper, but the administration made it online for part time.

Professor Bhattacharya asked whether we should we be concerned about response rate.

Professor Kelly noted that if the default for adjuncts is online evaluations, and the instructor does not fill out the FIF, students still complete them online and so the data is skewed. If adjuncts default to paper, but don’t give out the forms, then we just don’t get the data, but it doesn’t skew the data.

SVPAA Fitzgerald noted that for NEASC reporting we can aggregate the data any way we want and we can find a way to filter out the bad data.

**MOTION (Kelly/Second): The default for the IDEA evaluations should be paper for all part-time faculty.**

SVPAA Fitzgerald spoke against the motion, reiterating that we can get good data, this would just be a waste of paper time money and effort.

Professor Tromley said she was opposed to the motion because of the environmental impact.

Professor Dallavalle stated that the failure to give good guidance on the FIF is just a failure of chairs.

Professor Bayne stated that as the person who made the motion when the AC discussed the IDEA form last year [May 14, 2012], it was his interpretation that when the motion said that the default should be paper, then this applied to all faculty—both full and part-time. As a result, he said he was not sure that this motion was really necessary—we just need to do what the previous motion said.

A discussion of whether this motion was really necessary or in order followed, and subsequently the AC returned to the discussion of the motion on the floor.

Professor Petrino spoke in favor of the motion. She said that paper rates are higher and this is important for assessment purposes.

Professor Sapp said that he didn’t want to be wasteful, but he is just disturbed by the numbers.

**MOTION (Dennin/Second): To call the question.**

**MOTION PASSED: 15 in favor, 1 opposed, and 0 abstentions.**

**MOTION on the floor PASSED: 9 in favor, 7 opposed, and 1 abstention.**

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

**Altering the academic calendar for the remainder of the semester to try to recuperate some of the class time lost last week as a result of hurricane Sandy.**
Professor Epstein distributed printed copies of the three possibilities that were previously distributed to AC members by email.

Professor Rakowitz went through the options:

A: We do nothing systematic. We simply say that a week of class time is gone, and we move on with no change to the academic calendar. Faculty are free to seek a particular solution for themselves.

B: To add two class days to the end of the semester by dropping the third reading day and condensing final exams, plus making a number of small changes to some class meeting times over the remainder of the semester. This option would recoup between 75 and 150 minutes for each course, depending on the time code.

C: To hold classes on three Saturdays over the next five weeks, calling one a Monday, the second a Wednesday and the third a Friday, while still adding time to T-Th turbos and time code 2N. This option would recoup between fifty and 150 minutes per class, depending on the time code.

SVPAA Fitzgerald noted that with option B that Accounting and Modern Languages will be asked to give up their own final exam time blocks, students will still not be required to take more than two final exams in one day, and that whatever changes we propose it will be an option up to individual faculty. Faculty that are not able to meet during the additional times will of course not be forced to hold those classes—ought implies can.

Professor Lane said he wants to speak for students—he believes that this is a waste of time. Students aren’t going to miss having a couple fewer of our classes.

Professor Dallavalle said that she thinks it is important for us to say that our class time is important.

Professor Rafalski said that he thought it is too late in the semester to manage option C.

FUSA President Vogel mentioned that he does not like the idea of having five straight days of exams, and he would avoid changing times or time codes, but the loss of reading days in B is not such a big deal.

Professor Bayne mentioned the difficulties that any changes would present for part-time faculty, who may already have commitments elsewhere.

Professor Walker-Canton Roxana mentioned a suggestion from Kathy Schwab that we should make up time not by adding days, but by requiring students to attend a certain number of other campus events.

Chair Keenan noted from our discussion that it seemed as if option C was out, so the debate seemed to be between option B or doing nothing systematic [option A]. He wondered whether anyone was interested in making a motion for our adopting option B, so we could discuss it and vote it up or down.

Professor Dennin noted that if we adopt B, the new exam schedule would not be optional for individual faculty.

MOTION (Dennin/Fitzgerald): To adjust the academic calendar for the remainder of the semester by adding two days at the end of the end of the semester, adding twenty minutes to all remaining M, T, W turbo class meetings, adding 25 minutes to three non-Wednesday three times a week classes, adding time to all remaining 2G time code classes, dropping one final exam reading day, taking away the Accounting and Modern Languages special exam periods, and condensing the final exam period.

Professor Lane spoke against the motion because he believed that anything that changes the final exam schedule will make it harder to return to normal.
Professor Epstein thought that option B is not terribly disruptive. It is not that complicated—we are just going to have two more class days. We have missed class time, and this would be a uniform way of saying faculty can make up time in this way.

Professor Shea said that no one is comfortable in making changes—it will never be normal, but there are classes that do need to cover all the material. For those that can’t afford to lose the time, this is a reasonable way to make it up.

SVPAA Fitzgerald spoke in favor of the motion, and he mentioned that it will be important for us to be flexible with students who work or have internships and also not to schedule an exam or other high stakes activities during the times that classes are extended.

Professor Rafalski asked how much will this change the exam schedule.

FUSA President Vogel thought that some students will just say we had a hurrication, but some students will want to get their time. He then asked whether there was any reason not to have an extra reading day in the middle of those five straight days.

Professor Dennin suggested we could leave Saturday as an exam day and put the reading day somewhere else.

Professor Epstein said, just keep in mind the normality of the schedule.

**MOTION (Dallavalle/Second): To call the question.**

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

**MOTION on the floor PASSED: 11 in favor, 4 opposed, and 0 abstentions.**

**MOTION [Dennin/Lane] to adjourn.**

Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven M. Bayne
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.**
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.*
Guidelines for Faculty and Academic Staff Recruitment

The hiring of the people who work at Fairfield University is one of the most important activities 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:

1. curriculum vitae,  
2. graduate transcripts,  
3. three letters of recommendation from qualified reviewers,  
4. sample syllabi of courses taught if available,  
5. teaching evaluations if available,  
6. a personal statement covering teaching philosophy, research plan, and experience of - or interest in - working with people of diverse cultures and identities, and  
7. 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
Memo

To: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
   Educational Planning Committee
   Academic Council

From: Mark Scalese, SJ
       New Media: Film, Television & Radio Program Director

CC: Mary Frances Malone, Associate Academic Vice President
    Robin Crabtree, Dean of College of Arts & Sciences
    Manyul Im, Associate Dean, College of Arts & Sciences
    Laura Nash, Chair, Department of Visual & Performing Arts
    Susan Rakowitz, General Faculty Secretary

Date: September 6, 2012

Re: Closure of Radio Track

The New Media: Film, Television and Radio program is revising its curriculum and changing its name to “Film, Television, and Media Arts.” The details and rationale for those changes are described in the enclosed attachments. To date, the revisions received approved from the Department of Visual & Performing Arts on March 7, 2012, and from the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee on May 8, 2012. (See enclosed attachments.)

(Note: the March 19, 2012 date of the enclosed proposal post-dates the VPA meeting of March 7 and reflects changes suggested by the department at that time.)

This memo seeks approval to drop the Radio Track from our curriculum. We do so for the following reasons:

1. Since New Media became a major program of study in the Spring 2005 semester, only 3-4 students have graduated as Radio majors.
2. Our last Radio major graduated in 2010 and currently none of our students are majoring or minoring in Radio.

3. While WVOF continues to enjoy healthy student participation in music or sports programming, none of that has resulted in additional Radio majors to our program.

Consequently, we seek permission to formally close the Radio Track as we move forward with our revised Film, Television, and Media Arts program.

At the suggestion of Associate Academic Vice President Malone, we have included the following language in this year’s undergraduate catalog: "A revised curriculum of the New Media Program is undergoing approval as this catalog goes to press. The curriculum below applies to majors in the classes of 2013-15. Majors in the class of 2016 should consult with their academic advisors to ensure they take the courses necessary for graduation in the new curriculum."

AAVP Malone has ascertained that we need to secure all necessary internal approvals for our curriculum revision before submitting them to the state. Furthermore, having obtained those internal approvals, we may begin implementing the revised curriculum before receiving formal state approval. We would like to begin doing so at the beginning of the Spring 2013 semester. Therefore, we respectfully ask the various committees addressed by this memo to consider our request as expeditiously as possible.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
New Media Curriculum Revision
Minutes and Correspondence

DEPARTMENT OF VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS
Approved minutes of the meeting of March 7th, 2012 (Excerpt)

Location: CNS 8
In attendance: Chamlin, Walker-Canton, Eliasoph, Mayzik, Schneck, Porter, Rose, Haas, Scalese, Torff, Schwab, LoMonaco, Nash, Grossman
On Sabbatical: Yarrington
Leave: Sage

New Media Program Curriculum Revisions: Professor Porter circulated copies of the New Media Program Curriculum Proposal and explained to the VPA faculty that the New Media Program has been working on some exciting changes to their curriculum based on the five year review that took place last year.

Professor Scalese, S.J. summarized the structure of the document and then elaborated on the major revisions that are being proposed. First, Professor Scalese, S.J. announced that the Program is seeking to change the name of the program from New Media to Film Television and Media Arts as it reflects more accurately the focus of the program. Professor Scalese, S.J. noted that along with the change in name, the program will de-emphasize the “tracking” of Film and Television and eliminate the Radio program entirely. In addition to the de-emphasis of tracking, the program has decided upon six courses that all students in the program will take in their first two years which will give majors the foundations necessary to succeed in the upper level classes. The goal is to normalize the curriculum so that all students gain a broader understanding of the artforms themselves before getting more in depth on one particular aspect or genre. This change evolved from the realization that currently students in the program can take classes in-depth on one particular subject without getting a broad view of the artform. Professor Scalese, S.J. noted that there will still be variations in History/Theory courses that will focus more specifically on Film or Television that students can take to fulfill the major requirements based on their individual interests and professional goals. The Program has also decided to add an additional History/Theory requirement to the major curriculum. Course additions that are being proposed for the major are broad courses that will provide overviews of the art-forms themselves.

Prof. Scalese led a presentation of the proposed changes to the New Media curriculum. He noted that certain classes will be revised in order to shift from the 100 level to the 200 level. Professor Scalese also explained the requirement for majors to take two capstone classes resulting in a full year senior capstone. The plan is to begin next year meeting with sophomores in the program and start talking to them about their senior capstone projects. This will allow for students to be advised on courses based on their ultimate interests, which will then be reflected in their senior capstone project.
Professor Scalese, S.J. noted that the program is planning within the next year to propose an intermediate screenwriting course. The other option is to offer an umbrella independent study course which could be feature screenwriting. Currently the program is not sure if there are enough students interested in screenwriting to warrant a dedicated class or to offer the independent study in screenwriting. The program is also starting to suggest that students take CO 130 [Mass Media and Society] as one of their social studies core classes. Professor Scalese, S.J. noted that Appendix B of the proposal defines the current major requirements.

Professor Porter asked Professor Scalese to summarize what major changes are being proposed aside from the change in name and the de-emphasis on the tracks that currently exist within the program.

Professor Scalese, S.J. responded that since the program is requiring another history/theory course be taken, the program is thus requirements from 2 history/theory classes to 3 with one class at the 200 level. Professor Scalese, S.J. noted that the courses are mostly the same, but the organization of the curriculum will be different based on when in the four year period we recommend certain courses to be taken. Professor Mayzik added that a major change in the history/theory courses is that they are going to focus on both film and television instead of there being one history/theory course on film and one history/theory course on television.

Professor Eliasoph suggested that New Media use language that emphasizes the connection to the core and the alignment of the program goals and objectives to a liberal arts and humanities curriculum. Professor Eliasoph stated that embracing a slight change of attitude and humanities focused language will ensure that students know they are here to study within the larger context of liberal arts education and not in BFA type program.

Professor Scalese responded that currently, the faculty within the program try to be very mindful to create connections to the core and teach courses within that context of liberal arts education. Professor Scalese, S.J. added that the program is quite deliberately making the early classes contain a writing component.

Professor Walker Canton added that the Program is introducing a few new classes as well as renumbering and making a few courses have prerequisites in order to make sure students are building upon and connecting to courses in the greater liberal arts setting.

Professor Scalese, S.J. explained the various appendixes noting that they contain a first draft of what courses to offer each semester in order to make sure that enough sections are offered in those foundation classes so that students can fulfill all major requirements in the optimal sequence.

Professor Scalese, S.J. added that the program expects upwards of 20 students per year.

Professor Porter clarified that since the proposed classes teach both film and television, it is easy for students to make crossover connections between the two artforms and do not have to worry about how to fit an interesting film class into the television major. Professor Scalese, S.J. confirmed but noted that most students end up working professionally in television.

Professor Nash stated that she is interested in hearing more about the history and analysis classes and questioned what the content of a course with that designation would be.
Professor Scalese, S.J. stated that the first two courses a student would take are combinations of surveys of relevant topics (be it world cinema, American cinema, television) and the class would focus on how to decode film and how to write critically and intelligently about film and how to analyze film from a critical perspective. Professor Walker-Canton added that these classes already exist and this is already the manner in which those classes are taught. Professor Scalese added that topics might include: how does the audio communicate the film, the structure, the theme, the character juxtaposition etc.

Professor Nash noted that the word analysis is a great word to show what you are doing. Professor Nash asked whether there is any importance in the chronological order of the classes with relation to the subject and its place in history? Professor Haas answered that in the survey class, the content is presented more chronologically whereas a genre class is more about the form and genre and less about the chronological place of the film in history. Professor Walker-Canton added that if students want to pursue a more distinctive study of a particular genre, they will take a class in that genre; however, all students will get a broad overview of various genres and time periods in those six designated intro classes.

Professor Porter noted that this is a big change since in the past students were able to fulfill the major requirements by taking a Western class and a Hitchcock class without having any study in the other parts of the artform. Professor Nash asked whether there was a difference between the words film and cinema and if so what the difference is. Professor Walker-Canton noted that yes there is a difference. Professor Haas elaborated that film is the artifact of the film whereas cinema is the zeitgeist or cultural surroundings of the world.

Professor Porter pointed out that the program is going from a 30 hour major to a 36 hour major. This is the first time a VPA major will be that big. Professor Porter questioned whether there are other majors that big and whether there are precedents that we should be following. Professor Grossman stated that yes there are many more majors with that high of a load and many with even more. Professor Mayzik, S.J. added that English has a 36 hour major. Professor Porter stated that it is important that we are within the bounds of precedents. Professor Walker-Canton added that this artform has a science component in that we have to include the science of technology so that students become proficient. Professor Mayzik, S.J. noted that the increase in credit hours is due to the increase of the number of history/theory requirements. Professor Nash questioned the reasoning behind the 4 credit lab courses. Professor Walker-Canton explained that part of the thought of the LABs is that in many courses, first the films must be screened and then there needs to be a discussion. Professor Porter acknowledged that New Media’s challenge is that there is not a Theatre Fairfield or something like that to act as the lab experience outside of the classes. Your challenge is that you have to incorporate every element into the academic experience.
Professor Schwab questioned the logistics behind taking the same course twice (e.g., Filmmaker Studies). Professor Schwab asked whether there is a code to show that they are in fact two separate courses so that there is no redundancy on transcripts and in the registrar’s office. Professor Scalese noted that the dean suggested adding that certain courses could be taken twice in the language. Professor Schwab noted that VPA has been asked to make this clearer in the past and suggested giving examples in parentheses such as Film Genres: (Noir, Western, Silent etc.) Professor Porter confirmed that each course would receive its own code in the registrar to ensure transcript clarity.

Professor Schwab questioned whether there was in New Media a venue or program that could run during the semester like theatre Fairfield that would create an outlet for student work. It may not need to be required by majors, but may be very interesting as far as visibility within the campus community. Perhaps there would be value in having more than one film festival per year and showcase student work at two different intervals and maybe open it up to students who are not necessarily majors.

Professor Porter asked New Media about the possible BFA noted on the first page and whether it was suggested by the Dean. Professor Scalese noted that the program has made moves on that topic yet but it was included as an option that could be considered in the future.

Professor Porter noted that the department learning outcomes are missing from the proposal and that the program has done the work and should include it in either the narrative or as an appendix to the document.

Professor Eliasoph made the motion that the VPA faculty warmly endorse the curricular changes, while applauding New Media’s diligence in revamping the program. Next steps were discussed, and Professor Scalese, S.J. agreed to revise the documentation per the suggestions of the VPA faculty. Then the document will go to the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee. The faculty voted with enthusiastic unanimous support in favor of the proposed curriculum revisions to the New Media Program, pending suggested revisions. Professor Eliasoph concluded by saying that the VPA department is enthusiastic about the proposed changes to the New Media Program.
Present: Dean Robbin Crabtree, Anita Fernandez, Johanna Garvey (scribe), Jerelyn Johnson (Chair), Scott Lacy, Doug Peduti, Vin Rosivach, Giovanni Ruffini, Roxana Walker-Canton, Qin Zhang, Tommy Xie

Guests: Shannon Harding, Mark Scalese, David Crawford

IV. New Media Curriculum Revision

Mark Scalese presented the document, explaining that the revisions are the result of a five-year review of the new major, examining how to improve it. The process has gone through stages of evaluating, creating ideas, and then revising.

Peduti asked if these are major revisions. Scalese said that the existing name included “radio,” but few students had interest in that area. “New Media” was deceiving, intended to convey that traditional media converge today. But the term is more technical—including the web, non-linear story-telling, participatory media, installations (e.g., Professor Walker-Canton’s in February 2012). Originally there was a single-semester capstone, but that was not long enough, requiring a full year. They took away one elective to add a second semester of the capstone. For the category Historical Analysis, students could pick and choose without a broad, canonical introduction to texts. It seemed good to make it three courses, which removed an elective. So they looked at the whole picture as they made the revisions.

Discussion ensued on the number of credits required and on when a student must start the major. A second-semester sophomore could start the major but would need almost all core completed and would still have to take six NM courses per year. The new courses linked to the proposal have not yet gone through the approval process in VPA. Other questions arose concerning double-counting courses with media courses in Communication (Scalese said they are open to that possibility), the possibility of Professor Xie’s Digital Journalism course counting in the Production sequence, and more discussion of electives in the newly revised major. Dean Crabtree asked about the capstone experience, and Scalese noted that a student from this year’s course won the Arts & Sciences Award.

Discussion ensued on options within the major.

MOTION to endorse the revised proposal for New Media curriculum (Walker-Canton, Xie)

Discussion: Rosivach asked whether these changes mean it needs to go beyond the A&SCC. Crabtree said that we need to consult Mary Frances Malone: it may not need to go to Academic Council, EPC, UCC. Notification needs to go to the State because it is a degree name change. We should send it to Mary Frances Malone and note what is revised. Rosivach said that the key question is whether it requires state notification or approval; the latter requires that it go through all committees.
Johnson asked whether the revision affects the core. Walker-Canton said that it removes many courses from the core. Crabtree said that we add and sunset courses all the time, so it is not necessary for the UCC to see the revisions on that score. Rosivach said that the J of R is very literal about our core curriculum.

Dean Crabtree noted that the new design has more sequencing and she worries about students who start the major late, though that situation is parallel to science majors. Bottlenecks may hem in the faculty, she noted.

Rosivach said that he tells first-year students that it is OK to be undeclared. If we offer that advice, we better offer the course. It is understood for the sciences that the curricula are so heavily weighted (they receive a BS, not a BA). WE recognize that rigidity, but we should keep all BA majors as accessible as possible for first- and second-year students.

Johnson asked how may courses are offered each semester—is it really sixteen? Walker-Canton said yes, though a few do alternate; they have three full-time faculty and some adjuncts; it seems more rigid than it is, and students can jump into foundational courses at any time. Crabtree again expressed concerns about the hierarchical structure. Walker-Canton said that they have dealt with students case-by-case; using permission of the instructor and being open to adjustments.

MOTION to call the question (Ruffini/Garvey)

Question is called 7-2-1

MOTION to endorse the revisions passes 9-1-0

Respectfully submitted,
Johanna X. K. Garvey

May 23, 2012

Dear Mark,

As Chair of the Arts and Science Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you about the committee's decision regarding the Department of Visual and Performing Art's proposal for a revision of the New Media: Film, Television and Radio Program. Your proposal to change the title of the program to Film, Television, and Media Arts has been approved. All other program revisions have been approved as well, congratulations!

As I discussed with you, we are in the process of ascertaining what further approval is needed for your proposed changes and we will advise you as soon as we know what is needed. Please find attached the excerpted minutes from our meeting that you will need to accompany the proposal if it indeed needs further approval through UCC and beyond.
Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or need further clarification.

All the best,
Jerelyn

Jerelyn Johnson, PhD
Associate Professor, Department of Modern Languages and Literatures
Chair, Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee
Fairfield University

Email from Giovanni Ruffini, chair of UCC, on Sept. 11, 2012

Hi Mark - just a quick note to thank you for your appearance at the UCC today and to let you know that the UCC approved unanimously the proposal to eliminate the radio track. I will pass our approval to the next step up in the food chain. Thanks,
Giovanni Ruffini
Chair, UCC

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING
minutes of the meeting of September 11, 2012 (Excerpt)


5 (again). Old business: New Media program revisions: Prof. Scalese explained that as part of their reaccreditation New Media wanted to close down its Radio track, which would need UCC approval. Responding to a question from Prof. Kris Prof. Scalese said that the reason for closing the track was lack of interest: only three students had graduated in the track since spring 2005, the last in 2010. He continued that it had been the hope that coordinating with WVOF might channel more students into the program, but while students have been involved with WVOF this had not led to any increase in the number of students in the Radio track.

Prof. Fernandez observed that if there was no interest in the Radio track there seemed no point in keeping it going, and moved to endorse the closure of the Radio track. There was no further discussion, and the motion was unanimously approved.
Approved Minutes (Excerpt)
Educational Planning Committee
October 18, 2012

Present: Lynn Babington, Peter Bayers, Susan Franzosa, Catherine Giapponi, Sheila Grossman, Olivia Harriott, Evagelia Billias Lolis, Mark Scalese, Carl Scheraga, Christopher Staecker, Qin Zhang

Absent: Paul Fitzgerald

Meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. on October 18, 2012

Item 2 Proposal for Revision of New Media: Film, Television, and Radio Program to Film, Television and Media Arts Program

Prof. Scalese presented an overview of the proposed revisions to the New Media: Film, Television, and Radio Program. The revisions include a change in the name of the program from New Media: Film, Television, and Radio Program to Film, Television and Media Arts Program. The proposed revisions would eliminate the Radio Track from the curriculum. The proposed changes were approved by the Department of Visual and Performing Arts, the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee, and the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

Prof. Scalese explained that the proposed changes are the result of a five year review of the program that began in 2010. The revisions included curricular changes that: increased the number of history/analysis courses from 2 to 3 courses; added a two semester senior capstone; increased the number of required courses for the major from 11 to 12 courses; eliminated separate media tracks; eliminated the radio program entirely. In the first two years of the program, students take the same six classes which are foundation courses that provide a broad overview of film/TV production. The advanced sequence of courses taken junior and senior years provides an opportunity to specialize.

In addition to the curricular changes, the Department proposed a change in title to more accurately reflect media today. The term “new media” was deceiving. It has a more formal meaning that includes non-linear storytelling, web, participatory media, etc. and, therefore, was dropped from the program name. Since radio was eliminated from the program, it was dropped from the title, as well. Film, Television, and Media Arts most accurately represents the focus of the program.

Prof. Staecker made a motion to approve the Department Visual and Performing Arts proposal. Prof. Grossman seconded the motion.

Professor Zhang asked how many radio courses are currently offered. Prof. Scalese indicated that the Department has not offered a radio course in two years. There are no full-time faculty with radio experience and currently there are no students majoring or minoring in radio.

The motion was unanimously approved by the committee.
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-101(b), 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).
From: "Crabtree, Robbin" <RCrabtree@fairfield.edu>
Date: September 18, 2012 11:05:00 AM EDT
To: "Epstein, Robert" <REpstein@fairfield.edu>
Cc: "Rakowitz, Susan" <SRakowitz@fairfield.edu>, "Fitzgerald, Paul" <pfitzgerald@fairfield.edu>
Subject: Request for AC to change JOR language on Merit Plan re: untenured faculty

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 pointed out that if a person wants additional merit they would need to apply regardless of their situation. 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 Abbott 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.