1. Presidential courtesy

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
   a. Approval of minutes of December 3, 2012 (attached)
   b. Correspondence
   c. Oral reports

4. Council Subcommittee Reports
   a. Subcommittee to consider proposing IDEA form for administrators
   b. Subcommittee on broader academic freedom language for governance documents
   c. Subcommittee on the status of part-time faculty
   d. Subcommittee on calendar issues
   e. Subcommittee on sexual misconduct policies

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

6. Old Business
   a. Student grievance timeline (attachment)

7. New business
   a. Proposal for Master of Liberal Studies (attachment)
   b. UCC proposal on Core language requirement, in response to GF motion (attachments)
   c. UCC proposal on final exam policy (attachments)
   d. UCC proposal on revision of University College representation (attachments)
   e. Academic advising and PINs for registration (attachment)
   f. Budget Committee membership (attachment)
   g. Repeat course policy (attachment)
   h. Procedures governing faculty searches (See attachment on pp. 19-25 of AC packet for 12/3/12)
   i. Standard merit for untenured and newly promoted faculty (attachment)
   j. Regularization of language in Handbook and Journal of Record (Pending Item I, attachment)

• Lists of Attachments, Pending, and Ongoing Items are on page 2
List of Attachments:
For item 3.a. Minutes from AC meeting of 12/3/12 (pages 3-11)
For item 6.a. Academic Council Executive Committee’s summary of academic grievance timeline issues (pages 12-13)
For items 7.b.-d. Memo from Giovanni Ruffini, Chair of UCC (pages 68-69)
For item 7.b. Memo from Chair of UCC regarding Core language requirements (pages 70-71)
For item 7.c. Memo from Chair of UCC regarding final exam policy (page 72)
For item 7.d. Memo from Chair of UCC regarding University College representation (page 73)
For items 7.b.-d. Excerpted minutes of UCC meetings, Sept.-Dec. 2012 (pages 74-82)
For item 7.e. Memo from SVPAA regarding registration PINs (pages 83-84)
For item 7.f. Memos from General Faculty Secretary and President regarding composition of Budget Committee (pages 85-87)
For item 7.g. Memo from General Faculty Secretary regarding changes to repeat course policy (pages 88-89)
For item 7.i. 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 90-91)
For item 7.j. Memo from ACEC regarding regularization of language in Handbook and Journal of Record (pages 92-93)

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 2014 (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, December 3, 2012

Present: Professors Steven Bayne, Mousumi Bhattacharya, Nancy Dallavalle, Joe Dennin, David Downie, Bob Epstein (Executive Secretary), Chris Huntley, Dennis Keenan, (Chair), Ginny Kelly, 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: Profs. Olivia Harriott, (item 4d) and Mark Scalese, S.J. (item 7e), VP Tom Pellegrino and Dean Karen Donoghue (item 7f)

Regrets: Prof. Wendy Kohli.

Chair Keenan called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

1. Presidential courtesy

SVPAA Fitzgerald S.J. announced that Professor David Sapp has been appointed Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. He would have most of the responsibilities that Beth Boquet had under the same role.

SVPAA Fitzgerald S.J. updated the committee on admissions cycle. This year’s early applicant pool is 12% larger than last year’s. This is early action, not binding - 4892 early action applications, more AHANA categories, twice the number of international applicants. Dolan School of Business applications continue to climb; it is 29% this year. This year we continue to be test optional; SAT scores have jumped up 20 points. Next step is to bring admitted students to campus to make deeper connections. Admitted students (early action, early decision and regular decision) will be given the opportunity to meet the Deans and the faculty. This will create a deeper connection to Fairfield and help drive yield.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

Professor Rakowitz reported that she has received a working draft from senior management team on the strategic plan "refresh". She pointed out that it should start in Educational Planning Committee (EPC) for faculty input.

Dean Crabtree said there is one factual correction. Strategic planning draft is developed from respective school faculty plans. So it was vetted by faculty.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary

a. Approval of minutes of November 5, 2012

   MOTION (Lane /Petrino): To approve the draft minutes of Nov 5, 2012.

   MOTION PASSED: 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.

b. Correspondence - none

c. Oral reports - none
4. Council Subcommittee Reports

4d. Subcommittee to consider the implications of moving to Division III Athletics

Professor Harriott reported on Varsity Athletic spending (see report attached)

Mark Reed, Vice President for Administration, attended the third meeting of the subcommittee and provided data on Varsity Athletic spending. The data comes from NCAA database. Fairfield University spends above the MAAC average, but is on par with local schools (Quinnipiac, Holy Cross) on expense as a percentage on total. The subcommittee had a lengthy discussion with Reed. On the issue of moving to Division III, Reed pointed out that it has not been done by our local schools. Recommendations of the subcommittee are on the report. One of the main recommendations is that the Athletics department needs to rationalize spending and make the outcomes more transparent.

Professor Keenan: What would a Division III move signify?

Professor Hariott: The subcommittee talked about Loyola Maryland moving out of the MAAC.

Professor Sapp: A major expense is travel. Our cost would go up if we change conferences, for example if we join Patriot League.

Professor Huntley: We need additional endowment to get into other leagues.

Professor Tromley: One school had successfully made the transition - Cornell went back in four months to Division I from Division III.

Professor Dallavalle: Is it possible to look at a particular game, men’s Lacrosse, to see whether one sport can be downgraded?

Professor Lane: It is not possible.

Professor Epstein: Fairfield has 20 sports and 60 coaches. Are all these coaches are full time?

Professor Sapp: No.

Professor Epstein: I would like to know the breakdown between full time and part time. Also, how do we judge the academic performance of students?

Professor Huntley: The Golf team has 3.6 average GPA. The Athletic department has a goal of maintaining GPA, Fairfield has one of the highest graduation rates among athletes.

Professor Harriott: VP Reed said that moving to division 3 would signal financial problems and that would be bad for morale.

Professor Epstein: Did anyone point out to VP Reed that forcing the faculty and staff to accept financial sacrifices on account of a financial crisis also signals financial problems and is bad for morale?

Professor Huntley: The subcommittee specifically brought up the increase in salary, $400,000 from 2010 to 2011. It turns out that was due to hiring in the basketball program.

Professor Epstein: Part of it was that we were hiring the basketball coach away from the university with the highest per capita endowment in the world.

Professor Dennin: There are two types of sports - Red and white, red are the good ones. We have the red sports, the more expensive ones.

Professor Dallavalle: It seems to me that a variety of factors can be used to judge performance.
Professor Bhattacharya: Are there numbers for attendance, viewership?

Professor Lane asked Professor Harriott whether the subcommittee received goals from the President for Athletics. Professor Harriott replied that the goals are not transparent.

Professor Lane: The University of Chicago and City University of New York are Division III. NCAA provides these goals - ethnic background, grow leaders, balance male/female, financial benefit? to the university, entertainment to students. However, we do not have goals and objectives here. 16 million dollars is a high expense.

Professor Harriott: The Dashboard of the NCAA database has 26 indicators; the subcommittee had access using the President’s code.

Professor Keenan: Are schools measuring these goals?

Professor Lane: They are hard to measure; but if your spending is high, you need to measure them.

Professor Walker-Canton: Have there been any cuts in Athletics department?

Professor Lane: No.

Professor Walker-Canton: What are the problems of Division III?

Professor Lane: Wesleyan etc. are not going to take us in Division III.

Professor Huntley: Our expenses would be up.

Professor Harriott said that the issue of lack of transparency is not unique to Fairfield. To address it the NCAA database dashboard was revamped in 2008. Only the President and VP Reed have access to it.

Professor Tromley: What impact can the Academic Council have in this process? We can’t even change the exam schedule.

Professor Rakowitz asked why expenses doubled over 2004-2012.

Dean Crabtree: One factor, as presented to the Budget Committee, is that sports information moved from the Marketing Division to the Athletics Division. We do not have a comparative Marketing picture to see if its expenses were adjusted.

Professor Huntley: We can see decisions made in prior years.

SVPAA Fitzgerald S.J.: A faculty member is on the Athletics Committee, so faculty have oversight regarding the athletic budget. A vibrant athletics adds to University life. The white sports coaches are not full time. All athletes have higher than average GPA. Coaches cut up scholarship monies and spread it among students. A lot of it converts into need based aid.

Vogel (Student representative): MAAC doesn’t really do anything from the competition aspect. Only Loyola matters. He would be personally against it. Lot of schools in the Patriot League are comparable institutions. We should be doing all things that Professor Lane mentions.

Professor Lane: When strategic planning was done, a consultant was brought in. He was asked whether he should consider Division III? He said no, he was a Division I player. We lost an opportunity in hockey. Lacrosse has become too expensive; we are a basketball school. Women sports are getting ahead of it. We need revenue statistics on individual sports, cost statistic on individual sports, total number of scholarships to men and women.

Professor Harriott said that we have sport by sport break down.
Professor Epstein recommend that the discussion be moved to the Athletics Committee

**MOTION (EPSTEIN/SAPP):** The discussion on Varsity Athletics spending, based on the Academic subcommittee report be moved to the Athletics Committee.

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

Professor Huntley noted that he is appointed NCAA representative by the President. He succeeded Milo Peck. He represents an athlete when no one else would. He works for the President, not the athletics department. He scrutinizes the Budget. Leaving MAAC has a huge penalty. We need to see what Georgetown, Seton Hall, Providence are doing.

Professor Epstein requested that AC rearrange the agenda to bring in New Business as a guest is waiting.

**MOTION (EPSTEIN/LANE):** To move New Business before agenda item number 5.

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

7. New Business

**e. Closure of Radio concentration**

Professor Scalese S.J. from Visual and Performing Arts formally requested the Academic Council to support closure of the Radio component of the Film, Television and Media Arts program. This is a recommendation from the five-year review of the program. The program was approved as a major in 2004, began in Spring 2005. It was reviewed because it is a new program. The reasons for this recommendation are: first we have had very few radio majors – the last major to graduate was in 2010; nobody is majoring in radio now. Second, there is disparity between film majors and TV majors. We want to balance it. Film majors perceive they are getting more attention. Third, we want students to have a broader experience. Compared to others, they can now have a narrow but deep major. We would move the history requirement from 2 to 3.

Professor Rakowitz mentioned that the curriculum revisions have undergone review. We only need to review the Radio closure. Also the name of the major would need to be changed as it would go into the Journal of Record.

**MOTION (LANE/DOWNIE):** To close Radio track and change the name of the New Media: Film, Television and Radio program to Film, Television, and Media Arts.

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

**f. Sexual misconduct policy**

Chair Keenan directed the Committee to pages 36-37 of the Meeting Agenda packet.

Tom Pellegrino, Vice President for Student Affairs, described the policy for faculty if students come to them and report sexual misconduct. There is current discussion in Hartford about a change to the state requirement for reporting misconduct to appropriate authorities. The Federal Law is not very clear. The Clery Act, Title IX, Title VII provide guidelines. Are faculty members campus security authorities? Generally, the answer is no under the Clery Act. Title VII has provisions for sexual harassment in the workplace – if you are a supervisor of an employee, you need to report a sexual assault. Title IX adds sexual harassment to be reported, in addition to
assault. We were called by the Connecticut State Legislature on a series of hearings. Some Fairfield employees are already mandated to report, the State is not there yet but is likely going to expand the categories of mandated reporters. We can have our own policy based on different groups. Recommendation of general authorities is to have a reporting policy. Title IX coordinators should decide how to report when complaints come in. UConn and Wesleyan are reporting. So we felt that we should be reporting too. To sum up, there are three federal statutes that require some reporting for some groups. The State is poised to do something. A lot of schools have changed their policies. One question, what about the confidentiality relationship between faculty and student – point is that confidentiality is not a legal requirement. It is not protected by statutes.

Professor Walker-Canton: if a victim comes and talk about it, not report it, and is over 18, why should we be reporting it?

VP Pellegrino: In the majority of such circumstances it is necessary to find the access points (faculty, residence life, public safety). You give them options, for example a brochure. Yes, faculty is required to report it, under our policy.

Professor Dallavalle: Is it correct that “reporting” is not equivalent to “filing” a complaint?

VP Pellegrino: Yes

Dean Crabtree: Dawn DeBiase in my office is one of the trained people. I have asked her to write up a script. “Just so you know I am a mandated reporter, I can put you in touch with a confidential reporter who is not a mandated reporter.” It may have a chilling effect but also give them a resource.

Professor Rafalski: What is the status of a faculty member who is a mentor?

VP Pellegrino: Same as everybody else. An argument can be made that you may have an increased responsibility.

Professor Rafalski: We may have confessional responsibility.

VP Pellegrino: The law expects increased responsibility if it goes to court.

Professor Bayne: Is it true that charges would not be automatically filed if something is reported? It is the right of the victim to decide whether or not to press charges. Would Security contact the victim?

VP Pellegrino: The university’s Title IX agent does the investigation, Security is the first responder. An investigation can end quite quickly. The University can proceed if it can have effect on the community. The university counsel decides whether to continue with an investigation.

Professor Bayne: Suppose an assignment in class reveals sexual misconduct. Does the faculty member have to report it?

VP Pellegrino: If the student is giving you information for an assignment, not for discussing the incident, it is not a claim. So a fair argument can be made that it is outside the purview.

Professor Bayne: Office hour discussions? Are they reportable?

VP Pellegrino: My inclination is no. You can have Title IX investigator proceed on it.

SVPAA Fitzgerald S.J.: What are the values in our community? Every person merits respect. Sexual harassment is rampant in society. If it comes from an employee to a student there is a power differential involved. When such knowledge comes to the attention of a faculty member,
this is the point of the reporting responsibility. I have been part of a few investigations. It is a
good thing because sometimes the victims step up and make a complaint, the bad behavior is
investigated and stopped, and it is not repeated on others.

Professor Huntley: Who are protected under confidentiality?

VP Pellegrino: Counseling, Campus ministry. If the victim is a minor, call 911.

Professor Huntley: Do we have to investigate date, time etc?

VP Pellegrino: No, provide what information you have. The idea is, from an external viewpoint,
universities should not be perceived as sitting on this information.

Professor Walker-Canton: I feel some of it goes against Jesuit pedagogy – reflection etc. I feel
that students are opening up personal lives without recognizing the reporting requirement. I think
it is a backlash from Penn State.

VP Pellegrino: I can provide you with standard that courts use when Universities have been sued.
If there are pedagogical concerns, I am all for disclosures in the syllabus. So give some scripted
language ahead of time.

Professor Epstein: I share some of the same concerns that my colleagues have. Reflective essays,
major memoir requirement. If we are having this language, then we need to detail the
obligations. Also, what is the difference between the conversation being private and
confidential? What concerns me most is the word ‘misconduct’. I don’t know what it is.

VP Pellegrino: it is the broadest possible language.

Professor Epstein: Don’t you see the problem with it? From the administration point of view
broad is good, but for faculty we need more specific language because we are implementing it. I
need to know what misconduct it.

VP Pellegrino: The Student Handbook defines it. The question raised here is could we craft some
language for faculty member to say, this is a case when the policy does not apply? I have a
lawyer engaged to work on exclusions (such as memoirs, reflections, etc.)

Chair Keenan: We are beyond time. Two more questions, then we want to adjourn.

Professor Dallavalle: I understand Roxana’s point, but our students feel that they told someone.
It is our responsibility to take them to the right place.

Dean Babington: Nurses are mandatory reporters for everything. So we have scripted language
for everything. A student relates something about an incident of childhood abuse. We still have
to report.

Professor Sapp: Faculty should not think of themselves as repository of confessions. I have
several acquaintances who sue regularly. We are not friends of students.

Professor Sapp: Can we vote on whether or not we should put this on a future agenda?

Professor Epstein: We already voted that, and we are discussing it now.

Vogel (student representative): If a student is coming to a faculty member, it shows that they are
ready to talk to somebody. Faculty members are not trained to do the talking. Mentors are more
equipped. But reporting is helping the student to go to somebody who can help them.

Chair Keenan: I need a sense of whether we need future discussion on this.

Professor Rakowitz: My understanding is that we do not have too much leeway with the law.
VP Pellegrino: That is correct.
Chair Keenan: Do we need to learn more about this?
Professor Petrino: I do. I am in favor of a venue for more discussion. For example, what is the difference between misconduct and assault? It is in the student handbook but not in the faculty handbook.
Professor Bayne: I suggest that the Academic Council form a sub-committee to study this.
Professor Lane seconded.
Professor Walker-Canton: That would be a good way to bring back suggestions.
Professor Shea: What is the subcommittee supposed to do?
Professor Bayne: For example, language on exclusions. Do more research than we would be able to do here.
Professor Walker-Canton: For example, victims – are they ready to go to a broader audience? For me a further discussion on that is needed.
Professor Dallavalle: I would be hesitant to form a subcommittee right now. Let it play out somewhat so that we have more information.

**MOTION (BAYNE/LANE): To form a subcommittee of the Academic Council to study the Sexual misconduct policy**

**MOTION TIED: 7 in favor, 7 opposed 0 abstentions.**

Chair Keenan: I will vote on the motion, only because it is very close, and we should continue the conversation.

**MOTION PASSED. 8 in favor, 7 opposed 0 abstentions.**

**MOTION (DALLAVALLE/BAYNE) to adjourn.**

Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Mousumi Bhattacharya
Academic Council Ad Hoc Committee Report  
December 3, 2012

**Academic Council Ad Hoc Committee Members:** Katsiaryna Bardos, Olivia Harriott (Chair), Chris Huntley, Vin Rosivach, David Sapp.

**Charge:** Investigate three issues regarding Varsity Athletics at Fairfield University:
1. Current annual budget on varsity athletics
2. Costs savings if Fairfield University were to move to Division III
3. What would be the impact on morale if this were to happen?

The committee met four times this fall. Mark Reed, Vice President for Administration and Chief of Staff, was invited to the third meeting to discuss the management of varsity athletics and to share his perspective on a move to Division III.

**Fairfield University Varsity Athletics Quick Facts**
- 20 varsity sports: 9 men’s, 11 women’s
- 60 coaches; some have bonus contracts with performance-based incentives
- 420-430 varsity athletes, 600 students in club sports
- 106 full scholarships; $5,677,000 (12% of total financial aid budget) for 2010-11
- Most expensive sport teams in order: men’s and women’s basketball, men’s lacrosse, women’s and men’s soccer

**Strategic Goal of Athletics:**
**President von Arx quote:** “to become the number one mid-major school in both the state and the region” (in “Loyola leaving the MAAC,” The Mirror, vol. 38, Iss. 1, p. 18).

**Athletic Director Gene Doris quote:** “Our goal is to have Fairfield dominate the MAAC and become know as Connecticut’s best mid-major school,” (in “Steps Toward Achieving Growth and Success, 2007-2012: The Athletic Strategic Plan,” Fairfield Now, Summer 2007, available on line at http://www.fairfield.edu/publications/fn_sum07athplan.html

He made a similar statement in the CT Post in August 2012: http://www.ctpost.com/sports/article/Loyola-leaving-MAAC-not-a-shock-to-Fairfield-s-3825731.php

**Data from the NCAA Dashboard***:
- Fairfield U. athl. expenditures/student athlete (percentile compared to MACC, private institutions, local schools, Div I schools w/o football)
- Fairfield U. athl. expenditures/student athlete (annual trend; 2007-2011)
- Fairfield U. athl. expenditures/institutional expenditures (percentile)
- Fairfield U. athl. expenditures/institutional expenditures (annual trend)
- Fairfield U. total athletic expenditures (percentile)
- Fairfield U. total athletic expenditures (annual trend)

**Trend in athletic expenditures at Fairfield University:**
- FY 2004: $ 8,253,475
- FY 2010: $ 14,507,827
- FY 2011: $ 15,681,051
- FY 2012: $ 16,405,769

---

*NCAA Dashboard* is a collaborative financial tool initiated by the NCAA in 2008 that provides a way for Division I and II schools to self-report financial data and access data on comparator schools.
Summary:
% increase from FY 2004-2012: 98.77%
% increase FY 2011-2012: 4.62%

Moving to Division III. According to Mark Reed, universities haven’t made this move. He added that doing so would send the signal that the university is struggling financially and would create a morale problem that could negatively affect enrollment.

Summary of Committee Findings and Recommendations:
• We’re spending a ton of money on athletics
• In the current tight financial situation athletics should come under the microscope like everyone else;
• Win/lose records are not enough;
• The athletic program is said to aid recruitment, fund-raising, etc., but apparently there are no data to prove or disprove that it does;
• University needs to get data and use it to quantify benefits of athletic program;
• If the University doesn't know how to get data, learn from schools that do;
• Share data with the university community: if we're all taking a hit in compensation, etc. we should at least know that athletics spending is rational.
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.**
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Section One:

The MLS Working Group is seeking approval of a Master of Liberal Studies program housed in the College of Arts and Sciences at Fairfield University.

Background

This MLS proposal has its roots in a series of meetings, the first of which was facilitated by Dean Robbin Crabtree on 12/15/2010, of faculty interested in the possibility of developing M.A. programs in the humanities.

In the first meeting, it was clear that there was strong interest amongst faculty for developing some sort of master’s degree program(s) in the humanities, but there were two main approaches that different people were interested in: 1) a discipline specific master’s degree program and 2) an interdisciplinary master’s degree program such as a Master of Liberal Studies degree. It was also clear at this meeting that even if faculty interest was high, it would only make sense to move ahead with a new master’s degree program proposal if market research showed that it was likely to be viable.

At a second meeting on 3/16/11 we discussed various approaches to Master of Liberal Studies programs. At the end of that meeting we agreed to undertake a market survey for interest in master’s degrees in the Humanities. Steven Bayne agreed to work with Corey Wrinn, Judy Dobai, and Aaron Perkus to formulate the market survey. The market survey was run in the first week of May 2011 (see section 2 and Appendix Two for the results of the survey).

At a third meeting on 6/8/2011 the results of the market survey were discussed and those attending agreed that the results looked very promising for the prospects of developing an MLS program at Fairfield University, and we agreed to move forward.

On 10/12/2011 an informational meeting was held with a wide audience of interested CAS faculty. At that meeting interested faculty volunteered to serve as members of the MLS Working Group to begin development of this MLS proposal.

On October 13-15, 2011 Steven Bayne and Aaron Perkus represented Fairfield University at the Association of Graduate Liberal Studies Programs (AGLSP) annual workshop and conference.

On November 14, 2011 the MLS Working Group met for the first time, and has continued to meet on a regular basis to work on the details of this proposal.

The members of the MLS Working Group are:
Steven Bachelor, Department of History
Peter Bayers, Department of English
Steven Bayne, Department of Philosophy
Cecelia Bucki, Department of History
Angela Harkins, Department of Religious Studies
Olivia Harriott, Department of Biology
Martha LoMonaco, Department of Visual and Performing Arts, Theatre Program
Eric Mielants, Sociology
Aaron Perkus, Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Gita Rajan, Department of English
Giovanni Ruffini, Department of History

On October 24, 2012 the MLS Working Group approved the MLS program proposal to be submitted to the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee.
On November 13, 2012 the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee approved the MLS proposal along with the three new courses included in the proposal.

On December 20, 2012 the Educational Planning Committee approved the MLS proposal.

**Description, Overview, and Summary**
The Master of Liberal Studies program is designed to provide adults with a transformative experience through a broad interdisciplinary liberal arts curriculum. The program is intended to prepare graduates to be successful professionals, scholars, and life-long learners—to this end, the curriculum focuses on developing critical thinking and writing skills, expanding cultural perspectives, promoting integrative learning, and fostering independent and original research.

- The MLS is a 33 credit master’s degree. Students will complete one team-taught interdisciplinary foundational course, nine electives, and a capstone course in which they complete a master’s thesis or project (see section six below for more details).
  - Courses will be offered in the evenings.
  - The MLS can be completed through part- or full-time study (Note: at inception the full-time study option will depend on the availability of appropriate cross-listed courses from other Fairfield University graduate programs).
- The development of the MLS was driven by faculty interest in graduate teaching opportunities in the humanities, and there is also a clear interest within our geographical region (Fairfield and the four adjacent counties) in an interdisciplinary master’s degree in the liberal arts from Fairfield University (see section two below for more details).
- As an interdisciplinary master’s degree aimed at regional adult learners, the MLS fits squarely within the mission and strategic vision of Fairfield University (see section three below for more details).
- With its team-taught foundational course Fairfield University’s MLS program will offer students a unique opportunity amongst graduate liberal studies programs in our area (see sections three and six below for more details).
- Students in the MLS program will develop the ability to make connections across disciplines in order to develop a critical understanding of the self and its relation to society and the world (see section four below for more details).
- The MLS program will have a mutually beneficial symbiotic relationship with other College of Arts and Sciences graduate programs (see section five below for more details).
- The MLS program will be housed in the College of Arts and Sciences, it will have a Director, Assistant Director (at the discretion of the Director and Dean), and a representative Steering Committee (see section seven below for more details).
- The MLS program’s startup costs would be minor, and it is expected to be profitable by year two (see section eight and Appendix Seven below for more details).
- Assessment of MLS student learning will be carried out by the MLS Steering Committee from the outset of the program, after three years the MLSSC will conduct an internal review of the program, in the fifth year the program will undergo new program review in conjunction with the requirements for Full Membership in the Association of Graduate Liberal Studies Programs (see sections four and nine below for more details).
Section Two: Need for the MLS Program

Faculty Interest:

This Master of Liberal Studies degree proposal has its roots in the interest of a number of CAS faculty in an opportunity to offer disciplinary or interdisciplinary graduate courses at Fairfield University. These interests come together well in an interdisciplinary MLS program, as both disciplinary and interdisciplinary graduate level courses will contribute to the program. Many faculty find teaching at the master’s level to be an attractive option. Teaching master’s level students allows professors to share their expertise with students at a more sophisticated level, which is fulfilling in itself, but also has the benefit of allowing professors the opportunity to bring their teaching and research closer together.

Student Need:

An MLS degree serves two main populations of students: those students seeking personal enrichment through education and those seeking career enhancement. With its interdisciplinary approach and broad range of classes, an MLS degree is an excellent fit for an adult learner interested in continuing their post baccalaureate education in an academic setting. An MLS degree can also be an excellent choice for some seeking professional enhancement, for example a Connecticut public school teacher might find an interdisciplinary master’s degree program an attractive way to complete the current requirement for an MA or 30 credits beyond a baccalaureate. An MLS can also be a good fit for some students seeking an academic career. With its broad range of classes an MLS degree can be a good choice for those students who know they want to pursue graduate school and a career in academia, but are not ready to commit to a particular discipline. Being able to take a range of interdisciplinary and disciplinary courses can help these students determine which field they want to do Ph.D. research in—or they may even decide to pursue one of the recently developed Doctor of Liberal Studies degrees.

The vast majority of graduate liberal studies programs are designed predominately for adult part-time students. Adult part-time students tend to have substantial ties to the community in which they live, and as a result this means one of the main considerations for where to pursue an MLS degree is location. Adult part-time students interested in an MLS will be looking for a quality program close to home or work. Currently there are no graduate liberal studies programs in Fairfield County.

There are currently two colleges in Connecticut, and one in Westchester County, NY that have graduate liberal studies programs. The closest of these (forty minutes in good traffic) is Albertus Magnus College in New Haven, which has a relatively small MA in Liberal Studies program, graduating about 6 students per year. Wesleyan University in Middletown (slightly more than an hour in good traffic) houses the hallmark program in the state, and the oldest in the country, granting about 60 degrees per year. Manhattanville College in Purchase, NY also has a MA in Liberal Studies program, graduating about 5 students per year, but they are not a member of the AGLSP.

Market Survey:

Fairfield University conducted market research to assess the regional demand for a Master of Liberal Studies degree. Using the resources of a research panel firm, Fairfield faculty designed a survey with the assistance of the Office of Institutional Research and Enrollment Management. An electronic survey was conducted in May 2011 of individuals with a baccalaureate degree between the ages of 20-50 who live in a five-county region in proximity to
and including Fairfield County, plus local retirees who live within the town of Fairfield. The
survey had 1069 respondents. 216 (20%) of the initial respondents indicated a potential interest
in an MLS degree. From this group of potential students interested in an MLS program, 152
(70%) reported that they were either definitely, very likely, or likely to enroll in an MLS
program within five years. 119 (78%) of these respondents further reported that they were either
definitely, very likely, or likely to enroll in a Fairfield University MLS program within five
years. These likely to enroll numbers are strong and it may be worth noting that they compare
quite favorably with the numbers for the recently approved MPA program.

Section Three: Rationale

As seen in Section Two above, the MLS program makes sense given faculty interest and student
need, but it also makes sense in terms of both Fairfield University’s mission and strategic plan.

The MLS program’s mission of providing adults with a transformative experience through a
broad interdisciplinary liberal arts curriculum synthesizes nicely with Fairfield University’s
commitment to a liberal education in which “[a]ll of its schools share a liberal and humanistic
perspective and . . . a respect for all the disciplines—their similarities, their differences, and their
interrelationships” (Fairfield University Mission Statement). The MLS program’s focus on adult
learners also fits well with the fact that

    Fairfield recognizes that learning is a life-long process and sees the education which it
    provides as the foundation upon which its students may continue to build within their
    chosen areas of scholarly study or professional development. It also seeks to foster in
    its students a continuing intellectual curiosity and a desire for self-education which will
    extend to the broad range of areas to which they have been introduced in their studies.
    (Fairfield University Mission Statement)

    The interdisciplinary focus of the MLS program also fits well with the spirit of Goal I of
    Fairfield University’s Strategic Plan: Integration of the Core Curriculum. Although Goal I is
    aimed at the undergraduate curriculum, the interdisciplinary MLS program can be seen as an
    extension of Goal I’s aim “to begin breaking down the tendency toward mental
    compartmentalization, and help students transfer information and skills from one discipline to
    another” (Strategic Vision, p. 11).

    The MLS program in this proposal also fits well with the Strategic Plan’s “goal that in the
    next decade, Fairfield University will be known for distinctive graduate and professional
    programs” (Strategic Vision, p. 17). This MLS program will be a distinctive graduate program in
    liberal studies. Most graduate liberal studies programs are interdisciplinary in focus, but
    Fairfield’s team-taught interdisciplinary foundational course will make us distinctive. Having
two professors trained in different disciplines engaged with students in our interdisciplinary
foundational investigation of the self, society, and world will lay the groundwork for our MLS in
a dynamic and distinctive way. None of the graduate liberal studies programs in the region, and
very few nationally, have this distinctive way of grounding their graduate programs in liberal
studies.
Section Four: Objectives

Mission:
To deliver a transformative experience for students through a broad liberal arts curriculum focused on developing critical thinking and writing skills, expanding cultural perspectives, and promoting integrative learning by providing students with team-taught foundational courses, diverse seminars, and independent and original research opportunities. The MLS will culminate in a master’s thesis or project. The program is intended to prepare graduates to be successful professionals, scholars, and life-long learners.

Program Goals:
1. Students will develop the ability to make connections across disciplines in order to understand the convergence and divergence of different fields of knowledge and to understand the nature of an academic community.
2. Students will develop a critical understanding of the self and its relation to society and the world.
3. Students will develop a critical understanding of their own commitments regarding ethics and aesthetics.

Program Outcomes:
- Students will demonstrate proficiency in critical thinking.
- Students will write accomplished academic prose.
- Students will produce an original master's thesis or project that considers or transcends disciplinary boundaries.

Assessment of Student Learning:
No assessment work will be conducted for the first two years of the program in order to allow time for the inaugural and subsequent cohorts to produce a substantial enough amount of artifacts to assess. Starting in the third year members of the MLSSC will annually identify which outcome(s) will be assessed in an annual iterative process that reflects best practices in assessment. The design of the assessment project will be determined by the MLSSC, but it will be informed by the expectation that assessment of student learning, over time, needs to evaluate student achievement after completion of the foundational course(s), student achievement in the capstone, and student growth over time as a result of education. To accomplish this goal, the committee will use identical rubrics when assessing the same outcomes at different levels of the curriculum.

Section Five: Impact
The MLS program will not replace any other programs at the university. The MLS is a graduate program that is unique in its focus and content. As a graduate program, it will not have any effect on Fairfield University’s undergraduate core curriculum.
With regard to resources, as it is designed to be a self-supporting program, the MLS is not expected to have any major impact on existing programs. According to our six year revenue projections (see section eight below), the MLS will operate at a loss during the first year. In the second year, however, the MLS program will have a yearly positive net revenue and will have already made up for the first year’s revenue loss.

We expect the MLS program to have a mutually beneficial symbiotic relationship with other graduate programs in CAS. We expect to cross-list courses from other graduate programs in CAS—in particular we expect there to be a number of American Studies courses that will be suitable for MLS students. The same will also be true, to a lesser extent with the MA in Communication and the MPA. We also expect that some of the new courses developed for the MLS would be suitable to be cross-listed by other graduate programs.

Faculty for MLS courses will predominately be drawn from Fairfield University’s full-time faculty. We do not believe, however, that this will have a negative effect on the undergraduate curriculum or departments.

First, when an MLS course is taught as part of a faculty members regular teaching load, this means that during a particular semester she or he will teach one fewer undergraduate course. In some cases, however, a faculty member’s department will have the ability (based on curricular need and staffing) to allow that faculty member to teach an MLS course without needing to replace it in a particular semester’s schedule. In other cases, departments will need to replace the course that is usually taught by the faculty member, and the replacement cost of staffing these courses is included in our six year budget in Appendix Seven below.

Second, some MLS courses will be taught by faculty as overloads, and in these cases the MLS course will not affect the number of undergraduate courses a faculty member teaches in a particular semester.

Third, under normal conditions in any given year, faculty members will be limited to teaching at most one sixth of their regular yearly teaching load in the MLS program. Furthermore, as can be seen in the tentative initial four year curriculum map in Appendix Five, except for the foundational course and the capstone course, we do not plan to offer any MLS course more than once in this initial four year cycle. We also expect this pattern to continue with subsequent four year cycles. As a result of this, very few faculty members will be teaching more than one MLS course in any four year period. Consequently, in any given year, as well as in the long run, the vast majority of individual MLS faculty members’ teaching loads will still be at the undergraduate level.

Fourth, as can be seen from the four year curriculum map in Appendix Five below, MLS courses will be taught by faculty from a wide range of departments. The fifteen courses taught in fall and spring semesters over the course of the first four years represent the contributions of faculty from nine different departments. As the program moves forward, it is our intention to involve faculty from an even wider range of departments. So, even when faculty teach in the MLS program as part of load, this should not represent a burden on individual departments.

Finally, preserving the integrity of the undergraduate curriculum is one of the main reasons that the estimated expense/revenue model for the MLS includes two new full-time faculty lines (the first in year four and the second in year six). We project that in year four there will be seven MLS courses offered (one team taught), but with the new full-time faculty line, and on the supposition that two MLS sections would be taught as overloads, the MLS program would be responsible for adding at least as many undergraduate sections per year as the number of sections that would need to be covered due to faculty teaching MLS courses. In year six and beyond, the
addition of a second full-time faculty line would allow the MLS program to actually strengthen the undergraduate curriculum. With two full-time faculty lines, but with only seven MLS courses offered per year (one team taught), the MLS program would be responsible for adding at least four more undergraduate sections per year than the number of sections that would need to be covered due to faculty teaching MLS courses.

**Section Six: Program Detail**

The MLS will be a 33 credit degree (11 three credit courses)

- An accredited baccalaureate degree is a prerequisite for matriculation.
- Qualified students with a baccalaureate degree may take up to four courses before matriculating into the MLS program.
- Students are subject to the academic policies and general regulations in the College of Arts and Sciences Graduate Programs Catalog.

**The MLS will have the following program requirements:**

- **LS 401: Self, Society, World** (see new course proposal in Appendix Three below):
  - How do people make sense of themselves, their experience, and their place in the world? What insight can we gain on those identities and meanings through disciplinary theories and methodologies of the humanities, the natural sciences, the social sciences, or the arts? How are these insights influenced by family, geography, culture, religion, class, race, gender, etc? In this team-taught introductory course, we will explore the self, society, and the world through an interdisciplinary range of historical and contemporary sources and methodologies. Through this exploration students will be asked to deepen their ability to think, read, and write critically. Three credits.
    - This is the team-taught foundational course and is required of all MLS students.
    - MLS students are required to take this course the first time it is offered after their matriculation into the program.
    - Normally, this course will be offered annually in Fall.
  - Students will then be required to take nine three credit elective courses. These courses will be selected from:
    - Those designed specifically for the MLS program (see Appendix Four below for list of courses currently under development),
    - Those that are cross-listed from other CAS graduate programs (see Appendix Six below for list of courses to be cross-listed),
    - Up to two of these, may, with approval of the Director and Dean, be 300 level courses (extra work will be required), or independent studies courses. These courses may not be from the same discipline, or be taught by the same instructor.
    - Up to six credits may, with approval of the Director and Dean, be transferred from other universities.
• LS 599: *Capstone in Liberal Studies* (see new course proposal in Appendix Three below). This course is the culminating experience in the MLS program. It is designed to bring all MLS students together at the end of their experience. Students beginning together in LS 401 have since diverged to explore many different areas of interest and will now return to a single classroom to share the fruit of their exploration. Students in consultation with the instructor will design and complete a final project. The semester's out of class work will focus on that project's development and completion. Students will design outlines, proposals, reading lists and drafts of their final project to be submitted for critique by their peers. That critique will take the form of both in-class oral discussion and assigned written responses. Both the instructor and the students will assign readings from the fields of knowledge relevant to each final project. In-class work will be divided between student presentations at each stage of their final project; student critique of that product; and seminar discussion of the relevant readings. Three credits.

  o Prerequisites for this course are
    ▪ Completion of LS 401, and
    ▪ Submission and approval of a capstone project prospectus by the MLS Steering Committee.

  o The Capstone in Liberal Studies is to be taken in the final semester of study.

  o This course will be offered as a seminar.
    ▪ Except in the most unusual of circumstances, the Capstone in Liberal Studies may not be completed through an Independent Study.

  o Normally the Capstone will be offered in spring semester, but we don’t expect to offer it until the third year of the program.

**Section Seven: Administrative Structure and Governance**

**Internal Administrative Structure and Governance:**

The internal administrative structure for the MLS Program shall consist of a Director, Assistant Director (at the discretion of the Director), and a Steering Committee.

**Program Director:**

Initially the director shall be appointed to a three year term by the CAS Dean upon the recommendation of the MLS Working Group. Subsequently, the director shall be nominated by the MLS Steering Committee (MLSSC) and appointed to a three year
term by the CAS Dean. No more than two consecutive terms may be served as director. The Director’s term begins on July 1st.

The duties of the MLS Program Director are those in accordance with the duties for Graduate Program Directors outlined in section 1.13 of the CAS Governance Document.

**Assistant Program Director:**

At her or his discretion, and in consultation with the Dean and MLSSC, the MLS Program Director may appoint an Assistant Program Director on a yearly basis.

The duties of the MLS Assistant Program Director shall be determined by agreement between the Director and Assistant Director.

**Steering Committee:**

The MLS Steering Committee shall consist of nine CAS faculty members with at least one each from the Humanities, the Natural Sciences/Mathematics, and the Behavioral & Social Sciences and six positions at large. The Director and Assistant Director (if any) shall serve as ex officio voting members. Initially the MLSSC will be formed from the members of the MLS Working Group. After the first three years, the members of the MLSSC shall be nominated by CAS faculty and appointed to staggered three year terms by the Director in consultation with the Dean and appropriate department chairs.

The duties of the MLS Steering Committee shall be to advise and aid the director in the administration of and planning for the MLS program. Additionally the MLS Steering Committee shall be responsible for vetting MLS course and curriculum proposals, vetting applicants for admission into the MLS program, and carrying out program assessment.

**External Structures and Governance:**

**College of Arts and Sciences:**

The MLS program will be housed in the College of Arts and Sciences, and as a result it shall be subject to the governance structures of the CAS as detailed in the CAS Governance Document, which is available on the CAS Faculty Website at http://faculty.fairfield.edu/cas.

Additional or simply noteworthy relations between the MLS program and CAS are:

As it does for all of its graduate programs, CAS will provide some administrative support to the MLS program. This will include enrollment management and course schedule planning (currently through Associate Dean Aaron Perkus), assistance for the Council of Graduate Programs (currently through Ms. Fran Yadre, its administrative assistant), and the assignment of a Program Assistant to the MLS program (either dedicated or shared).

The Dean of CAS shall be apprised of all program details and outcomes through regular reports from the MLS Program Director, and periodic meetings with the Steering Committee.

The CAS Dean shall be consulted on any major decisions related to program revenues. Any permanent faculty lines must be approved by the CAS Dean, and the Dean shall be afforded all hiring privileges belonging to the office.
The Dean must monitor and approve the percentage of full-time faculty time devoted to part-of-load teaching in the program.

The Dean reports to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Since the MLS program is housed in CAS, all new courses, cross-listings, and curriculum revisions must be reviewed by the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee.

**Office of Graduate Admissions and Enrollment Management:**

The Office of Graduate Admission will handle admissions according to all policies and procedures currently in effect for other CAS graduate programs.

The OGA will manage the receipt of eligibility documents (e.g., undergraduate transcripts, requests for transfer credits) and other admissions functions.

The OGA will facilitate the process of accepting students into the MLS Program as they would for other graduate programs at the University.

The OGA, under the direction of the Vice President for Admissions, will continue to oversee the marketing research process and will participate in the development of financial models for the program.

The Vice President for Admissions reports to the Sr. vice President for Strategic Initiatives on matters related to market research, graduate enrollments, and program outcomes.

**Office of Graduate Marketing:**

Development of program materials and program marketing will be managed by the Office of Graduate Marketing and Enrollment Management.

**Section Eight: Resources**

**Physical:**

The main physical requirements for the MLS program will be seminar style classrooms, and office space for a Program Assistant—both of these can be met within the parameters of currently available university resources.

The library has the necessary resources for the MLS program. If new library acquisitions become necessary, these would be provided for from the revenues generated by the program or purchased through normal department and library acquisition processes.

**Marketing:**

All CAS graduate programs use centralized marketing strategies in conjunction with the university’s marketing division. According to our six year budget projections (see Appendix Seven below), for the first two years the biggest expense of the MLS program will be for marketing. At the start, it will be important to get the word out about the program, but as the program becomes known in the area we project that marketing costs will decrease.

**Personnel:**

As can be seen in the tentative initial four year curriculum map in Appendix Five, we plan to offer a total of eighteen MLS courses (including three summer courses) during the initial four year cycle. After the program reaches maturity in year four, we expect to offer twenty-eight MLS courses (including four summer courses) during a regular four year cycle.
There will be no faculty assigned to teach full-time in the MLS program. Instead, MLS classes will be staffed by a combination of full-time faculty teaching as part of load, full-time faculty teaching as overload, and part-time faculty.

Full-time faculty teaching as part of load, under normal circumstances, will not be permitted to teach more than one sixth of the normal teaching load in the MLS program in any given year.

When an MLS course is taught as part of regular teaching load, this means that during a particular semester the faculty member will teach one fewer undergraduate course. In some cases, a faculty member’s department will have the ability, based on its curricular needs, to allow that faculty member to teach an MLS course without needing to replace it in a particular semester’s schedule. In other cases, departments will need to replace the course that is usually taught by the faculty member. In light of this, replacement costs for staffing undergraduate courses that would normally be taught by faculty members who are teaching in the MLS program are included in the six year budget in Appendix Seven below.

Full-time faculty teaching overloads and part-time faculty will be compensated according to the salaries for part-time instruction specified in the Memo of Understanding in place at the time the courses are run. Stipend costs are reflected in the six year budget in Appendix Seven below.

The six year budget includes a projection of the addition of new full-time faculty lines in years four and six. As mentioned above, these full-time faculty lines will enable us to make sure that the MLS program does not negatively affect the undergraduate curriculum, while at the same time allowing for much of MLS teaching to be done as part of load.

One of the resource issues with these two faculty lines is their equitable distribution. Since the faculty teaching in the MLS program will be drawn from many different departments in CAS, it would be difficult to equitably assign two tenure track lines. One possibility is that the two full-time faculty lines projected in the budget be rotating full-time Visiting Assistant Professor positions. For example, since the MLS Director’s department will be contributing the most regular resources, the first full-time faculty line (projected to be created in year four) could be a full-time Visiting Assistant Professor position that rotates with the director of the MLS program. In turn the second full-time faculty line (projected to be created in year six) could then be a full-time Visiting Assistant Professor position annually rotated in a systematic way amongst the departments that contribute faculty to the MLS program.

**Budget:**

A six year budget is included in Appendix Seven and it provides information on expected enrollment, projected number of courses offered, expected tuition revenues, projected full-time and part-time faculty expense, marketing expenses, and an overview of expected net revenue from the program.

Our projected number of students in the first year is quite conservative, but even with eight students taking an average of only three credits (one course) per semester, this will allow us to offer our team-taught foundational course along with one new MLS course (along with any courses from other CAS graduate programs that are suitable for cross-listing). With this conservative estimate and the higher initial cost for marketing, the MLS program would lose $27,500 the first year.

In the second year with a conservative estimate of twenty total students taking an average of only 3.5 credits (on average just over one course) in fall and spring semester and an average of 3 credits in summer (one course), we would be able to offer our team-taught foundational course
and three new MLS courses including summer (along with suitable cross-listed courses). With this conservative estimate and still higher initial costs for marketing, the MLS program would have net revenue of $39,500 in the second year and a cumulative net revenue of $12,000 (thus already making up for the loss from the first year).

In the third year with thirty-three total students in the program taking an average of only 3.5 credits (on average just over one course) in fall and spring semester and an average of 3 credits in summer (one course), we would offer our team-taught foundational course and four new MLS courses (along with suitable cross-listed courses). With normal costs for marketing, the MLS program would have net revenue of $113,758 in the third year and a cumulative net revenue of $125,758. Note: the numbers in the third year budget reflect that from the third year on, the largest yearly expense will be the cost of faculty.

In the fourth year with forty-five total students in the program taking an average of only 3.5 credits in fall and spring semester and an average of 3 credits in summer, we would offer our team-taught foundational course and six MLS courses (along with suitable cross-listed courses). With the addition of a full-time faculty line, and having reached the expected on-going normal number of course offerings, the MLS program would have net revenue of $114,660 in the fourth year and a cumulative net revenue of $240,418.

In the fifth year with forty-five total students in the program taking an average of only 3.5 credits in fall and spring semester and an average of 3 credits in summer, we would offer our team-taught foundational course and six MLS courses (along with suitable cross-listed courses). In the fifth year we project that the MLS program would have net revenue of $121,269 and a cumulative net revenue of $361,687.

In the sixth year with forty-five total students in the program taking an average of only 3.5 credits in fall and spring semester and an average of 3 credits in summer, we would offer our team-taught foundational course and six MLS courses (along with suitable cross-listed courses). In the sixth year we project that with the addition of a second full-time faculty line, the MLS program would have net revenue of $41,198 and a cumulative net revenue of $402,886.

Section Nine: Projections for the Future

In addition to our expectations for the number of students, number of classes, and number of full-time faculty lines (all spelled out in the previous section) we have not so much projections for the future, but expectations for moments of reflection on our program and its curriculum.

After the third year the MLSSC will carry out an internal review of the program. There are two curricular issues in particular that we expect to reassess at that time.

One issue concerns the number (and content) of foundational courses. In the MLS Working Group there was a good amount of discussion of having one foundational course that is an interdisciplinary introduction to knowledge of the self, society, and world and a second foundational course that is an interdisciplinary introduction to the different methodologies used to create knowledge of the self, society, and world. We ultimately agreed that for the purposes of starting an MLS program it made sense to try to combine both the theoretical and methodological aspects in one single foundational course. We also agreed, however, that this was an issue that is worth evaluating again after the program has been up and running for three years.

A second issue concerns whether the MLS program should offer students the option of concentrations—that is, the ability, once they have taken the interdisciplinary foundational course(s), to focus their studies within a particular discipline before returning to the
interdisciplinary capstone experience. The MLS Working Group did not reach consensus about the advisability of having concentrations in an MLS program. We did agree, however, that given the logistical and financial constraints of getting a new program started, it would not be possible to offer a sufficient number of courses to support even a small number of concentrations at the beginning of the MLS program. We also agreed that after the third year we could revisit this issue to first evaluate whether concentrations are logistically possible for Fairfield’s program, and, second, if they are logistically possible, to evaluate the advisability of having concentrations in Fairfield’s MLS program.

In the fifth year the program will undergo new program review. This will involve both an internal and external review in accordance with the *Guidelines for Academic Program Review in the College of Arts & Sciences*, which were developed by a task force of the CAS Planning Committee and endorsed by A&SCC. Additionally in the fifth year, we also plan to apply to become Full Members of the Association of Graduate Liberal Studies Programs. As the application requirements for Full Membership in the AGLSP are closely aligned with the A&SCC fifth year review guidelines, we expect to be able to undertake them in conjunction with each other.
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Appendix Two: Report of Market Survey

Master of Arts in Liberal Studies
Market Survey Results

Fairfield University Enrollment Management/Institutional Research
October 12, 2011

MLS Market Survey Methodology

- Survey designed internally with faculty input
- Launched through Fairfield’s own online survey system
- Names purchased through a panel provider
  - Ages 20-50 + Local Retirees
  - Live in surrounding five counties
  - Attained BA
  - Interested in MA or further education
  - Work in all industries
Master of Arts in Liberal Studies

Preferences Survey

- A Master of Arts in Liberal Studies (MLS) degree is an interdisciplinary program focused on history, literature, politics, ethics, and philosophy. It is designed to broaden the candidate's intellectual horizons and strengthen their communication skills.

- It integrates knowledge and skills from various disciplines, providing a holistic understanding of the world.

- The program offers a wide range of concentrations, including:
  - History
  - Literature
  - American Studies
  - Politics
  - Science
  - Philosophy

- Learning outcomes and benefits:
  - Students become valuable assets in the workplace or community through the emphasis on critical thinking and multiple intellectual interests.
  - They develop strong research and writing skills.

- Please choose whether or not you are interested in pursuing a MLS. If "Yes," then you are planning to pursue or apply for a MLS program within the U.S. in the next five years AND hope to enroll in the degree program.

- Options:
  - Yes, I'm potentially interested in a MLS
  - No, I'm not interested in a specific Arts & Sciences degree program
  - Yes, I'm more interested in a specific Arts & Sciences degree program than an interdisciplinary program

---

Screening Question Results

- 216, 20%: Yes, I'm potentially interested in a MLS
- 143, 13%: I'm more interested in a specific Arts & Sciences degree program than an interdisciplinary program
- 710, 67%: No, I'm not interested in a MLS nor a specific Arts & Sciences degree program
Interest in MLS

Concentrations

- History: 93
- Film and New Media: 78
- Writing and Rhetoric: 61
- Literature: 60
- Fine Arts: 58
- Philosophy (including Ethics): 57
- Modern Languages: 53
- American Studies: 48
- Religious Studies: 43
- Museum Studies: 32
- Public History (Archiving): 26
- Classical Studies: 25
- Other: 9

Program Structure: Modes of Instruction

- Mostly face-to-face classroom instruction
- Only face-to-face classroom instruction
- Mostly online instruction
- Only online instruction

Legend:
- 1st or 2nd Choice
- 3rd or Last Choice
Program Structure: Types of Instruction

Internship Aspects

- Most liberal studies programs provide students with the opportunity to complete a final project to connect their individual ideas to themes learned in the core and concentration courses. Which option is most appealing to you?
Study Abroad Option

- Are you interested in a study abroad portion of the program which would involve a small group of students attending a course overseas for credit? The course would be taught by US-based faculty who travel abroad with the students. The course would last around two weeks and revolve around a subject to the area traveled to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, interested</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, not interested</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future after MLS

- Reasons for pursuing a graduate degree in Liberal Studies
  1. Enrichment and interest in the content
  2. Opportunity to change field completely
  3. Advancement in my current career within my organization
  - Not Preparation for further graduate study

- Career path/ideal field with achievement of a MLS
  1. Arts & Culture
  2. Education
  3. Non-profit
  - Not Journalism nor Public Affairs
Enrollment Drivers

- Top reasons for interest in Fairfield-specific MLS
  1. Close proximity to work and home
  2. Fairfield’s overall academic reputation
  3. Interest in educational enrichment

- Fairfield’s current graduate students display similar preferences (2010 Adult Student Survey)
  - Top enrollment drivers for current Fairfield students:
    1. Programs offered
    2. Location
    3. Academic reputation
    4. Course selection

Respondents “Likely to Enroll in a Fairfield MLS Program” in the next Five Years
Enrollment Drivers – Summary and Future

- Important factors for potential MLS students
  - Affordability
  - Flexibility in course offerings
  - Ability to mix concentrations
  - “Real world” experiences

- Fairfield offers these features already, and can continue to for the benefit of a MLS program
  - Faculty guidance
  - Develop curriculum
  - Marketing of program

Projected Interest

- Over 1000 respondents to survey
- Sample is representative of Fairfield University’s graduate programs’ reach
- Demographic of sample is also comparable to current graduate population

- 20% are potentially interested in a MLS
- 15% are likely to enroll in a MLS program within five years
- 12% are likely to enroll in a Fairfield MLS program within five years
## Projected Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Avg. current first-time students per year</th>
<th>Projected first-time students for next fiscal year</th>
<th>Avg. projected credits per student per fiscal year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA in Communication</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA in American Studies</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Public Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA in Liberal Studies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Three: New Course Proposals- See GFS Website

Appendix Four: MLS Courses Under Development

Note:

1) Each of these courses must be vetted by the MLSSC and the A&SCC, and approved by the CAS Dean before being offered.

2) The numbering of these courses is mostly alphabetical by author, and is very likely to change when courses are vetted by the MLSCC.

**LS: 501: Cold War Anglo Masculinity**
Bayers

This course examines the construction of middle and upper-class Anglo masculinity in the post-WWII era, particularly how that masculinity was shaped by popular media such as television, magazines, advertising, men’s service clubs, and sport. In addition, the course will examine how film and literature responded to Anglo masculine norms that more often than not were seen as psychologically stifling. Films might include Easy Rider, The Graduate, Rebel Without a Cause, and literature might include works by Updike, Kerouac, and Cheever.

**LS 502: The Frontier in American Literature**
Bayers

For the last five centuries, the frontier - understood as the place where humanity comes into contact with its apparent absence in the shape of alien beings and landscapes - has been the subject of some of the most lasting and powerful American stories. In this course, students concentrate on some of the major representations of the frontier produced between the 1820s and the present to learn how to recognize and talk about the position that the American western has occupied in our culture. Authors include Cooper, Twain, Cather, and McCarthy; filmmakers include Ford, Peckinpah, and Eastwood.

**LS 503: Native American Literature and Philosophy**
Bayers and Bayne

In this course we will focus on novels, short stories, poems, and essays written by Native American writers. In addition to focusing on these texts for their literary value, we will place special emphasis on the philosophical themes developed by Native American writers. We will investigate Native American themes in Metaphysics, Epistemology, Logic, Philosophy of Science, Ethics, and Political Philosophy. Additionally, we will investigate how Native American approaches to philosophy compare to western philosophical approaches, and how Native American philosophy relates to religion or spirituality.

**LS 504: Kant’s Transcendental Idealism and the American Transcendentalists**
Bayne and Petrino

The roots of the American Transcendentalist movement of the mid 19th Century are often traced to the Transcendental Idealism of Immanuel Kant. In this course we will begin by focusing on Kant’s Transcendental Idealism and then we will investigate how themes in Transcendental Idealism are taken up, developed, changed, and perhaps misunderstood by the American Transcendentalists. In addition to Kant, we will read authors such as Emerson, Fuller, Thoreau, Alcott, Poe, Hawthorne, Melville, Douglass, Davis, Whitman, and Dickinson.
LS 505: David Hume and Jane Austen: Ethics, Aesthetics, and Knowledge
Bayne and ?

It has recently been argued by E. M. Dadlez that the novels of Jane Austen provide illustrations, support, and even demonstrations of various aspects of Hume’s moral theory as well as aspects of his theories in aesthetics and epistemology. In this course we will read Hume’s *Treatise of Human Nature, Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*, and the novels of Jane Austen in order to investigate the connections between Austen and Hume.

LS 506: The Morality of Politics
Boryczka

Family values. Culture Wars. These phrases capture a political landscape shaped by debates over morality that continue to determine power dynamics in the United States and abroad. This course explores the relationship between morality and politics as they influence local, national and global institutions and processes of power. Second wave feminism provides the course’s point of departure that examines how this U.S. based movement intersects with global feminisms, particularly among women in developing countries. This lens of analysis further introduces the phenomena of backlash politics that ushered in the culture wars and family values debates. The course then moves to examining specific policy issues such as sex education, gay marriage, pornography, and food politics to consider how we understand the moral subject as political citizen and what this means to our political lives. The course concludes by focusing on immigration as a means of considering alternative moral frameworks more conducive to a politics of belonging aligned with global citizenship and more inclusionary visions for twenty-first century political life.

LS 507: Philosophical Perspectives on Women in Classical Literature
Brill

Ancient Greek and Latin literature presented its audiences with a cast of characters who continue to enjoy social, political and cultural currency. Antigone and Oedipus, Helen and Paris, Cassandra and Prometheus have all had a hand in shaping western thought about the natures of beauty and freedom, the limits of human knowledge, and the role of law. The prominence and frequency with which ancient Greek and Latin cultures presented in text and on stage aspects of the lives of the very characters—women, ‘barbarians’ and slaves—who were marginalized in those same societies is striking. In this course we will focus specifically upon the literary characterizations of women found throughout the ancient Greek and Latin worlds.

LS 508: Ancient Medicine and Philosophy
Brill

The human body is a unique mixture of the self-evident and the mysterious. Identifying its basic elements, determining its health and sickness, and healing its diseases are projects that have been matters of contention and debate spanning the course of written history. The various methods for investigating the human body have been subject to foundational questions of scientific investigation, religious sanction, social condemnation and philosophical impasse. In this class, we will look at the way in which Ancient Greek medical practitioners and philosophers took up these investigations, negotiated problems of method, and profoundly influenced the ways we talk about, think about and treat the body today.

As we follow several philosophical transformations concerning how to conceive of the body we will organize our investigation around the following questions: How does each thinker conceive of the relationship between the body and the soul? Where does each thinker locate the person in relation to the body and the soul? What are the dominant models for describing the organization of the body with which each thinker is working?
LS 509: Rome in the Cultural Imagination  
Carolan

The city of Rome has been a source of wonder and amazement throughout recorded history. A center of artistic, cultural, religious, and political power, Rome has attracted legions of artists, religious pilgrims, politicians, and entrepreneurs over its long history. Both the home of the Catholic Church and a center of licentiousness, Rome is a paradox whose contrasting charms captivate our imagination. This course will examine the foundation myths of the city recounted in the works of Virgil and Livy. We will study the cultural mores of antiquity in Ovid as well. We will consider the riches of Renaissance and Baroque Rome, especially in regards to the Papal court, found in the autobiography of the artist Cellini. We will read poetry written expressively for and about the Roman plebe in the works of the nineteenth century popular writer Belli as well as those of the twentieth century man of letters Pasolini. This course includes an analysis of Rome’s centrality in the world of art; we will pay particular attention to the representation of this city in the films of Rossellini, Fellini and Ozpetek and in an opera by Puccini. We will study the political importance of Rome from its inception in antiquity, through the Risorgimento (Italian Unification), to Fascism, World War II, to present day. The goal of this course is to provide a wide-ranging, interdisciplinary approach to the study of the city of Rome that has played a critical role in the development of the West.

LS 510: East/West Dialogue: China and Italy through the Ages  
Carolan

This course examines the relationship between China and Italy throughout the ages. Initially, the promise of riches from trade inspired Italians to venture to China. In the fourteenth century Marco Polo famously wrote of his travels to the East in Il Milione. This text inspired Columbus, who possessed a heavily annotated version of the travelogue, to explore a new route to the East. Thus the discovery of the “new world” in the fifteenth century resonates with the European preoccupation with the East. The Jesuit Matteo Ricci traveled to China in the sixteenth century as one of the first Westerners who had learned the language well enough to read and write classical Chinese, the language of scholars and officials. This accomplishment, along with Ricci’s appreciation of indigenous Chinese culture and Confucianism in particular, allowed the Jesuit to develop a dialogue regarding religion and culture. In the eighteenth century Giuseppe Castiglione, an Italian Jesuit who took the Chinese name of Lang Shi-Ning, assisted in the design of the Imperial Garden in addition to his work as a court painter. Early in the twentieth century Imperial China granted a concession zone in Tientsin (now Tianjin) to the Kingdom of Italy. Administered by an Italian official from Rome for almost forty years, the zone was finally returned to Nationalist China following the conclusion of World War II. In contemporary times, we see representations of dynamic social and cultural change in Antonioni’s documentary Chung Kuo (1972), Bertolucci’s epic tale The Last Emperor (1987) and Amelio’s haunting drama The Missing Star (2006). The course concludes with a consideration of Chinese presence in Italy today as represented in Saviano’s novel Gomorrah as well as in recent Italian documentaries.

LS 511: Art, Myths & Politics: Pharaohs to U.S. Presidents  
Eliasoph

LS 512: Sacred Texts in America  
Harkins

This course is an introduction to the academic study of religion. This course has two major foci: (1) The History of the Sacred Text: Material Aspects of Sacred Texts in Judaism and Christianity; (2) Sacred Texts in American Contexts. The first half of this course will establish a working vocabulary and conceptual framework for the study of religion, both of which will prove useful in our semester-long conversation about sacred texts. While there will be some discussion of a number of religious traditions, this course will focus on the particular religious traditions of Judaism and Christianity, in their diverse forms in America.
This course will examine the continuity and change of the religious experience of sacred texts over time in the religions of Judaism and Christianity from antiquity to the modern period. Included in the topics of this section of the course is an examination of the process of canonization and the relationship between texts and their communities. Some questions that concern this part of the course include: how have sacred texts been produced, by whom and for what particular purposes? How have the various forms and format of sacred texts in Judaism and Christianity influenced the use, the reading, and the interpretation of these texts throughout history? The course will address how sacred texts appear and are experienced in American contexts. In this part of the course, we will reflect upon the diverse expressions sacred writings take in America. What does the examination of sacred texts say about American culture and its experience of religion?

**LS 513: History and Memory: Coming to Terms with Traumatic Pasts**
Rosenfeld

Genuine historical understanding requires not only knowledge of what transpired in the past but an appreciation of how perceptions have changed over time. This course introduces students to the complex relationship between history and memory by examining how divisive pasts have been remembered, politicized and, if at all possible, come to terms with the 20th century. The pasts in questions are historical legacies that have been marked by extremity rather than normalcy. They include cases of genocide, such as the Nazi Holocaust and the decimation of Native Americans in the New World, as well as episodes of military conflict such as World War II and the American Civil War. Marked by war, criminality, and death, these historical events have left deep scars upon the collective memories of the nations involved. They are thus excellent case studies for understanding how the past has evolved into the present.

**LS 514: History of Feminism in the West**
Hohl

Feminism is a multi-faceted struggle for women’s autonomy and self-determination. Based on initial protests against subordination followed by a more complex series of manifestations, feminism has been characterized by some scholars as the “longest non-violent revolution”. During the 19th and 20th centuries, the development of feminist consciousness reached a critical stage under the aegis of reform initiatives and with the evolution of theories designed to explain women’s oppression and to offer frameworks for emancipation. Beginning with the United States, birthplace of the first organized woman’s movement, this course looks beyond the U.S. to analyze responses to the “woman question” in Western Europe. We explore the tension between relational and individualistic approaches, the limits of gender as a category and in human rights discourse and the linkage of gender, race and class with other features of identity. Finally, we focus on the confines and possibilities of global feminism. This course is designed to assist students interested in women and gender as components of their future research.

**LS 515: Inventing Themselves: African American Women’s History**
Hohl

At the intersection of race, gender and class, African-American women often challenged the codification of blackness and femaleness as well as limited conceptions of class consciousness. From the Diaspora to the present, they established forms of resistance, devised survival strategies and transmitted cultural knowledge while defying racial/gendered stereotypes. The multiple roles assumed by Black women during their struggle from slaves to citizens in the U.S. require a careful study of the relational nature of difference and identity. This course focuses on African-American women as subjects and as agents of pivotal importance within the family, community, church and the labor force. Special attention will be paid to theory surrounding Black women’s roles in social justice movements such as abolition, social welfare and civil rights. A writing-intensive seminar, we engage in intensive primary source analysis and in historiographical debate.
LS 516: Problems in Ancient History
Ruffini
This course explores the major debates among scholars of Greco-Roman antiquity. Students will examine the role of class conflict in social and political change; the nature of ancient money and trade; explanations for ancient imperialism and colonialism; the chief causes of religious change; and changing attitudes towards sex and sexuality in antiquity. Focus will be on classical Athens, the late Roman republic and the late Roman empire.

LS 517: European History for Americanists
Behre
A broad survey of European history from the Middle Ages until the dawn of the modern era designed for teachers and other specialists in American history. Topics covered include: the invention of Europe and its cultural diversity; the intellectual expansion of Europe and the questions posed by European thinkers; skepticism and the Enlightenment; European Revolutions and their connection to events in America; traditions of radical thought, women's rights and religious freedom.

LS 518: The Making of French History
Behre
This course considers the Annales School of French historiography and its impact on the study of history in general. Growing from the groundbreaking efforts of Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre in the 1930s, this quantitative effort at comparative "total history" has changed the way historians approach their work ever since. Knowledge of French history is not required; students will look at important moments in French history as necessary background to this inquiry.

LS 519: War in European History, 1300-1945
Abbott
This course will focus upon relationships between war and social, political, economic, and technological developments in Europe from the later Middle Ages to the end of the Second World War. The course will deal with the specifics of warfare (strategy, tactics, training, and weaponry) only in the context of broader issues: the various costs of war (taxation, social disruption, changes in political systems), attitudes toward war (reasons for going to war, rules of warfare, peace negotiations), and the different kinds of warfare possible (conventional, guerilla, terror). A major research project will be required.

LS 520: England, 1485-1688
Abbott
This course will focus upon the political and religious changes that took place in England from the death of Henry VII to the Glorious Revolution. During this period England went from a feudal monarchy to a constitutional one, from a Roman Catholic Church that controlled all religious activity to a religiously pluralistic state, and from a single country to an empire that not only included Scotland and Ireland but colonies in the New World and trading bases in Africa and Asia. The course will also deal with the ramifications of this period of change in England for American government, law, and society. A major research project will be required.

LS 521: Death
Keenan
This course will explore the issue of death from a variety of perspectives: philosophical, literary, anthropological, and historical.
Readings to be drawn from:

Aries, The Hour of Our Death: The Classic History of Western Attitudes Toward Death over the Last One Thousand Years
Becker, The Denial of Death
Faust, This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War
Tolstoy, The Death of Ivan Ilyich
Faulkner, As I Lay Dying
Blanchot, Death Sentence
Mann, Death in Venice
Plato, Apology, and Phaedo
Montaigne, “That to Philosophize is the Learn How to Die”
Hegel, “Independence and Dependence of Self-Consciousness: Lordship and Bondage” (from Phenomenology of Spirit)
Kierkegaard, “The Decisiveness of Death (At the Side of a Grave)”
Freud, Beyond the Pleasure Principle, and Civilization and Its Discontents
Heidegger, “Dasein’s Possibility of Being-a-whole, and Being-towards-death” (from Being and Time), and “What is Metaphysics?”
Jonas, “The Burden and Blessing of Mortality”
Derrida, The Gift of Death

LS 522: The Gift

Keenan

This course will explore the philosophical, anthropological, and sociological aspects of the phenomenon of the gift.

Readings to be drawn from:

Emerson, “Gifts”
Nietzsche, “On the Gift-Giving Virtue” (from Thus Spoke Zarathustra)
Mauss, The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies
Bataille, The Accursed Share: An Essay on General Economy
Benveniste, “Gift and Exchange in the Indo-European Vocabulary” (from Problems in General Linguistics)
Lévi-Strauss, Introduction to the Work of Marcel Mauss
Sahlins, “The Spirit of the Gift”
Gasché, “Heliocentric Exchange”
Irigaray, “Women on the Market” (from The Sex Which Is Not One)
Derrida, “The Time of the King” (from Given Time)
Cixous, “Sorties: Out and Out: Attacks/Ways Out/Forays” (from The Newly Born Woman)
Bourdieu, The Logic of Practice
Godelier, The Enigma of the Gift
Godbout (in collaboration with Caillé), The World of the Gift
Shapiro, “The Metaphysics of Presents: Nietzsche’s Gift, the Debt to Emerson, Heidegger’s Values”
Shershow, The Work and the Gift

LS 523: The Rise of China in Historical Perspective

Li

China's recent rapid rise has caught the world's attention. How did China manage to transform itself from being one of the poorest countries in the world to the second largest world economy in the past three
decades? Using a historical perspective, this course examines the ideas and institutions that shaped China and its people and the internal and external dynamics that contributed to China's rise from the 1800s to the present. In this seminar students will learn historical approach and methods and engage in critical analysis of historical and secondary sources published in English language.

**LS 524: Music of Black Americans**  
Torff

This course is a musical and historical survey of African-American music and its essential contributions to American culture. African heritage, slave songs, and the colonial era will be studied followed by the role of black Americans in the music and culture of the Revolutionary and Civil War periods. The evolution of the spirituals, minstrel songs, and ragtime as it relates to dance forms will be examined along with the role of blacks as performers in classical music and theatre. The final section will look at racism and issues of gender in America, and how musicians of diverse backgrounds have collaborated and contributed to the evolution of American culture despite adversity.

**LS 525: The Encounter of China and the West: Texts and Images**  
Xiao

This course examines the relationship between China and the West throughout the centuries. Drawing upon a rich body of historical and fictional materials, the course emphasizes the intellectual and artistic aspects of the encounter in modern times. We discuss both the West's experience and views of China and China's response to the West. The course materials, which include fiction, films, non-fictional essays as well as theoretical articles, are arranged based on key historical figures, events, and issues. Students not only develop a foundational knowledge about China-and-the-West intercultural experience and representations but also learn to think and analyze critically the relationships between fiction and history, between art and life, and between self and society. All texts are in English. Films have subtitles.
Appendix Five: Tentative Initial Four Year Curriculum Map

Fall 2013

Spring 2014

Fall 2014

Spring 2015
LS 516: *Problems in Ancient History*: Ruffini.

Summer 2015

Fall 2015

Spring 2016
LS 599: *Capstone in Liberal Studies*: Mielants.
LS 502: *The Frontier in American Literature*: Bayers

Summer 2016
LS 505: *David Hume and Jane Austen: Ethics, Aesthetics, and Knowledge*: Bayne (Travel Course).

Fall 2016
LS 523: *The Rise of China in Historical Perspective*: Li.

Spring 2017
LS 599: *Capstone in Liberal Studies*.
LS 512: *Sacred Texts in America*: Harkins.

Summer 2017
LS 509: *Rome in the Cultural Imagination*: Carolan (Travel Course).
Appendix Six: Courses to be cross-listed from other CAS graduate programs

Note:
1) The cross-listing of each of these courses must be approved by both programs, and reviewed by (at least) the chair of A&SCC.
2) There will very likely be additions to this list.

Courses to be cross-listed from the American Studies graduate program:

AS 402 American Historiography
AS 410 Introduction to Women’s and Gender Studies
AS 420 Feminist Theory and Gender Studies
ASAH 441 Fine Art vs. Anti-Art: 1917-1967
ASHI 442 Immigration, Ethnicity, and Race in U.S. History
ASHI 459 Working in America: A Social History
ASIT 481 Visions of Italy and America in Film
ASMU 401 The History of Jazz
ASMU 402 The History of Rock
ASPO 467 Politics in Film
ASSO 463 Urban/Suburban Sociology
ASSO 465 Urban Sociology: New York
ASSO 469 Women: Work and Sport
ASTA 421 Ethnic American Performance & Society
ASTA 452 Art & Entertainment in America: 1950 to the Present
ASTA 453 American Popular Entertainments and Social History

Courses to be cross-listed from Communication:

CO 440 Ethics and Communication
CO 535 Globalization, Communication, and Culture
## Appendix Seven: Six Year Budget

### Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (FY)</th>
<th>Projected # of</th>
<th>Avg # Credits per</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Per Credit Rate</th>
<th>Total Tuition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year One (FY14)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>$31,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fall &amp; spring avg hrs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>summer avg hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Two (FY15)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$676</td>
<td>$135,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fall &amp; spring avg hrs</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>summer avg hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Three (FY16)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>$703</td>
<td>$232,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fall &amp; spring avg hrs</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>summer avg hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Four (FY17)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>$731</td>
<td>$329,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fall &amp; spring avg hrs</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>summer avg hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Five (FY18)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>$760</td>
<td>$342,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fall &amp; spring avg hrs</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>summer avg hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Six (FY19)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>$791</td>
<td>$355,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fall &amp; spring avg hrs</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>summer avg hrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (FY)</th>
<th>FT Faculty Expense</th>
<th>PT/Overload</th>
<th>Supplemental Pay</th>
<th>Program Coordinator</th>
<th>Market/Recruit Exp</th>
<th>Total Direct</th>
<th>25% Gross Revenue</th>
<th>Net Revenue</th>
<th>Cumulative Net</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year One (FY14)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$50,900</td>
<td>$7,800</td>
<td>-$27,500</td>
<td>-$27,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Two (FY15)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$61,900</td>
<td>$33,800</td>
<td>$39,500</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Three (FY16)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$32,400</td>
<td>$2,844</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$60,244</td>
<td>$58,001</td>
<td>$113,758</td>
<td>$125,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Four (FY17)</td>
<td>$92,991</td>
<td>$11,200</td>
<td>$2,916</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$132,107</td>
<td>$82,256</td>
<td>$114,660</td>
<td>$240,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Five (FY18)</td>
<td>$95,781</td>
<td>$11,600</td>
<td>$2,988</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$135,369</td>
<td>$85,546</td>
<td>$121,269</td>
<td>$361,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Six (FY19)</td>
<td>$191,645</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$3,060</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$225,705</td>
<td>$88,968</td>
<td>$41,198</td>
<td>$402,886</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes and Clarifications related to MLS program budget:**

- New faculty lines estimated at $92,991K, calculated using estimated salary for asst professors, plus 45% benefits.
- Year 6 includes additional faculty line; to be evaluated based on actual enrollment
- Likely courses: 2 in year 1; 4 in year 2; 5 in year 3; 7 each year thereafter
- Pace of enrollment based on MA American Studies
- Adjunct pay rate calculated at $5000 per course for model purposes; increased by $200 per year for potential salary increases
- Supplemental Pay includes estimate for $300 stipend per student enrolled in 300 level courses at 3 per year and 12% stipend for supervision of independent studies at 3 per year starting in year 3
Appendix Eight: Master of Liberal Studies Working Group Meeting Minutes:

Meeting of the Masters of Liberal Studies Working Group

November 14, 2011

Present: Steve Bachelor, Peter Bayers, Steve Bayne (Chair), Olivia Harriot, Eric Milientes, Aaron Perkus, Gita Rajan, Giovanni Ruffini.

Regrets: Cecelia Bucki, Nancy Dallavalle

Background—During initial conversations, we asked the question: “do we want disciplinary masters programs or interdisciplinary programs.” A market survey was conducted. Asked which types of programs are people most interested in. Response for MLS was substantially higher than for discipline specific programs—this doesn’t preclude moving in that direction in the future. When asked about concentrations, history had the highest rating. About 1000 people completed the survey. Population is a representative of our area and whom we would expect to enroll. Enrollment management was pleasantly surprised by the market response. One of the challenges will be to lure people away from other institutions while not cannibalizing from our own programs. Thus, markets this program to retirees, spouses, etc. Target these two groups to make it appealing to them.

Although the sciences were not part of the initial survey, after the conference we (Steve and Aaron) saw the draw and importance of including.

Course descriptions were solicited from faculty from a wide variety of disciplines. Participation in the working group was sought out. Our next step is to write the proposal. Aaron and Steve attended the AGLSP (Association of Graduate Liberal Studies Programs) conference.

Conversation about the basic structure:

Two Core courses (interdisciplinary): team-taught courses—courses that build the community of those who are in the MLS program. Perhaps a very small residential component—retreat/residency. (1) there are not many programs out there that team teach courses so this will set us apart (2) Community building connected to the mission—makes us distinctive.

Eight interdisciplinary electives

Capstone (thesis/research/performance)—portfolio. If you do away with the requirement of the thesis, enrollment boost. Need to remember what our target audience—lifetime learners, those doing this for personal enrichment. Great many possibilities for encouraging, through intellectual discourse, to keep the students interested. Has to be fun, as open as possible, etc. We meet their demands in terms of capstone while ensuring that it meets out demands.

33 credits

Who is going to write the proposals for each of the various parts?

Back to the capstone—a single person assigned to the class as opposed to individual advisors. It is a “credit” argument. We might simply have a rotation as far as who gets to do this. Similar to the variety of independent studies. Program director can keep an eye on the pool of students.

Core course and community catharsis of the capstone. Connecting someone who is overseeing the research as well as someone who helps with advising.
Core: One core methodology course broadly conceived (toolbox) quantitative and qualitative aspects. One interdisciplinary theory class. Opportunity to use other resources on campus to cover places that might be gaps. LACs uses weekly guest lectures—one specific person to talk about their expertise.

First Year

**Fall one**
- 1 core
- 1 elective

**Spring one**
- 1 core
- 1 elective

**Fall two**
- 1 core
- 2 electives

**Spring two**
- 1 core
- 2 electives

etc,

Need to look at the possibility of using undergraduate courses for masters credit. More the model of using courses that are legitimate graduate courses for a masters program. How many of those? Under what circumstances? Perhaps allow them to take one class.

There currently a problem because all programs present to the A&S curriculum committee—since there are not currently criteria in place, it is all rather in flux.

Down the road there has to be some sort of oversight mechanism…the director makes the decisions, faculty invited to meetings to vote…clearly a problem. Look to the interdisciplinary programs for help on how to resolve the role of the director.

General agreement to 2 core, 8 electives, 1 capstone.

Steve will write the description, overview and summary.

Who will write the two core courses—Eric, Gita.

Timeline—at the end of spring, we would want to have a draft that we are pretty much in agreement about.

Aaron Perkus and Steve Bachelor will write the Objectives section.

Giovianni agreed to work on the Capstone proposal.

We discussed the timeline for getting drafts of this work done and discussing the results. There was
general agreement that sooner is better than later, and the possibility of a final meeting before the end of the semester to discuss drafts of the core course proposals and the governance structure was proposed.

Given this timeline and Gita’s availability, it was agreed that Eric would work on drafts of the core course proposals, he would try to contact Olivia, and he would also work with Steve Bayne.

Steve Bayne agreed to work on a draft of the governance section, and would investigate the possibility of using the recent IL governance document as a model.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Aaron Perkus, and

Steve Bayne

---

**MLS Working Group**

**Meeting of December 19, 2011**

**Minutes**

Present: Professors Peter Bayers; Steve Bayne; Cecelia Bucki; Angela Harkins; Olivia Harriott; Eric Mielants; Dean Aaron Perkus;

Regrets: Professors Steve Bachelor; Gita Rajan.

I. Announcements

Prof. Nancy Dallavalle will be unable to participate in the Working Group. Angela Harkins will be her replacement. Prof. Bayne also asked Prof. Mary Ann Carolan, who is also unable to serve. Prof. Bayne remarked that he regrets that Modern Languages does not have a participant. Both Prof. Bayne and Prof. Mielants suggested Prof. Joel Goldfield as a possibility, too. Dean Perkus commented that he thinks the MLS Working Group has a good blend of departments, and thus the Committee does not necessarily have to have a member from Modern Languages.

Prof. Bayne also explained that by Fall of 2012 he would like to be able to submit the MLS proposal to Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee to begin the formal approval process for the MLS program, though he is concerned about approval given current budgetary constraints. Dean Perkus commented that he is concerned about approval given current budgetary constraints. Dean Perkus commented that the curriculum committee would not be concerned with budget issues, and that as it is, the market research shows that this would be a revenue generating program. Prof. Harkins asked about the sciences as part of the MLS program. Prof. Bayne explained that most MLS programs involve the sciences. Prof. Perkus said many students for programs like these want exposure to sciences from the “5000” ft. level. Interested in non-technical view of science. Prof. Bucki remarked that she thinks that including the sciences is a plus for the program.

II. Minutes from Nov. 3, 2011 Meeting:

Minutes approved unanimously.

III. Review of Sample Core Course Syllabi:
Context: At the previous meeting of the Working Group, Prof. Mielants volunteered to construct two sample syllabi as core courses for the MLS program: one that concentrated on how knowledge has been constructed over the past 2000 years; the other seeks to examine multiple methodologies as well as heuristic tools used in the humanities, social sciences and natural sciences to critically consider the nature of scientific evidence. It is important to note that these syllabi were constructed as a starting point to facilitate discussion about core courses for the MLS program.

Discussion:

Prof. Bayne explained that the courses would be at the 400 level. Electives in the MLS will be at 500 level.

Prof. Mielants explained that he tried to construct the courses in such a way that science would include a Nobel Prize winning author. Prof. Mielants remarked that he was trying to create an introduction to methodologies in the sciences course. Moreover, the course also seeks to create a broad syllabus.

Prof. Bayne underscored that these are sample syllabi. Prof. Bayne also commented that the framework of the course proposal is what matters; how it’s taught will be up to a given instructor.

Prof. Bucki raised questions and concerns. Prof. Bucki explained that she thinks that these courses are unmarketable as introductory courses. Prof. Bucki believes that the first course in the program should be discipline specific, and that Fairfield should consider following the model of Wesleyan, which does not have required courses.

Prof. Bayne commented that at the annual Association of Graduate Liberal Studies Programs Workshop and Conference he and Aaron attended, they found that most MLS programs have required core courses.

Prof. Harkins commented on the two syllabi. Prof. Harkins explained that she thinks that a paper that is weighed 50% is too daunting, and instead encouraged smaller stake projects. Prof. Harkins also commented that she would like to see the courses designed to be more topical, and that the amount of topics would be relatively narrow. Prof. Harkins also remarked that she thinks assignments that would enliven the courses, for instance taking advantage of museums like the Met would be interesting. Prof. Harkins feels too that the course might include Near East topics such as Near East mythologies. Prof. Harkins also pointed out that this student body is different than students in a Ph.D. program. Prof. Harkin also wondered if an intro course might be 2 credits.

Prof. Perkus remarked that he thinks it’s important to think about marketing. He commented that he thinks that conceptually these courses are on the right track, but the committee needs to think how these courses are presented to a potential audience.

Prof. Harriott commented that she is enthusiastic about the content of the 402 course.

Prof. Bayne asked that the committee think about the course proposal as opposed to the syllabus itself.

Prof. Bucki pointed out that in her experience teaching Historiography to graduate students in American Studies shows that rigor can be expected in a course, but how the course is pitched to students is important.

Prof. Harkins also commented that the course needs to be appealing to potential untraditional
graduate students.

Prof. Perkus suggested that a potential key to either courses success would be to frame it by asking good questions.

Prof. Mielants suggested that a way to appeal to older students would be to ask questions about their own past experiences as students in a way they may not have considered when they were students twenty or thirty years ago. Perhaps ask questions that would help them understand the relevance of various past educational experiences in a new way.

Prof. Perkus suggested that students ask questions that take stock of their own lives.

Prof. Harriott commented that it can be the student’s task to ask how a course is relevant to them.

Prof. Bucki asked if two courses were necessary, and suggested that a foundational course in a specific discipline concentration might be less daunting.

Prof. Bayne explained that based on market research that the program would not have enough students to offer concentrations right from the outset.

Prof. Bucki commented that the MLS concentrations at Wesleyan are multi-disciplinary, and expressed concern about the marketability of an interdisciplinary core course.

Members of the Working Group wondered if perhaps one course should be offered instead of two.

Prof. Mielants remarked that these courses can reflect the interdisciplinary nature of the program, and that combining two courses may not be feasible.

Prof. Bucki commented that interdisciplinary goals need to be balanced with a concentration. Prof. Bucki believes this would offer a more concrete structure to the program.

Prof. Bayne commented that he thinks both courses overlap in terms of their attention to the humanities and sciences.

Prof. Harkins remarked that the 401 course seemed to focus on knowledge, and wondered if the marketing research said anything about the appeal of the arts to students.

Prof. Bayne commented that he saw no reason that this course would not potentially include art and music.

Prof. Bayne commented that different professors would teach the course in different ways. He observed that professors would offer content in a way that goes beyond the actual course description.

Prof. Bucki commented that she thinks the current proposed courses are too constricted by the current suggested format.

Prof. Harkins suggested that a version of this course could have a number of professors play in role in teaching an introductory course.

Prof. Bayne pointed to the difficulties of making this work, and that as a rule, this course would be taught as part of a professors teaching load.

Prof. Bucki noted that American Studies 403 has different professors lecture each week. So there is a model, though it has its limits.
Prof. Harriott asked what the market survey said about how many students would be enrolled each year.

Prof. Bayne explained that Judy Dubai said the program would get 15 students in the first year, and then 10-15 added per year.

Prof. Bayne also commented that he would certainly be willing to consider perhaps having only one core course.

Prof. Perkus pointed out that potential MLS students 10 to 15 years out of college, so some kind of core course might be needed, though he underscored the need to make the course appealing to attract students to the program.

Prof. Mielants imagined that this course could provide linkages to specific disciplines that students may have not thought before. When they take discipline specific courses, it will be framed in respect to a context established in the foundational course.

Prof. Bucki commented that all courses, whatever the discipline, would be at some level interdisciplinary.

Prof. Harkins asked if a methods course should be sequenced first as a core course.

Prof. Bucki commented that she thought you cannot in theory do all methodologies without content. Students need a “hands on” approach.

Dean Perkus thought the committee should consider one course that combines some ideas from each of the proposed courses that does not try to do it all.

Prof. Mielants again commented that he fears that trying to combine it all into one course is too much.

Prof. Bayne offered that he has course syllabi from other graduate liberal studies programs as possible models.

Prof. Bayne commented that at the next meeting the committee needs to continue this discussion. He suggested that committee members take the current course proposals and modify them to perhaps come up with a new single course or a new version of both courses. The members of the committee agreed to do so individually.

Prof. Bayne also explained that his inclination at this point is to consider asking interested faculty for proposals for electives.

Prof. Perkus commented that without developing learning outcomes he thought we are not ready to ask for proposals for electives yet.

Prof. Bayne mentioned that Prof. Bachelor had emailed him before the meeting and wrote that he (Prof. Bachelor) was interested in working on the outcomes for the program. Prof. Perkus agreed that he would work together with Prof. Bachelor to create a mission statement and outcomes.

**Item IV: Governance structure**

Prof. Bayne pointed out that he has looked at International Studies as a possible model for the MLS program government structure, but he thinks the I.S. structure will not work for the MLS. Professor Bayne explained that the thinks the government structure should include a Director and/or associate;
Steering committee; a curriculum committee; a program assistant.

Prof. Bayne commented that we need to think about how to decide membership on the steering committee. And we need to think about the size of the committee.

Prof. Bayne also pointed out that we would need to think about membership in regard to the Curriculum Committee.

Prof. Bayne commented that he expected the first steering committee to be composed of the current members of the working group.

Prof. Harkins thought that perhaps the current committee could solicit committee members from each relevant department.

Prof. Bayne commented that he thought the steering committee could use a distribution similar to the steering committee for the College of A&S. Prof. Bayne also stated that we would set up term limits in a similar fashion.

The Working Group discussed composition of steering committee, and Prof. Bayne said he will begin the process of constructing a governance structure, and that for the time being, he sees no objections to the current Working Group members remaining as is.

Prof. Bayne concluded the meeting reiterating the need to revisit the current proposed core courses. He also talked about a possible residency model for these courses, perhaps creating weekend sessions in order to help build a program community.

Meeting Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Bayers

---

**MLS Working Group**

**Meeting of February 9, 2012**

**Approved MINUTES**

Present: Professors: Steve Bachelor, Peter Bayers, Steve Bayne (chair), Cecelia Bucki, Olivia Harriott, Eric Mielants, Gita Rajan. Associate Dean Aaron Perkus.

Regrets: Angela Harkin, Giovanni Ruffini.

1. Announcement: Chair Bayne, along with Mark LeClair, will be at meeting on Feb. 22, 2012 called by SVP Fitzgerald to discuss future implementation of MLS and MPA plans. Stay tuned.

2. Minutes of last meeting ((12/19/11) approved unanimously, with 3 abstentions.

3. Core Courses:

   a. Three proposals: two re. one core course plus concentrations (Bucki, Ruffini); one proposal for one core course along the lines of Duke’s MLS Intro core “The Self in the World” by Kent Wicker (Bayers).
b. Bayne distributed his projection, based on market data, of how many courses could be offered each year and how long it would take to complete program without concentrations (Year Three) and with concentrations (Year Five) based on 30-credit program without capstone.

c. discussion ensued, with split between those who favored concentrations and those who favored quick completion through interdisciplinary courses (i.e. no concentrations).

> Motion (Mielants): to approve the development of a 33-credit Masters of Liberal Studies curriculum without concentrations, containing at least one foundational, team-taught course, one capstone experience, and up to nine elective courses designed to support this interdisciplinary program. Seconded by Bachelor. **Unanimously Approved.**

> Motion (Bucki): Since the previous motion was approved based on expediency, to get the program up and running and to attract students, I move to revisit the question of concentrations after Year Three. Seconded by Bachelor. **Unanimously Approved.**

c. further discussion about core courses: consider the SMU model of a foundation course and a “writing-intensive” course. What about a “writing facilitator”?

d. Steve Bayne volunteered to work on a general proposal for core-course guidelines for next meeting.


Respectfully submitted,

Cecelia Bucki, Scribe *du jour*

---

**MLS Working Group**

**Thursday, February 22, 2012**

**1:30-3:30 PM in CNS 8**

In attendance: Steve Bayne (chair), Peter Bayers, Cecelia Bucki, Eric Mielants, Angela Harkins, Aaron Perkus, Giovanni Ruffini.

Regrets: Steve Bachelor, Marti LoMonaco, Gita Rajan.

1. Meeting was called to order by Steve Bayne at 1:35 PM.

2. Chair’s Announcements:

   - Steve reported that Marti LoMonaco was interested in joining the working group but sends her regrets for today’s meeting.
   - Steve announced that the meeting with Mark LeClair and Aaron Perkus and Paul Fitzgerald has been rescheduled.

3. Approval of Minutes: Motion to approve by Peter; Seconded by Eric. Minutes were approved with minor corrections.

4. Core Course Proposal:
A. Number of Core Courses: Steve opened the discussion of the “core course” for the MLS program. During the first 3 years, he proposed that having 1 core course rather than 2 or more, would help with the quality and quantity of the electives that could be offered. Eric agreed that this could help with marketing the program and suggested that this could be easily revisited in the future if needed.

- Motion: Cecelia moved that the Working Group begin with 1 core course, but that this decision should be revisited after the first 3 years. Motion seconded by Peter.

- Discussion of the motion: Aaron said that there were many comparable programs that offered 2 or more core courses; Cecelia responded and said that it was not clear that those core courses served the same purpose as our core courses. Eric expressed the desire to someday see 2 core courses after the 3 year period.

- VOTE: all in favor; motion unanimously passed.

B. Core Course Proposal: MLS 401 dated 2/16/12

There was an open discussion of the proposal. Cecelia complimented the course’s title (“self” has an appeal for an American audience) and also the use of the word “world” has a good international dimension.

Criticisms of the proposal: There were various aspects of the proposal itself that were critiqued by the group.

- Weekend events. Several members of the group found the required weekend events to be burdensome and potentially a problem for busy student schedules. Steve described some of the rationale for including this language: to create community, to make use of the city and its resources. It was decided by the group that this was not an essential aspect of the course that needed to be encoded in the course proposal. This however does not mean that faculty would be unable to offer this if they so desired.

- Team-teaching: Giovanni questioned whether students would find team-teaching to be attractive and questioned whether it belonged in the proposal. Many people expressed that team-teaching was a desirable feature of the program. Aaron raised the point that having the language of team-teaching in the course proposal would help to secure funding for this for faculty. Steve also thought that team-teaching would be more cost-efficient than asking for a new hire line, and so more desirable. Eric and Angela expressed that the team teaching helped to enrich and enhance the experience of the core course which is intentionally broad.

- Wording: some discussion followed about changing the wording of the proposal to include “perspectives” and “theories” throughout and to delete redundancies.

- Goals/Objectives: Aaron initiated a discussion of the course proposal’s “goals/objectives” section and said that what was listed were not objectives because they were not measurable. He also proposed removing #4 listed there; the group did not agree to remove #4. It was decided that the New Course Proposal form was ambiguous and that the MLS working group was interpreting the category to read: GOALS and/or Objectives.
• Format of the course: Cecelia noted that the New Course Proposal form specifies all three: lecture, discussion, and seminar, and proposed that we choose only “seminar” format. All agreed.

  o Motion: Giovanni moved to adopt the proposal with minor changes; seconded by Aaron. There were 6 votes in favor; one opposed.

C. Administrative Structure:

• Motion: Giovanni moved to adopt section #7 on the Administrative Structure; seconded by Aaron.

Discussion of this motion followed. Cecelia expressed strongly that she did not feel comfortable with having the CAS faculty elect members of the MLS steering committee. Steve said that he thinks that these positions should be elected offices. Eric agreed with Cecelia that it is important for stability not to have open elections for the MLS at the beginning. Eric suggested that there be open elections after the 1st three years. It was agreed that the director should be appointed and that there should be 9 people on the committee total. It was decided not to include an ex officio member from the administration at this time. Angela suggested that the statement “six positions at large” be added to the membership of the group.

  • VOTE: to adopt #7 with changes was passed unanimously.

D. Mission Statement

Some discussion of the mission statement was begun but it was decided that a motion to approve the Mission statement would be postponed until the next meeting. Several people expressed concerns about the wording of this mission, specifically the ‘undergraduate’ context of certain phrases. Several changes were suggested to this mission statement which resulted in the following version:

To deliver a transformative experience for students through a broad liberal arts curriculum focused on developing critical thinking and writing skills, expanding cultural perspectives, and promoting integrative learning by providing students with team-taught courses, diverse community engagement, independent and original research opportunities culminating in a capstone experience. The program is intended to prepare graduates to be successful professionals or life-long learners.

There was no time to complete the discussion of this mission statement and further revisions may be needed. Concerns were also raised about program goal #3, and program outcome #3, but neither of these were discussed in any detail.

5. Next meeting was scheduled for March 7 at 11:30 AM (Minutes: Eric Mielants). Location TBA. Discussion of the MLS 499 course is scheduled for that time. Giovanni will prepare necessary revisions in light of today’s meeting and Steve will circulate it ahead of time.

Submitted by
Angela Kim Harkins
MLS Working Group
Meeting of Wednesday, March 7, 2012
at 11:30 a.m. in DMH 230.

In attendance: Steve Bachelor, Peter Bayers, Steve Bayne (chair), Cecelia Bucki, Angela Harkins, Olivia Harriott, Marti LoMonaco, Eric Mielants, Aaron Perkus, Gita Rajan, Giovanni Ruffini.

Minute taker: Eric Mielants

1. Announcements: Discussion of the MLS meeting with Dean Crabtree and AVP Fitzgerald and Steve Bayne as Chair of the MLS Working Group. This group has the full support of the administration to continue moving forward. Questions raised were whether we would be willing to allow students to take 300 level courses as part of their requirements. This will be discussed at a further meeting. Dean Crabtree also would like one of our courses to be crosslisted with other graduate programs every single semester. This may be feasible in crosslisting with graduate American Studies courses. This comes out of a concern with an incoming class with only 15 students and give them enough flexibility.

2. Approval of previous minutes. No corrections. Motion to approve by Peter, seconded by Eric. 5 in favor, 4 abstentions.

3. Section 4 of program proposal: Objectives. Discussion of attachment and relevant section of attached minutes from the 2/22 meeting.

The mission statement should state specifically it’s a graduate program.

The paragraph D, p. 3 should end with “successful professionals, scholars, and life-long learners.”

Dr. Ruffini: I’d like to eliminate the mission statement reference to the promotion of social justice. A majority agrees the reference should be moved elsewhere.

Dr Bucki: Should the mission statement include references to team-taught courses.

Dr Perkus: It sends a message to prospective students about the foundational course(s) which will be team-taught. But it can be moved to the course proposal instead.

Dr. Bucki: I’d like to avoid false advertising and call it a “team-taught foundational course” and “diverse seminars” instead of “community engagement” and “master’s thesis or ‘project” instead of experience.

Dr Bachelor: we should insert a period after ‘opportunities’, followed by “The MLS will culminate in a master’s thesis or project.”

Motion to approve revised mission statement as follows (Dr. Mielants/Dr. Ruffini):

Mission:
To deliver a transformative experience for students through a broad liberal arts curriculum focused on developing critical thinking and writing skills, expanding cultural perspectives, and promoting integrative learning by providing students with team-taught foundational courses, diverse seminars, and independent and original research opportunities. The MLS will culminate in a master’s thesis or project. The program is intended to prepare graduates to be successful professionals, scholars, and life-long learners.

**Motion approved unanimously.**

A discussion followed about the program goals.

Dr Bayne: I’d like to see an addition in nr. 1 which refers to a critical appraisal of the world.

Dr. Harkins: Perhaps we should reformulate goal nr. 2 as the word physical is ambiguous as stated.

Dr Perkus: we could say “students would explore a critical understanding of the self and its relation to society and the world” instead of the current wording.

Dr. Ruffini: comments about nr. 3: sounds very vague

Dr. Perkus: perhaps the focus on values is out of place

Dr. Mielants: Nr. 3 could be rephrased “Students will develop a clear and consistent understanding of and commitment to their own preferences regarding ethics and aesthetics.”

**Motion to approve the new 3 goals as follows (Dr. Rajan/Dr Bayers):**

**Program Goals:**

1. Students will develop the ability to make connections across disciplines in order to understand the convergence and divergence of different fields of knowledge and to understand the nature of an academic community.

2. Students will develop a critical understanding of the self and its relation to society and the world.

3. Students will develop a clear and consistent understanding of, and commitment to, their own preferences regarding ethics and aesthetics.

**Motion approved unanimously.** One Abstention by Dr. Ruffini.

Discussion on outcomes which need to be measurable.

Dr. Ruffini: “switch words considers and transcend” in nr. 3

Dr Bayers: replace “research with project” in nr 3

**Motion to approve the program outcomes as follows (Dr. Bayers/Dr. Mielants):**

**Program Outcomes:**

1. Students will demonstrate proficiency in critical thinking.

2. Students will write accomplished academic prose.

3. Students will produce an original master’s thesis or project that considers or
transcends disciplinary boundaries.

**Motion approved unanimously**

4. Capstone experience. See attachment. This will be discussed at the next meeting.

5. Next meeting date to be determined by Doodle poll.

6. Adjournment.

---

**Master of Liberal Studies (MLS) Working Group Draft Minutes**

**Submitted by Olivia Harriott**

**March 28, 2012**

**In Attendance:**

Professors Steve Bachelor, Peter Bayers, Steve Bayne (Chair), Cecelia Bucki, Angela Harkins, Olivia Harriott, Marti LoMonaco, Eric Mielants, Aaron Perkus, Giovanni Ruffini.

1.) **Announcements:** none

2.) **Approval of minutes**

Dr. Ruffini moved to accept the minutes as written; seconded by Dr. Bachelor. The motion passed unanimously.

3.) **Capstone experience.** (hand-out)

**Dr. Perkus** moved to approve the MLS capstone experience and Dr. Bachelor seconded.

A discussion about the details of the capstone ensued.

**Dr. Bucki** inquired about the course description, specifically whether the capstone was a culminating seminar or individual projects. She presented as one model a capstone class as the culminating experience with individual projects or thesis as the final result. She furthered that this model gives faculty latitude to create projects based on their preferences. Dr. Bucki expressed concern about workload for the faculty teaching the capstone and the potential involvement of external faculty. She stated that it is not necessary to be specific about the project/thesis format and that the project should have some interdisciplinary nature.

**Dr. Bachelor** spoke in favor of the proposal stating that the professor controls the “rigor”.

**Dr. Perkus** added that students may not have common texts because they’ll be doing independent work; the instructors will give deadlines, workshops, etc. Dr. Perkus then posed the question: How do you create a community of scholars and commonality among members in order to give meaningful feedback?

**Dr. Mielants** said that the capstone will bring all the different specialties together and provide research methodologies.
Dr. Bayers said that the capstone could grow out of a smaller project (under a particular professor) and that the language in the description should be clear, “disciplinary or interdisciplinary or either.”

Dr. Bucki asked if one instructor could shepherd a number of students through a project and said that various fields of expertise could be useful to students.

Dr. Bayne said he liked the peer-review aspect of the capstone where students teach and defend their work, and read the work of others.

Dr. Harkins proposed the portfolio model, which she said offers quality control and where students may develop a small project, which can be further developed as the capstone project. With respect to peer review, Dr. Harkins expressed concern that peer review will only be as good as the participants and will be based on the quality of the group of students involved.

Dr. Perkus spoke in favor of the proposal highlighting as strengths the community and interdisciplinary aspects, and its detailed vision for the program.

A discussion about capstone preparation and rigor continued. Dr. Perkus suggested language that would recommend that students propose a project after the completion of “X” courses and identify a mentor before beginning the capstone. He furthered that we should trust our own ability to have students ready for a rigorous Master’s program. He thought that the Peer review aspects were strong, and that faculty will attend the presentations (e.g. symposium style presentations).

Dr. Bayers asked if the capstone course should be a one-credit course.

Dr. Bachelor responded that a one-credit model will be difficult for assigning faculty teaching load.

Dr. Harkins suggested a time-line for the capstone course, where at the beginning of the course, students present to the group their best piece of preliminary work, receive feedback, then at halfway point, present again with improvements. Dr. Harkins said that this approach will enrich the conversation and students can see how the projects develop.

Dr. Bucki added that a statement of thesis and bibliography should be required.

Dr. Perkus said the capstone should have the same goals and learning outcomes and descriptions and that a “model syllabus” should be added.

Dr. Ruffini provided a definition of the “syllabus,” requirement in the course proposal, which includes: goals, learning outcomes and course description only.

Dr. Bucki moved to amend MLS 401 in prerequisites under #3, completion of MLS 401 a submission and approval by the program committee of a Prospectus, seconded by Dr. LoMonaco.

The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion of the proposal then turned to a number of small specific changes to the language that were agreed on by the group before the motion to approve the proposal as variously amended was accepted unanimously.

4.) Discussion of whether to allow MLS students to take some number of 300 level courses to fulfill the requirements of the MLS degree.

Dr. Ruffini spoke in favor and thought that students can be challenged intellectually in the class.

Dr. Bucki commented that some graduate students don’t like mixed classes because of the lack of
rigor. She furthered that the instructor can give extra readings for grad students if course is mixed.

Dr. Harkins favors a contract that outlines additional readings and the higher expectations of the student.

Dr. Bayers added that mixed classes can potentially elevate the course experience, but questioned do we risk not filling grad courses.

Dr. Meilents spoke against enrolling grad students in 300-level undergrad courses. He stated that this policy will water down content, is bad for marketing and that some grad students may not want to be in a mixed class with undergrads.

Dr. LoMonaco spoke of the existing successful model in American Studies, which allows some students to complete their degree within a given time period.

Dr. Perkus added that it may be important to help launch the MLS program and that it could change the revenue model for the program. He said eventually the policy can be changed.

Dr. Bucki recommended that MLS students be allowed to take grad level courses in other professional programs.

Dr. Bayne reported that the deadline for MLS course proposals is April 16th. He said we may need to extend the deadline to end of April.

5.) Next meeting - middle of April sometime. Tentative timeline given by Dr. Bayne:

End of April – MLS proposal submissions due
Mid April – MLS working group meeting
Early May – MLS working group meeting to discuss course proposals
This semester Dr. Bayne (Chair) meeting with Judy Dubai to discuss budget
Summer 2012 – MLS working group work on MLS draft proposal
September: MLS working group finalize MLS proposal
October: submit MLS proposal to ASCC
Fall of 2013: – start program

6.) Adjournment

Dr. Ruffini moved to adjourn and Dr. Bayers seconded.
Regrets: Cecelia Bucki (sabbatical), Angela Harkins, Eric Mielants (sabbatical), Gita Rajan.

10:11—Meeting called to order (Bayne).

1. **Announcements:**
   a. **Dr. Bayne** attended an excellent AGLSP conference in Portland. Next year it is in Chicago and we should consider sending several people. Since this conference accepts papers, participation might be fundable by department budgets. Pre-conference workshops involving all the details involved in creating and maintaining a program would also be advisable.

   b. **Dr. Bayne:** We (the working group) will have to generate additional course proposals, as well as meet to approve these before we are actually tapped to be the steering committee. We are fine to launch the program now since the Fall 2013 course, our Foundational Course, is already in the proposal. That is the only first semester course. **Dr. Perkus** mentioned that the MPA proposal, currently at the state level, is getting pushback from the state because it doesn’t have the entire curriculum developed and approved. **Dr. Bayne** is looking to create a four year curriculum map of initial courses. **Dr. Bayers** reminded the committee that we already have courses on the books through American Studies. **Dr. Perkus** also indicated that a new course, connecting Science, Technology and Literature interdisciplinarily, has been proposed by **Dr Rajan** and will be developed by **Drs. Rajan, Perkus and Harriott** for review in Spring 13. **Dr. Perkus** also noted that the Dean has reviewed and endorsed the proposal—indicating that it was well written and thought through. Several of her suggestions have been incorporated into the most recent draft (noted below).

2. **Dr. Bayne:** Our current plan, pending approval from this committee, is to go to ASCC November 13; EPC in Dec; AC in Feb; State in March; BoT March/April.

3. **Dr. Bayne** and **Dr. Perkus** will be meeting with marketing next week to begin strategizing about the launch for Fall 13. At that time, a contingency plan will also be discussed should the program not be ready to launch until Spring 14.

4. Approval of minutes. (LoMonaco, Ruffini). Approved unanimously.
5. Approval of LS 598: Independent Study. (Ruffini, Perkus). Starts on page 34 of program proposal. Dr. Ruffini—looks like an excellent course that he would be happy to take if he were a student and would love to teach as a professor. A robust discussion followed regarding limitations to the number of IS or 300 level a student should take (see 6g under discussion of program below). Dr. LoMonaco added that it is important to have this (of independent studies courses) flexibility in the program. (Passed Unanimously)

6. Approval of MLS program proposal. (LoMonaco/Harriott)

Dr Bayne highlighted the major changes since the program proposal was last reviewed.

a) Sample syllabus for the foundation course has been included.

b) Regarding the steering committee, Dean Crabtree was opposed to an election—preferred a nomination process, wherein appointments are made through consultation with director and dean. This change was incorporated into the proposal (page 10). None of the other grad programs directly elect their steering committees. There were no objections to this change.

c) Discussion about budget—Dr. Perkus: stated that this was very similar to the MPA program in terms of the enrollment numbers for first three years, return to the university, etc. Dr. Ruffini initiated a discussion regarding the scalability of the program. Dr. Perkus offered that the challenge is both to launch and sustain this (and any graduate) program. Dr. Bayne mentioned that in regards to scalability, 45 students is the current ceiling. It is unlikely that we will be so many more than 45 (in years 4,5,6) that this would be a problem. The question of selectivity is going to be a challenge in the beginning, but once we are established, the selection process will become much more important. Should the program reach its enrollment goals, two lines will be created (first by year four) for rotating visiting professors. At that point, we will have recommendations on how this new line would be decided. If we do explode in enrollment (and consequently raise the ceiling), we have a case to make about increasing the number of lines generated.

d) Based upon discussion as a whole, the program director stipend will be raised to $5000 (from $4500) to be consistent to the other graduate program directors in CAS.

e) Resources Section (page 10/11)—discussion ensued regarding faculty teaching as part of load for the program. Dr. Bayne: The task will be to choose faculty from participating departments wherein departments are able to allow a faculty member to teach in the MLS program as part of load, or to choose faculty who would like to teach in the MLS as an overload. All of this is in consultation with the dean based on an overall assessment of faculty and programmatic load. The group discussed the possibility of noting on the budget page indicating that if enrollment goes as planned, by year 4, the entire curriculum could be taught as part of load for participating faculty and noting in the budget narrative that faculty members will have the option to teach as part of load depending upon an assessment of the overall curricular and departmental demands. Dr. Harriot: Similar to the Honors Program, permission is historically always been granted to allow departmental faculty to teach Honors.
courses as part of load. The proposal suggests that a rotating visiting position lines would provide for sufficient coverage for the undergraduate curriculum. **Dr. Perkus:** Careful consideration must be placed on ensuring that the undergraduate programs do not suffer as a result of part-of-load teaching in the graduate program.

f) Discussion on Appendix 5—**Dr. LoMonaco** indicated that many more AS courses should be included with the possible courses that will be cross-listed with the MLS program. **Dr. Bayne:** the vision is that moving forward, a new course proposal needs to be created for a course to be cross-listed. Courses will not be allowed to be cross-listed without MLS curriculum committee review in consultation with the program wherein the course is housed.

g) (Continued from number 5 above). **Dr. Bayne:** In the program proposal, (page 8) students may take up to two 300 level courses or Independent Studies. These courses may not be in the same discipline or with the same instructor.

h) **Dr. Bayers** indicated his support for the governance structure section of the proposal. **Dr. Bayne** mentioned that he used all the existing governance structures as a basis for developing this one.

i) **Dr. Harriott** wanted to discuss of how this program might be marketed: wealthy adults, teachers needing credentials, and graduates from our BPS program. This degree will rely a great deal on how it enters the market—identifying and appealing to the target populations will be essential.

j) It was decided by the whole that the program requirements would be based on the established language contained in the Graduate Programs catalog.

k) Dr. Bayne reiterated the importance of receiving vitas from the entire working group. He needs them all by November 1\(^{st}\), no more than 4 pages.

l) Motion to approve the MLS program passed unanimously.

7. Next meeting has been tentatively scheduled to be held before the end of the semester.
8. Meeting Adjourned 11:50am

Minutes respectfully submitted by Aaron Perkus
Appendix Nine: A&SCC Approval and Minutes:
Notification of Approval by A&SCC:
From: Rosivach, Vincent
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2012 9:47 PM
To: Bayne, Steven
Subject: MLS proposal
Attachments: ascc minutes october 2012.docx

Dear Prof. Bayne:
The Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee, at its meeting of November 13, approved the proposal for a Master of Arts in Liberal Studies with the proviso that the MALS steering committee provide in future drafts of its proposal greater specificity as to the program’s use of faculty resources, including consideration of how the program will be staffed, the number of times the courses are taught and its impact on teaching loads.
I have attached a draft copy of the minutes of the meeting to give you a sense of the Committee’s discussion.
If you have any questions about the Committee’s approval, the proviso which it has attached, or the Committee’s discussion please do not hesitate to speak with me.
Best wishes for the success of this proposal.

Vincent J. Rosivach
Chair, Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee

Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee
A&SCC Meeting of November 13, 2012
Draft Minutes (Excerpt)

Present: Crabtree (Dean, CAS), Fernandez, Garvey, Miners, Rosivach (chair), Ruffini (recording), Xie
Absent: Lacy, Johnson, Williams
Guests: Steve Bayne (Philosophy for MLS)

Called to order at 3:30 PM.

In absence of old business and minutes for approval, the meeting proceeded to new business.

1) MOTION
At the chair’s request, Fernandez makes and Garvey seconds a motion to re-order the agenda to proceed directly to the MLS proposal’s curricular aspects. The motion passes unanimously.

Chair invites Prof. Bayne to present the curriculum of the proposed Master of Liberal Studies program. Bayne then discusses the sequence of study in the program; its required courses; its possible courses of study; and the general philosophy behind the program in its interdisciplinary aspect.
A question period follows. Xie asks how the capstone experience can work in an interdisciplinary way, and whether only one professor is at stake. Bayne confirms that one professor will teach the class, and that that professor will work with outside specialists, and that the class members as a whole will also contribute to that process. Miners asked about the survey response rate; how instruction will count towards faculty schedules; and whether undergraduates will take any of these classes. Bayne states that teaching will be a mix of load and overload, adding that desire to avoid taking away from undergraduate instruction is behind the desire to add new faculty lines in years four and six of the program’s development. Crabtree notes that all graduate programs work on a similar mix of load and overload. Both Bayne and Crabtree note that some classes will be open to undergraduates. Bayne departs.

**MOTION**

Xie makes and Fernandez seconds the motion to recommend the approval of this proposal. Miners expresses doubts about the market survey, having never seen one historically which admits to negative results; and also expresses concern about the impact for full-time faculty and their undergraduate teaching responsibilities. The chair suggests a response, which follows as a:

**MOTION**

By Miners seconded by Ruffini that the motion on the floor be amended so that the A&SCC’s recommendation of the acceptance of the proposal be contingent on the MLS steering committee providing in future drafts of its proposal greater specificity as to the program’s use of faculty resources, including consideration of how the program will be staffed, the number of times the courses are taught and its impact on teaching loads. Fernandez believes this has been addressed in the proposal. Miners responds by stating that our approval of the proposal will provide momentum to a proliferation of new programs. Crabtree speaks against the motion to amend, also pointing to previous discussion of this issue in the process of creating the proposal; pointing to historical success in getting promised new faculty lines for new programs; and pointing to existing mechanisms for departments to contribute fractional lines. Garvey believes that the proposal does not give enough specificity as to the use of faculty resources, particularly in the first few years.

The motion passes 3 votes to 1 with 1 abstention.

**THE AMENDED MOTION**

To recommend approval of this proposal with further specificity on the use of faculty resources. Crabtree speaks in favor of the motion; notes that the greater resource specificity will help the proposal in further steps of the approval process; and compliments the proposal for its organization. Miners has reservations about its success in the marketplace, but likes the flavor of the proposal and its broad learning objectives. Ruffini speaks in favor of the motion, noting the hard work and energy of the MLS committee and the ideas for course proposals coming down the pipeline. Crabtree points to nascent state approval issues potentially requiring the A&SCC to see future course proposals sooner than we might have anticipated. The chair asks that the committee receive this courses as soon as possible.

The motion passes unanimously.
Appendix Ten: EPC Meeting Draft Minutes (Excerpt)

Educational Planning Committee
Fairfield University
Draft Minutes
December 20, 2012

Present: Peter Bayers, Paul Fitzgerald, Cathy Giapponi, Sheila Grossman, Olivia Harriott, Evangelia Bilias Lolis, Qin Zhang, Mark Scalese, Carl Scheraga, Christopher Staecker, Susan Franzosa

Visiting: Associate Dean GSEAP Faith-Anne Dohm

Regrets: Dean Lynn Babbington

3. Consideration of the Master of Liberal Studies (MLS)
Professor Bayne presented the MLS as a 33-credit interdisciplinary master’s degree housed in the CAS. He stated that the conception of the program was motivated by faculty interest. Professor Bayers noted the loss of money during the first year. Dean Franzosa questioned the stipend of $5,000 for the MLS program coordinator, which is higher than the $2,750 stipend for program directors. Professor Bayne responded that the America Studies program director receives $5,000. Professor Giapponi asked about demographics of the market research survey. Professor Bayne indicated that he didn’t have those data. Associate Dean Perkus responded that ages 20-50 was the target. SVPAA Fitzgerald asked if a MLS degree would be helpful for a high school teacher. Professor Bayne responded yes but added that the intention is not to take students away from other programs. Professor Scheraga agreed that teachers would find this program very interesting. Dean Franzosa felt that the MLS program would compete with GSEAP’s Master of Foundations of Teaching, which allows candidates to incorporate specialties into the subjects taught. Dean Franzosa continued by saying that teachers often want to earn a master’s in the subject they teach. Assoc. Dean Perkus said that the market survey results indicated that the majority of respondents wanted flexibility in a program. Professor Grossman said she was impressed with the response rate of the market survey and asked about projected numbers of students. Assoc Dean Perkus said the goal is to enroll 12 students the first year of the program, then 20 in the second. Professor Bayne shared enrollment data from the University of Southern California (USC) MLS program, reporting a total population of <45 students in the program. SVPAA Fitzgerald reported that USC is located in a bad neighborhood and would not attract certain adult learners. Assoc. Dean Perkus said that we are likely to target 40-70 year old adult learners who may be retired and want to return to school. He also reported that the professional studies program at the former university college graduated up to ~12 bachelors of professional studies students per year. He said it would be these students directed to this type of program. Professor Bayers spoke of the problems with justification of team-taught courses. Professor Bayne stated that aside from year one, the budget should support a team-taught course. Assoc. Dean Perkus added that the curriculum was designed with just one team taught course that will offer students a community building experience at the start of the program. SVPAA Fitzgerald said that we are comfortable losing money the first year and that it’s understood that we need to invest in a program for a couple of years to get it launched. He said that the
university will build into the revenue stream over time by adding a faculty line or an endowed chair. Professor Bayers said that because there is an overlap with American Studies, students could take courses in both programs. He continued that with careful planning we can ensure that the classes fill and that students have a robust experience in the class. Dean Franzosa shared her experience developing a similar program at her former institution and said they had a hard time obtaining students who were committed to pursuing a degree. Dean Franzosa also expressed concerned about the marketing and financial structure and noted that the stated 25% gross revenue to the University is unlikely accomplished with other programs. SVPAA Fitzgerald said that this approach is part of the new financial model for graduate programs. Professor Scalese asked about the existence of guidelines for new course proposals to the program. Professor Bayne referred to the mission statement and goals and objectives outlined in the program. Bayne said that interdisciplinary courses that contribute to the interdisciplinary nature of the program are welcome and that the goal is for students see how disciplines differ in their approaches. Assoc. Dean Perkus added that the capstone clarifies the intent of the program, which is to think in inter-, cross- and trans-disciplinary ways. Professor Bayne said that our university is already interdisciplinary-based and looking at the course pre-proposals already submitted, it shouldn’t be difficult to get interdisciplinary courses. Dean Franzosa inquired about internships and service learning. Professor Bayne responded that no structure for internships or service learning was developed and that if they are, they will be based on individual courses.

Professor Grossman motioned to approve, SVPAA Fitzgerald seconded.

Professor Bayers spoke in favor of the program and thought that the population of individuals who would be interested is out there. He furthered that marketing data indicated that students don’t know about our program and that the University needs to do a better job identifying marketing streams. SVPAA Fitzgerald reported that President von Arx invested $200,000 into marketing of graduate programs with additional marketing on Metro North, Google ads, electronic and static billboards, and radio and television. Professor Giapponi said that demographic data would help target certain groups. Professor Zhang responded that interest is there, the market is there, and there are no competitors. Dean Franzosa added that marketing that is specific to certain constituents would be crucial to the success of the program. She thought that the program would compete with the GSEAP, and she was disappointed that GSEAP was not consulted. Professor Harriott said that she thought the omission of GSEAP was unintentional. Professor Bilias Lolis asked if the 20% of survey respondents who expressed interest in the program was congruent with what was wanted. SPAA Fitzgerald responded yes. Dean Franzosa said that the state looks at the academic quality of a program and not whether or not it is viable. She also said and that the first cohorts are the best marketers of any program. SPAA Fitzgerald expressed optimism about internship opportunities and study trips, referring to the recent successful Bellarmine museum of art trip to Cuba as an example. He further stated that this type of program would help us make friends with a certain demographic profile.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Appendix Eleven: CVs of MLS Working Group- See GFS Website
Memos to the Academic Council from the UCC detailing the UCC’s actions for the fall semester have not adequately outlined the rationale for those actions. I supply those rationales herein.

1. Final Exam Policy
In my memo of November 9, I forwarded to you three motions regarding language changes to the Journal of Record final exam policy. In subsequent correspondence we agreed that the first of those motions was based on a false premise. Accordingly, I will discuss only Motions B and C. Motion B first made alterations to section 2 of the JOR final exam language. These alterations were very simple. The committee’s rationale for supporting these alterations was only the desire to stress the cumulative nature of the final comprehensive evaluation, and to clarify that that evaluation might take a combination of forms, and not be limited to one form alone. Motion B next made alterations to sections 3 and 4. The committee’s rationale for the new language it proposed was simply the belief that final evaluations should be cumulative. The committee’s rationale for excising the remaining text from sections 3 and 4 was that the text as it stands created an unnecessarily burdensome and opaque set of requirements which are in any case widely and consistently violated by current faculty practice. Motion C alters the language regarding the final evaluation’s percentage of the total grade. The committee’s rationale for these changes was that the “one-third” requirement represented a particular compromise meaningful for an historical moment in Fairfield’s past, not a figure with any particular significance, and that preserving the integrity of the final evaluation date would ensure that the evaluation remain as comprehensive as possible, rather than simply becoming another assignment with an earlier due date.

2. The University College Seat on the UCC
In the agenda for the committee’s October meeting, I presented to the committee language for a motion recommending that the UC seat on the UCC “be retained as a regular seat for a voting representative to be appointed by the SVPAA on an annual basis to represent the interests of part-time undergraduate students.” Objections to this formulation were raised on the grounds that it did not come in the form of formal Faculty Handbook language to be amended, and that the phrase “interests of part-time undergraduate students” implied that the UCC was itself a committee of faculty representing the interests of constituents, rather than the student body as a whole.

Accordingly, in the agenda for the committee’s November meeting, I presented to the committee language for a motion amending the appropriate portion of the Faculty Handbook to call for the addition of “an academic officer whose focus is on part-time undergraduate students to be appointed by the SVPAA.” Objections to this formulation were raised on the grounds that it excluded the service of faculty members and that it was not clear whether this academic officer would serve a three-year, non-renewable term and be able to vote.

Accordingly, in the agenda for the committee’s December meeting, I presented to the committee the language ultimately passed by the committee and forwarded to the Academic Council for its consideration. I would summarize the committee’s rationale for passing this motion by saying that...
the committee believes that part-time undergraduates should continue to play an important role at Fairfield University; that the abolition of the UC seat on the committee would otherwise represent a loss of expertise in this area; and that the proposed motion allows us to draw that expertise from the broadest possible pool. The committee did not feel strongly committed to the appointee’s lack of voting rights, and indeed several members of the committee were on the record as open to the possibility of this appointee having voting rights.

3. Area V Core Requirements
This action was the most difficult for the committee, in part because of the feeling shared by several of its members that the language of the motion passed by the General Faculty on October 12, 2012 (“to draft a proposal for a core language requirement that will apply to all Fairfield undergraduates”) contained an inherent ambiguity. As my memo to you of December 5 indicated, I indicated to the committee that I would accept any motion that would either (a) propose a set of requirements covering all undergraduates or (b) propose the same requirement for all undergraduates.

Prior to debate on this issue, I circulated to the committee four options which I believed were potentially viable motions. None of my options proposed the same requirement for all undergraduates, in part because I was not certain that that was the intended goal of the General Faculty motion, and in part because I did not think that any such motion would be mathematically viable given the numerical composition of the committee. Some members of the committee did disagree with me, off the record, but no one presented a motion on the record that would have proposed the same requirement for all undergraduates. Nor did anyone else present any other alternative motions.

The committee ultimately chose to move, debate and pass language which would uphold the committee’s decision of last year to reduce the Dolan School of Business Area V requirement (and, in the process, formalize the School of Engineering exemption from the requirement, which has been de facto but not de iure). Given the fact that the committee’s composition is in large part identical to its composition a year ago, the debate was unsurprisingly similar to last year’s debate and necessarily quite divided. The minority, speaking against the motion, typically argued that the step was an erosion of the core and an assault on the value of learning a foreign language. The majority, speaking for the motion, typically argued that the professional schools at Fairfield had special curricular needs, and that changes in the language placement practices had forced the DSB to seek this requirement reduction.

There was, however, a new element to this year’s debate: an emphasis on continuity of policy and an objection to the process which returned the issue to the committee. Several members spoke strongly against the General Faculty motion, declaring it inappropriate and/or opaque, and for this reason declared support for upholding last year’s decision. Other members -- including one who had voted against the change last year -- announced support for the change this year on the grounds that it represented bad policy to have three requirements in as many years.

In short, I would summarize the committee’s rationale for passing this motion by saying that the committee (a) chose to stand by its decision of the prior year for reasons of policy continuity, and thus affirmed its opinion that (b) the DSB’s case for a reduction in its Area V requirement was sound; and (c) found the General Faculty’s instructions to the committee to be too opaque to serve as the basis for any further action.
TO: Bob Epstein, Executive Secretary, Academic Council  
FM: Giovanni Ruffini, Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee  
RE: Area V Core Requirements  
ON: December 5, 2012

On 10/12/2012, the General Faculty passed the following motion:

“The General Faculty directs the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) to review the core language requirement, in consultation with the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures and the Program in Classical Studies, and to draft a proposal for a core language requirement that will apply to all Fairfield undergraduates.”

Noting discussion at that General Faculty meeting pointing to potential ambiguity in the language of the motion, I asked the General Faculty Secretary for guidance as to the intent of the framers of the motion. I was advised that the UCC should do the best it could to interpret the motion. In subsequent discussion with the UCC, I informed my colleagues that I would rule in order any motion that either (a) proposed a “requirement that will apply to all Fairfield undergraduates,” or (b) proposed the same requirement for all Fairfield undergraduates. As you will see, our ultimate recommendation is responsive to the first interpretation, but not the second.

Since the October meeting of the General Faculty, I have met with and received written feedback from the Dean of the Dolan School of Business, the Chair of the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures and the Director of the Program in Classical Studies. I presented a list of possible motions to the UCC for debate without a pending motion at its November meeting, and asked for suggestions for other possible motions at that time. I then scheduled a formal debate on a motion to take place on December 4, 2012. At that meeting, the UCC approved by a vote of 8 to 6 with 1 abstention a motion to recommend to the Academic Council that the Journal of Record language governing Area V of the core curriculum be changed as follows:

Area V: Modern and Classical Languages
(1) 2 semesters (at least at the intermediate level) of any language listed among the offerings of the Modern Languages Department or the Greek and Roman Studies Program.

Nursing Core Requirement:
Nursing students must complete the core curriculum that is required of all Fairfield undergraduates with one exception. Nursing students enroll in either the two semesters of foreign language or the two semesters of fine arts.

Dolan School of Business Core Requirement:
For students in the Charles F. Dolan School of Business, Area V of the core requirements is two semesters of the same language at any level.

College of Arts and Sciences Core Requirement:
2 semesters (at least at the intermediate level) of any language listed among the offerings of the Modern Languages Department or the Greek and Roman Studies Program.
**Dolan School of Business Core Requirement:**
For students in the Charles F. Dolan School of Business, Area V of the core requirements is two semesters of the same language at any level.

**School of Nursing Core Requirement:**
Nursing students must complete the core curriculum that is required of all Fairfield undergraduates with one exception. Nursing students enroll in either the two semesters of foreign language or the two semesters of fine arts.

**School of Engineering:**
Students in the School of Engineering are exempt from the Area V core requirement.
To: Bob Epstein, Executive Secretary, Academic Council  
From: Giovanni Ruffini, Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee  
Re: Journal of Record Final Exam Language  
On: November 9, 2012

On July 16, 2012, then executive secretary of the Academic Council Susan Rakowitz drafted a memo (see attached) to then chair of the UCC Alison Kris. That memo relayed to the UCC the text of a motion passed by the Academic Council on May 14, 2012 directing the UCC to “consider final exam policies, and if appropriate, make recommendations for changes to the JOR.” Accordingly, on September 11, 2012, the UCC moved to create a subcommittee to investigate this issue and report back to the committee. (See attached September minutes.) That subcommittee reported its findings to the committee on both October 2 and November 6, 2012. (See attached October minutes and forthcoming November minutes.) In its report to the UCC, the subcommittee recommended three changes to the Journal of Record language on final exams. The UCC debated these recommendations and moved this week via three separate motions to adopt them in altered form. The motions all took the form of a recommendation from the UCC to the Academic Council to revise the JOR language on final exams. The text of the three proposed alterations is included below. Motions A and B refer to the section of the Journal of Record titled “Final Exam Policy” in the JOR as printed on August 31, 2012 and published online at http://wwwfaculty.fairfield.edu/gfs/jor8_2012.html. Motion C refers to the section titled “Final Exam as a Percentage of Total Grade” at ibid.

**Motion A:**
Add the following summary description:

> Since accreditation organizations consider a final examination’s hours as part of a course’s total semester hours it is important that the contact hours dedicated towards the final exam in the current policy be maintained. To satisfy expectations that a take-home exam approximates the contact hours of a traditional final exam, faculty will be available to their students for an equivalent time either in on-campus office hours and/or in virtual office hours (via e-mail, chat room, discussion posts, phone, Skype, or other similar social medium) before or at the time scheduled for the final. This information must be included in the syllabus for students and in departmental documentation.

**Motion B:**
Retain the text of number 1 and replace the text of number 2 as follows:

> 2. *In every case, the form of the final, end-of-semester comprehensive evaluation (such as written examination, take-home, oral exam, paper, or a combination of these) must appear on the syllabus at the beginning of the semester.*

Replace the text of numbers 3 and 4 with:

> 3. *The final comprehensive evaluation should reflect integration of course materials discussed during the semester.*

**Motion C:**
Replace the text of “Final Exam as a Percentage of Total Grade” with:

> The final comprehensive evaluation should weigh heavily toward the final grade and should be reflected in the syllabus. No alternative form of final evaluation is to be due prior to the date assigned by the Registrar for that course’s final examination. Any exceptions would require written notifications to the dean and the chairperson.
TO: Bob Epstein
   Executive Secretary, Academic Council
FM: Giovanni Ruffini
   Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
ON: December 5, 2012
RE: University College & the UCC

The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee’s composition currently includes a regular seat for a voting representative of the University College. In light of the closing of University College, on 4/30/12, the Academic Council passed the following motion:

During 2012-13, the UC slot on UCC should be filled, by appointment of the SVPAA, with an administrator to represent the interests of UC students, part-time students and BPS students. The UCC should make a recommendation to the Council on the permanent disposition of this committee membership slot.

Accordingly, on December 4, 2012, the UCC unanimously approved a recommendation to the Academic Council that the first paragraph of Section I.c.b.4 of the Faculty Handbook be amended as follows:

Representation on the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee shall follow the same pattern as representation from the undergraduate schools on the Academic Council, with the addition of one faculty member or academic administrator with expertise in the needs of part-time undergraduate students (to be appointed by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs for a three-year non-renewable term without voting rights), and one student member (the Director of Academics from the Fairfield University Student Association) with voting rights. Other representatives shall be elected for three-year overlapping terms, not simply as representative of their curriculum areas, but as resource persons to oversee the total curriculum. The highest ranking Academic Officer of the University shall be a member with voting rights. The Dean of the School whose interests are under discussion by the Committee shall be an advisory member.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding this motion and our recommendation.
UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING
minutes of the meeting of September 11, 2012 (Excerpts)


6. New Business: Examination of Final Exam Policy: Among the items included in a lengthy communication from the Academic Council was a request for the UCC to review the statements on final exam policy in the Journal of Record. Prof. Rosivach provided some background to the present policy. He noted that there was some confusion between “final exam” and “final comprehensive evaluation,” and that the latter was required, not the former. He explained that the language of the present policy reflects the tension between a former AVP, who wanted a policy that would require all professors to give bluebook final exams of fixed length at times determined by the registrar, and faculty who took the Faculty Handbook language about a professor’s wide latitude in testing seriously. He added that he agreed strongly with that former AVP’s insistence that there should be a final comprehensive assessment in every course, even if he disagreed with his insistence that this had to be by a traditional exam. Prof. Miners explained that this item had originated with the CAE and had come to the Academic Council through the FDEC. The CAE was especially concerned with the requirement that the final exam constitute 1/3 of the semester grade.

Prof. Kris recommended new language along the lines of the FDEC memo to the Academic Council that would also reflect Prof. Rosivach’s concern. Dean Crabtree suggested that a subcommittee be formed to draft appropriate language. Prof. Rosivach moved to table further discussion of the topic until a subcommittee reported to the committee. The vote to table carried 6-3-4. Dean Crabtree moved to create a subcommittee to draft language to replace the current language on final exams in the Journal of Record, and to bring this new language to the committee at its next meeting. The motion was unanimously approved and Professors Etemad, Bose Godbole and Xie agreed to serve as the subcommittee.

In discussing the subcommittee’s work Dean Crabtree noted that there was an issue about contact hours (if there was no in-class final exam how did this affect the contact hours required for a course). She added that individual faculty should have purview over their final exams in dialogue with the practices in their discipline and department, and that the dean should not be involved in allowing exceptions. She also agreed that the final exam should focus on synthesis and principles rather than specific details. She also suggested that the subcommittee consult with the CAE in addressing its concerns.

SVPAA Fitzgerald supported the formation of the subcommittee. Experience with the no-three-finals-on-one-day policy had shown that many faculty were not scheduling traditional final exams. He said that the new language should speak of what is appropriate for the different disciplines, and that it was important to have language broad enough to cover everything, so there would be no need for exceptions.
UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING

Minutes of the meeting of October 02, 2012 (Excerpts)
Approved November 06, 2012

Attending: Professors Mousumi Bose Godbole, Bruce Bradford, Shah Etemad, Anita Fernandez, Johanna Garvey, Alison Kris, Scott Lacy, Larry Miners, Rajasree Rajamma, Shanon Reckinger, Vin Rosivach, Giovanni Ruffini (Chair), Yohuru Williams, Tommy Xie, SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, Deans: Jack Beal, Robbin Crabtree, Don Gibson.

Guests: Dean Perkus, Professors: Doug Lyon, Tim Talty

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 3:32 pm.

7. Examination of final exam policy- Report from the sub-committee:

A concern was raised from the floor that the memo detailing the sub-committee’s suggestion was not distributed before the meeting for the members to give adequate thought to the proposal.

Prof. Etemad reported on the sub-committee’s findings, a summary of which was also circulated during the meeting. Following a few clarification questions, a motion was made to table the item until the next meeting and to re-order the agenda to take up item 4C (joint Sociology/Anthropology major). The motion passed with 8 votes in favor and 3 abstentions.

9. Permanent disposition of University College slot on the UCC:

The motion under discussion was: that the UCC recommend to the Academic Council that the University College seat on the UCC be retained as a regular seat for a voting representative to be appointed by the SVPAA on an annual basis to represent the interests of part-time undergraduate students.

Prof. Crabtree pointed out that it will be good to maintain the position as we are still dealing with part-time students, online students and EPC. Prof. Rosivach said that since this is a handbook amendment, the request has to come from the schools. But since we do not have a UC, there is nobody who has experience with the PT students to represent their interest.

Prof. Rosivach moved to table the motion until the next meeting. The motion passed unanimously with 11 votes in favor.
UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING
Minutes of the meeting on November 06, 2012 (Excerpts)
3:30 PM Library Conference Room
Attending: Professors Mousumi Bose Godbole, Bruce Bradford, Shah Etemad, Anita Fernandez, Johanna Garvey, Jerelyn Johnson, Alison Kris, Scott Lacy, Larry Miners, Rajasree Rajamma, Shanon Reckinger, Vin Rosivach, Tommy Xie, Giovanni Ruffini (Chair), Deans: Don Gibson, Lynn Babington, Aaron Perkus (for Robbin Crabtree)
Guests: Professors Faith-Anne Dohm, and Shannon Harding
The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 3:31 PM.

1. Old Business

Examination of final exam policy: Three motions were made.

Motion A (motion to approve made by Prof. Rosivach, seconded by Prof. Kris):
In JoR, page 22 – include the following summary description:
Since accreditation organizations consider a final examination’s hours as part of a course’s total semester hours it is important that the contact hours dedicated towards the final exam in the current policy be maintained. To satisfy expectations that a take-home exam approximates the contact hours of a traditional final exam, faculty will be available to their students for an equivalent time either in on-campus office hours and/or in virtual office hours (via e-mail, chat room, discussion posts, phone, Skype, or other similar social medium) before or at the time scheduled for the final. This information must be included in the syllabus for students and in departmental documentation.

Motion carried by unanimous vote, 13-0.

There was a brief discussion about whether this recommendation applied to both graduate and undergraduate courses, and the sentiment was a unanimous yes.

Motion B (motion to approve made by Prof. Rosivach, seconded by Prof. Bose Godbole):
In JoR, page 22 - Number 1. stays, and number 2. will be modified as follows:
2. In every case, the form of the final, end-of-semester comprehensive evaluation (such as written examination, take-home, oral exam, paper, or a combination of these) must appear on the syllabus at the beginning of the semester.
Number 3. and 4. will be replaced by:
3. Final comprehensive evaluation should reflect integration of course materials discussed during the semester.

Motion carried by unanimous vote, 13-0.

Motion C (motion to approve made by Prof. Garvey, seconded by Prof. Fernandez):
Replace “Final Exam as a Percentage of Total Grade” by:
The final comprehensive evaluation should weigh heavily toward the final grade and should be reflected in the syllabus. Final exam occurs during the scheduled exam period. Any exceptions would require written notifications to the dean and the chairperson.

There was a motion to amend the motion by replacing the second sentence with:
No alternative form of final evaluation is to be due prior to the date assigned by the Registrar for that course's final examination.

Motion to amend the motion carried by unanimous vote, 13-0.

Motion, as amended, carried by unanimous vote, 13-0.

3. **Old Business**: continued

   **Permanent disposition of University College slot on the UCC**
   
   There was discussion as to whether or not the *academic officer* on the committee should serve for a three-year, non-renewable term.
   
   There was a motion to table consideration of this entire issue (motion made by Prof. Im, seconded by Prof. Bradford)

   Motion to table carried, 12-1.

4. **New Business**

   **Language core requirement: 15-minute discussion without a pending motion**

   There was a general discussion of this complicated issue, that has previously come before the committee. Among the comments were the following:
   - The core will never be uniform.
   - The is universal, except for the language requirement.
   - The exception for the language requirement for Engineering predates the Journal of Record.
   - A question was raised whether the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures needed to come up with new options.

   No motions made.
UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING
Draft Minutes: December 4, 2012 (Excerpts)
3:30 PM Library Conference Room

Attending: Professors Mousumi Bose Godbole, Bruce Bradford, Shah Etemad, Anita Fernandez, Johanna Garvey, Jerelyn Johnson, Alison Kris, Scott Lacy, Larry Miners, Rajasree Rajamma, Shanon Reckinger, Vin Rosivach, Yohuru Williams, Tommy Xie, Giovanni Ruffini (Chair), Deans: Robbin Crabtree, Lynn Babington, Don Gibson, Aaron Perkus

2. Old Business

Permanent disposition of University College slot on the UCC

The Chair presented the history of this piece of business, and said that this item was tabled.

The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee’s composition currently includes a regular seat for a voting representative of the University College. In light of the closing of University College, on 4/30/12, the Academic Council passed the following motion:

_During 2012-13, the UC slot on UCC should be filled, by appointment of the SVPAA, with an administrator to represent the interests of UC students, part-time students and BPS students. The UCC should make a recommendation to the Council on the permanent disposition of this committee membership slot._

This business was introduced and tabled at the November UCC meeting because committee members noted language issues (semantics) and questions about appropriate membership requirements. At the request of the Chair, several committee members reconsidered and revised a motion for the UCC. The revisions were made to facilitate simple modifications to membership composition and terms of service.

_Originally Proposed UCC motion:_
The first paragraph of Section I.c.b.4 of the Faculty Handbook currently reads:

_Representation on the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee shall follow the same pattern as representation from the undergraduate schools on the Academic Council, with the addition of one member of the professional staff from University College, and one student member (the Director of Academics from the Fairfield University Student Association) with voting rights. Other representatives shall be elected for three-year overlapping terms, not simply as representative of their curriculum areas, but as resource persons to oversee the total curriculum. The highest ranking Academic Officer of the University shall be a member with voting rights. The Dean of the School whose interests are under discussion by the Committee shall be an advisory member._

Prof. Rosivach MOVED to approve the revised motion (below), seconded by Prof. Bradford.

_Representation on the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee shall follow the same pattern as representation from the undergraduate schools on the Academic Council, with the addition of one member of the professional staff from University College_
one faculty member or academic administrator with expertise in the needs of part-time undergraduate students (to be appointed by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs for a three-year non-renewable term without voting rights), and one student member (the Director of Academics from the Fairfield University Student Association) with voting rights. Other representatives shall be elected for three-year overlapping terms, not simply as representative of their curriculum areas, but as resource persons to oversee the total curriculum. The highest ranking Academic Officer of the University shall be a member with voting rights. The Dean of the School whose interests are under discussion by the Committee shall be an advisory member.

Committee members discussed the motion. Prof. Rosivach pointed colleagues’ attention to the revisions in the motion to demonstrate that voting rights (whether members have them or not) and terms of service (three years, renewable/non-renewable) are easily edited with a motion from the floor.

Prof. Kris spoke in favor of the motion; she appreciated the flexible terminology and phrasing in terms for voting rights and terms of service. Prof. Miners also spoke in favor of the motion; he noted that he would consider giving voting rights to the member appointed by the AVP.

The Chair asked for additional comments from the committee, and hearing none, he called for a vote.

Motion PASSED (14-0-0)*
*NB-the vote count increased because several committee members arrived after the vote to approve the November minutes.

Language core requirement

The Chair briefly introduced the agenda item, and he presented four possible motions the committee could consider and/or modify. The four motions were distributed to committee members prior to the meeting. The Chair noted that all four motions, as written, do not impact existing Core requirements in Engineering and the School of Nursing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Status quo</td>
<td>affirm previous decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Status quo ante</td>
<td>overturn previous decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Universal 1-year</td>
<td>CAS &amp; DSB = 2 semesters any level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Compromise</td>
<td>DSB = 3 semesters; CAS = 2 semesters at intermediate level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before opening the floor for discussion, the Chair explained that the final (non procedural) vote will be conducted by secret ballot. Prof. Rosivach inquired about the rationale for a secret ballot. Rosivach questioned the impact of a secret vote in terms of collegiality and transparency. He empathized, however, with untenured faculty who may feel anxious about openly casting critical votes in the presence of senior colleagues and administrators.

Prof. Miners supported Prof. Rosivach’s comments and he urged committee members to “build bridges minus animosity.”
Prof. Johnson noted that colleagues (namely junior colleagues) reported discomfort and anxiety about the previous vote, including discussions leading to the final vote. She advocates secret ballot voting whenever a colleague requests it.

Prof. Rosivach **MOVED** that all future UCC votes be open votes (no secret ballots). Prof. Miners seconded the motion.

The Chair opened the floor for debate.

Professors Garvey, Johnson, and Kris spoke against the motion. They said that protecting junior faculty was a primary motivation for their vote. Garvey noted that the previous vote had several abstentions, which could have impacted the final result.

Dean Perkus spoke in favor of the motion. He argued that one’s election to the UCC carries responsibilities, which include highly influential votes. Perkus reiterated that highly influential votes should be open votes.

Prof. Williams spoke against the motion; he questioned whether an open vote is a precondition for collegial discussions.

Hearing no more discussion, the Chair called the vote.

Motion **FAILED** (3-10-0)

Prof. Bradford **MOVED** to approve the “status quo” motion, that the Journal of Record language on Area V be modified to read as follows, seconded by Prof. Rajamma.

Area V: Modern and Classical Languages

**College of Arts and Sciences Core Requirement:**
2 semesters (at least at the intermediate level) of any language listed among the offerings of the Modern Languages Department or the Greek and Roman Studies Program.

**Dolan School of Business Core Requirement:**
For students in the Charles F. Dolan School of Business, Area V of the core requirements is two semesters of the same language at any level.

**School of Nursing Core Requirement:**
Nursing students must complete the core curriculum that is required of all Fairfield undergraduates with one exception. Nursing students enroll in either the two semesters of foreign language or the two semesters of fine arts.

**School of Engineering:**
Students in the School of Engineering are exempt from the Area V core requirement.

The Chair opened the floor for debate.

Prof. Bradford said that the DSB demonstrated that regional competitors have less language requirements. He argued that, as a requirement, two semesters of language at the intermediate level is a recruiting problem. He shared a personal anecdote about his children’s recent decision making strategies in choosing colleges other than Fairfield.
Prof. Rosivach spoke in favor of the motion. He said that once the vote was taken, the process was complete. After voting against the motion last year, Rosivach now will vote in favor because, he added, overturning the previous vote would be a horrible precedent. He advocated the status quo motion because it provides continuity and stability of policy, which allows program directors and chairs to better align curricular needs and resources.

Prof. Godbole spoke in favor of the motion. She said the previous process and final vote taught the committee that there is an appropriate language requirement for each of the schools (CAS, DSB, SoN, etc.). Godbole said that the status quo motion allows the DSB to better compete with other professional schools (recruiting and student preparedness for career).

Prof. Rajamma spoke in favor of the motion. She explained the preference she shares with DSB colleagues to encourage rather than force language study. She promoted student choice as a motivating factor for supporting the motion.

Prof. Johnson spoke against the motion. Without questioning the outcome, she noted that the previous vote was acrimonious. In Johnson’s opinion, due to the calendar the General Faculty did not have adequate time to consider this issue. She also disagreed with the focus on foreign language as the area of contention in the DSB Core. Johnson empathized with DSB concerns over balancing Core and program curricula, but she insisted that this issue is not solely a language issue. She urged colleagues to consider address the entire Core, rather than the language requirement in isolation.

Dean Gibson spoke in favor of the motion. He reminded the committee that the General Faculty voted on this issue. The status quo motion, according to Gibson, does not prevent DSB language study beyond the intermediate level. He argued that an “intentional” rather than “forced” language curriculum provides more flexibility for students, and that some students will still elect to study language beyond the introductory level.

Dean Perkus spoke in favor of the motion. He said that the previous process was complete and by the book. It was a long and deliberative process, and this reconsideration of the original process should not be used as an opportunity to change the Core.

Prof. Miners spoke in favor of the motion, recalling his knowledge of the institutional history at Fairfield. Despite what he characterized as his increasing support and appreciation of the Core, he is sensitive to the curricular needs of the professional schools. He said that we have established reductions in the language Core requirements for Engineering and the School of Nursing, so he supports the right of the DSB to pursue the same policy.

Prof. Williams spoke against the motion, and expressed support for Prof. Johnson’s previous comments. He argued that we do a disservice to the student who leaves Fairfield with only beginner level foreign language skills.

Prof. Godbole spoke in favor of the motion. She argued that two semesters may not give students proficiency, but that students will gain enough mastery to understand some nuances of what is happening in a conversation.
Prof. Johnson spoke against the motion. She disagreed with Prof. Godbole; Johnson explained that two semesters of language at any level will not allow the language program to serve DSB students in terms of what the language Core delivers (goals, objectives). She noted that neither “mastery” nor “exposure” are goals of the existing language Core curriculum.

Prof. Fernandez spoke against the motion. She said there is a large difference between studying two and four semesters of language. Fernandez would like specific details and data on the actual impact of Fairfield University language requirements on DSB recruitment; she also requested more details on the nature of language study at regional peer business schools.

Prof. Bradford responded to Prof. Fernandez. He said, “the numbers aren’t out there.” He noted that he previously referred to anecdotal evidence because there are no numbers on how many people opted out of Fairfield due to the language requirement.

Dean Gibson reiterated that from the DSB perspective, the status quo motion is about increasing flexibility, not reducing language requirements.

Prof. Rosivach reminded the committee that we do not need to rely on anecdotal evidence; we can get data.

Prof. Kris spoke in favor of the motion because she does not like the idea of redoing process that was completed last year.

Prof. Garvey spoke against the motion. She expressed her understanding of the DSB issue with the Core. She spoke in favor of the process the brought this motion to the UCC agenda. She advised against anecdotal debating, which, she says, may lead to unraveling the Core. Garvey stated that she found convincing the statements made by Professors Johnson and Williams.

Dean Crabtree spoke against the motion. She said the General Faculty sent this business back to the UCC with the desire for a common Core language requirement in the face of a progressively splintering Core. While appreciating the difficulty of the discussion, Crabtree noted that the status quo motion is unsatisfactory to a large number of faculty. She added that arguments about freeing students from taking courses that presently do not interest them is the wrong direction.

Prof. Bradford disagreed with Dean Crabtree and noted that a majority of colleagues at the Spring General Faculty meeting voted for the current status quo.

Prof. Rosivach CALLED THE QUESTION, seconded by Prof. Minors

Motion PASSES (9-4-1).

The Chair distributed paper ballots to committee members, and he called the vote by secret ballot.

The “Status Quo” Motion PASSES (8-6-1).
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.

Academic Council  
Packet for Meeting  
February 4, 2013  
Page 85
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 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.*
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 said that we may want to send this back because of timing issues. Larry Miners pointed out that the first suggestion of Fr. Paul Fitzgerald makes the calendar year in which a faculty member comes up for tenure/promotion not represented for that round of merit review. Fr. Paul Fitzgerald joined the discussion. This request comes from a joint meeting of the board of trustees and concerns of faculty for what they need to do in a given year. The question arose: Is it necessary for a person who goes through the process of rank and tenure and/or given a positive recommendation for a continuing contract to apply for merit? Bill Abbot pointed out that if a person wants additional merit they would need to apply regardless of their situation. Fr. Paul Fitzgerald said that we need to have a way to apply for additional merit that is not addressed here. Larry Miners reiterated that the MOU is often accepted after merit applications are due. Meredith Wallace Kazer moved to approve as revised, Emily Smith seconded, and all approved.
MEMORANDUM
Academic Council Executive Committee
Fairfield University

TO: Academic Council

FROM: Academic Council Executive Committee

DATE: January 17, 2013

RE: Matters from the review of the Handbook (prior to a new edition) that the AC agreed to take up

A process to review the Faculty Handbook for clarity and consistency and recommend changes to the AC, if appropriate, prior to the publication of a new edition [AC motion 3/29/2010] was begun by the faculty members on the 2010-11 AC Executive Committee and completed by the faculty members on the 2011-12 AC Executive Committee. The full report from that work (dated 2/14/2012) is on the Secretary of the General Faculty’s website with the materials for the March 5, 2012 AC meeting; the report was taken up by the Council on April 16, 2012.

The report contained a section (pages 7-8) “(IV) A list of issues that came to our attention for which the Council should determine whether or not these matters should be taken up.” Of the nine items on that list, the Council decided [see 4/16/2012 AC minutes] to take up six. In this memo, the Executive Committee is recommending ways in which the Council might want to address each of these six matters. The items are numbered and appear as they did in the original report. The Council decided to take no action on items numbered 5, 8 and 9.

1. The Grievance Procedure in Appendix I could be revised to conform to AAUP standards.

Recommend: A subcommittee be formed to compare the current Grievance Procedure to AAUP standards and to recommend revisions to the Council, if appropriate.

2. The language on voting rights for faculty members on leave (I.A.4 (a) (b) (c)) could be revisited and revised.

Recommend: According to the Handbook, faculty members on leave have severely restricted voting rights. Specifically, they do not have the right to vote at General Faculty meetings, except that they can cast an absentee ballot in an election or for any unchanged proposal that appears on the agenda. Presumably the policy was intended to protect the time of faculty on leave, but if followed, the policy could disenfranchise faculty from important votes. The Executive Committee suggests that the Council consider the following change: to allow faculty members on leave the right to vote if they are interested but not require them to attend General Faculty meetings and not to use the small number of faculty members on leave in calculating the number needed for a quorum. In this way, faculty members on leave need not feel pressured to attend meetings – either to vote or to reach a quorum, but faculty members on leave who wish to may either attend and vote or send a proxy.
MOTION. Amend the Faculty Handbook section I.A.4 by deleting items b. and c. and revising (shown below in bold and underline) and re-lettering d.:

b. Faculty members have a contractual obligation to attend meetings of the General Faculty, except when on leave. A faculty member on leave may vote or designate a proxy to vote on his or her behalf in a General Faculty meeting, but is not counted in determining a quorum. An active faculty member [continue to end].

3. The language in the Handbook on page 22, in II.A.2.a, paragraph 3 on appeals is, “A candidate whose promotion is not recommended by the Rank and Tenure Committee may appeal to the Committee only if he/she has additional significant information that had not been submitted with the original application file.” This is not consistent with the Timetable and Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion in the Journal of Record, which state that a candidate may appeal with additional information or clarification.

Recommend: That the Rank and Tenure Committee be charged with recommending revisions to either the Handbook or the Timetable and Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion to remove this inconsistency.

4. The language in the Handbook on page 24, in II.A.3.c. (2) may be problematic with regard to time on maternity leave counting towards tenure.

Recommend: Fairfield’s maternity policy was designed so that women would not necessarily have their careers interrupted and tenure delayed when taking a leave from teaching for childbirth. A subcommittee, including faculty with recent experience on the Rank and Tenure Committee, should be charged with drafting language for the Handbook and/or Journal of Record clarifying how time spent on maternity leave will ordinarily be treated with regard to tenure.


Recommend: That the Faculty Salary Committee be charged with making recommendations that would ensure that this reference to maternity leave in the Handbook reflects the current policy.

7. The language in the Handbook on page 34, in II.C.4, on teaching load is, technically, correct, but could be clarified to emphasize that a normal teaching load is 9 hours/week.

Recommend: The AC Executive Committee thinks that this matter can easily be clarified with a Journal of Record entry as follows.

MOTION. Add to the Journal of Record: A normal teaching load for tenured and tenure-track faculty is nine hours per week.