ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, April 29, 2013
CNS 200
3:30 – 5:00 PM

1. Presidential courtesy

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
   a. Approval of minutes of 3/4/13 and 3/18/13 (attachments)
   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
   f. Subcommittee on Community-Engaged Scholarship

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

6. Old Business
   a. Proposed changes to Spring 2014 Academic Calendar (attachment)

7. New business
   a. Ballot of candidates for Committee on Committees
   b. Committee on Conference: advice on June meeting with Board
   c. Motion to require the administration to prepare a strategic plan (attachment)
   d. Procedures governing faculty searches (See attachment on pp. 19-25 of AC packet for 12/3/12)
   e. Regularization of language in Handbook and Journal of Record (Pending Item I, attachment)
   f. Time code issues (attachment)
   g. Issues involving required student purchase of class materials (attachment)
   h. Motion from Committee on Committees regarding composition of Educational Technology Committee (attachment)
   i. Proposal for VPA Concentration in Arts Administration (attachment)
   j. Proposal to change the name of the Program on the Environment (attachment)

* Lists of Attachments, Pending, and Ongoing Items are on page 2
List of Attachments:
For item 3.a. Academic Council minutes of March 4 (pp. 3-8) and March 18 (pp. 9-14)
For item 6.b. Memo from Calendar Subcommittee proposing changes to Spring 2014 Calendar (p. 15)
For item 7.c. Memo and motion from Prof. Carl Scheraga (p. 16)
For item 7.e. Memo from ACEC regarding regularization of language in Handbook and Journal of Record (pp. 17-18)
For item 7.f. Memo from Dean Robbin Crabtree regarding time code issues (p. 19)
For item 7.g. Memo from ACEC on sale of course materials to students (p. 20)
For item 7.h. Memo from Committee on Committees regarding Educational Technology Committee (p. 20)
For item 7.i. Proposal for VPA Concentration in Arts Administration with excerpts of relevant minutes (pp. 21-32)
For item 7.j. Proposal to change the name of the Program on the Environment (pp. 33-34)

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.
DRAFT MINUTES
ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
Monday, March 4, 2013
CNS 200 (The John Carroll Room) 3:30 – 5:00 PM

Present: Professors Bhattacharya, Dallavalle, Dennin, Downie, Epstein (Executive Secretary), He, Huntley, Keenan (Chair), Kelly, Kohli, Lasseter, Petrino, Rafalski, Rakowitz (General Faculty Secretary), Shea, Walker-Canton, and Winn; Deans Babington, Beal and Gibson; SVPAA Fitzgerald, S.J.; FUSA President Robert Vogel

Regrets: Professor Lane, Deans Crabtree and Franzosa.

Invited guests: Professors Betsy Bowen and Paula Gill Lopez (item 7a).

1. Presidential Courtesy
SVPAA Fitzgerald reported that Dean Gibson and Assoc. Dean Ligas led DSB faculty in preparing a sixth year AACSB maintenance of Accreditation report. The Chair of last year’s external review committee plus one new outside reviewer commented positively on our sixth year report and are recommending to the AACSB Accreditation Committee that the DSB be reaccredited. The letter going to the AACSB noted that the faculty has addressed the issues of research standards, strategic planning, and the updating of pedagogy and curriculum based on the assessment of students’ learning. SVPAA Fitzgerald noted that the Blizzard named Nemo caused us to lose another Monday.

MOTION (Epstein/Petrino): To re-order the agenda so that the first item is 7.a.
MOTION PASSED: 17 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty
None.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
No correspondence or oral reports.

7. New business
a. Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees: Report from December meeting and guidance for March meeting

Prof. Gill Lopez reported on the December 6th meeting with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. The meeting began with an update from SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, SJ, introducing the new institutional dashboard indicators, followed by a report by Professor Mark LeClair on the new Masters in Public Administration.

Then the group addressed the agenda items developed jointly with John Baldovin, SJ, chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, based on these questions: How do we maintain a high quality liberal arts education? What are our goals for the next 2-3 years? Specific items for discussion were identified:
1. Examine the dashboard indicators in more depth.
2. Question the wisdom of developing a distance learning model.
3. Address our ongoing student gender imbalance.
4. Bring discussion of the cost of faculty into dialogue with other costs.
5. Ask about the use of faculty expertise vs outside consultants.
6. Discuss the value of the Jesuit brand, and how this is being employed.

Discussion. Downie: did they engage you in real discussion, or did it seem to be more pro forma? Gill Lopez: very engaged, because we had jointly developed these agenda items. Downie: did this meeting seem different, compared to earlier meetings? Bowen: yes, not a qualitative difference, but a more wide ranging, less scripted discussion than in the past. Does this mean something? Not sure. Kohli: one issue was the affordable education question. There were still some around the table that think that faculty is the drain on this question. Also, marketing issues came out as a common concern from the board. The context seemed to be how to cut costs. Gill Lopez: the idea that we were all interested in the idea of marketing drew the group together. I know from talking to John Baldovin that he is very excited about working with us. Dennin: did you directly address the issue of faculty versus other costs? Kohli: not much. We did address that students care about this. Gill Lopez: this is something to be addressed next time with more data, so that we can name precisely where the student satisfaction margin lies. Fitzgerald, SJ: best discussion I’ve seen with the committee on conference. I’m grateful to the committee for this new approach. It’s very important for the trustees to have a good sense of the academic program, they are not in the first place the ones who should be indicating where we should go; this is our task. Rakowitz: did you spend much time talking about the distance learning issue? Was there a clear consensus about what this entails? Bowen: one trustee has been hearing about MOOCS. Gill Lopez: we did not spend a lot of time on this, it seemed to be the concern of the one person raising it. Kohli: we did ask about how to reconcile that pedagogy with a Jesuit pedagogy, this is not an answer to cost problem. Gill Lopez: what we want, as a deliverable for next time, is for us to dig around in the data to see what is the source of student satisfaction and dissatisfaction. We know the dashboard indicators about advising, but we also know that the real issue is that students are dissatisfied with our online registration process.

What direction does the Academic Council offer for the next meeting? Downie: a distinction is needed, that specific accurate data about faculty costs versus administration costs should also note faculty who are doing administrative work. We could also note where we could cut specific costs by eliminating academic programs, as a way of indicating that we are serious about cost cutting too. Epstein: I’ve been hearing from faculty about how dispirited they are about faculty salary situation. A younger faculty member told him that every year he is facing a salary problem. This year it seems to be especially dispiriting, last year the faculty made big concessions under the claim of institutional crisis. We then find out much later that the university in fact ran a surplus, and that very little of that surplus went back to faculty salaries. This year, instead of treating those as temporary sacrifices in the face of crisis, the administration wants to make even deeper cuts under the banner of “long term sustainability”. The faculty have always been ready to face long-term stability questions. We have always said that we do not want to face this drama every year. But the administration says that they don’t want to do that. One important thing to bring to the board’s attention is that they will need to identify proper long-term goals for proper compensation for faculty. Well, what are the long-term prospects for the university? Where does the academic division fit into that?

MOTION: (Epstein/Dennin): to authorize the Committee on Conference to consult with the salary committee and faculty members of the ACEC in advance of the next board meeting.
Discussion: Kohli: the faculty should frame these issues in the context of academic excellence. Epstein: the board would be free to frame this in any way that they see fit. Dennin: I represent the faculty on the Board of Trustee’s finance committee. We just met, and the new budget has a 20% contribution to health care built right into it. I would like to be able to express the will of the faculty on this. Rakowitz: I support the motion, is it correct that the committee on conference may consult with other Board committees? Yes.

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

Keenan: anything else for the committee on conference? Huntley: They should request an external cost audit for all divisions. Before we consider any cost cutting, the board needs to insist on an external cost audit. We don't seem to have a plan in place for assigning indirect costs. Shea: I question the notion of faculty being viewed as a drain. Part of what I would hope is that at some point there would be data presented in terms of grant monies brought in by faculty that offer resources, scholarships, etc. Why are faculty seen as expense only, not income? What about students who return to us for graduate degrees? A large number of students come back, they put their money where their mouth is when they come back for graduate degrees. Notice that the fundraising people call faculty grants on their sheet, when they account for their own productivity. Sometimes this is appropriate, sometimes not. This is a problem. Bowen: let me clarify the desired outcome. Do we want the trustees to do something specific? Huntley: Request the external audit of our cost accounting procedures. Downie: they need to see the rate of spending on faculty. We need to show accurate numbers; and comparative numbers from our peer schools, as appropriate. Bhattacharya: HR metrics will tell you that learning is not a cost, it is an investment. Gill Lopez: we should ask for the audit up front. Epstein: we need to look at academic vs non-academic metrics and include benchmarking.

5. Petitions for immediate hearing:

Fitzgerald, SJ, observed 1) that we had lost a Monday due to the recent snow, and 2) that Monday/Thursday classes are already short for the semester. Dallavalle: We should set, in advance of the semester, contingency plans for class days that must be made up in case these are impacted by weather, etc. Bhattacharya: we used to do this with the Tuesday/Monday set up, but that was a mess for schools with grad programs.

**MOTION (Fitzgerald/Winn): To declare the first reading day of the exam period a Monday, to make up for the recent snow day.**

Vogel says that there will be a concert the evening before the first reading day. Rakowitz: I speak against, the schedule does not begin with two reading days, it is one reading day, then two exams days. If we do anything, we should use the Monday after Easter as a Monday. Kelly: did you say this would be optional? Lasseter: I speak against the motion, as we only have the one reading day. We also lost all the classes after noon on the previous Friday. We should cut our losses. He: I speak reluctantly against the motion, the idea is great, but the schedule has already absorbed this, it is too late. An extra day late in the semester will be more trouble than it’s worth. In the future, we need some clear days set aside to accommodate these disruptions.

**MOTION FAILS: In favor 2, opposed 13, abstention 2.**

4. Council Subcommittee Reports
d. Subcommittee on calendar issues
Epstein: The report begins on p. 3. The council formed this committee at the October 2012 meeting, charged to review the academic calendar and to propose changes as appropriate. One thing that comes up frequently is the length of the semester. To re-affirm, there are no state requirements for semester length at private universities. NEASC refers to federal guidelines for typical semester length as “15 weeks of instruction time.” This seems to suggest that the normal course is 15 weeks, but does this include exams? Not clear. We are similar to our peers in having a 14-week semester followed by an exam week. But, while we meet this norm regularly, this year and next year we are not doing this in the spring semester. Why? Because the JOR requires that we start when we do. With Monday holidays, and without academic Mondays we have a relatively short and lopsided semester, short on Mondays and Thursdays. The number of MR classes is conspicuously fewer than TF classes, and Monday turbos are short by 3 weeks. Ending time is also an issue. The administration is concerned about our Fall semester ending too close to Christmas, and we have faculty contract language that has the year starting on 1 September. In the spring, there are two bookends: in the beginning we have JOR language that says that there should be about a month between the two semesters. The other issue is that there is a tradition of having commencement on the weekend before Memorial Day, as well as some kind of senior week. We therefore need to have commencement a full week before Memorial Day. But many universities do have commencement on Memorial Day weekend. In the past, faculty were told that the leases of beach residences prohibited this, but this is not true any more.

So, Lane and Epstein find that, to address the brevity and imbalance of the spring semester, we could
1. revert to designating the Tuesday after Presidents Day as a Monday,
2. start spring earlier,
3. start fall earlier, or
4. end spring semester later.

The subcommittee felt that the most reasonable approach would be to do the Monday/Tuesday. The reintroduction of academic Mondays would have problems, of course. We should simply allow flexibility in the implementation. We are talking about undergrad teaching on Monday, so the subcommittee would recommend that there be no undergraduate Monday turbos. Finally, it does seem that we will have storms, so we do need to build into the official academic calendar some flexibility, so that we can have days to make up snow days.

Discussion. Vogel: Beach house rentals begin September 1, that would be a factor. Downie: starting a week before would be problematic. Fitzgerald: the easier fix would be to remove the JOR language about the month. Epstein: the easiest one is to move commencement. Fitzgerald: Mark Reed said that the staff greatly appreciate having the 3 days weekend to rest up. Rakowitz: Why did we lose the Tuesday/Mondays? These were difficult for adjuncts, who need a dependable schedule. Kohli: if we could at least get rid of the turbo option on Mondays, that would help. Epstein: I think that’s an easy and important one, but I don’t think we can do only this. The published academic calendar for next spring has a week and a half more for the TF sections. We need to address this. The simplest way to address this is to have an academic Monday. Downie: in general I think the Monday/Tuesday is too complicated. I think we should increase the number of people living off campus. We could also have senior week begin on Tuesday, we could also have a random Tuesday off. Dennin: who decides when commencement is? Fitzgerald: Mary Frances Malone plans Commencement. Who also has the authority to say we’ll move commencement? I do, in terms of moving inside in case of rain. For many families, traveling on Memorial Day would be more convenient. Walker-Canton: what about just adding 6 minutes to the Monday-Thursday
classes? Epstein: I tried to add time to classes, didn’t work. Walker-Canton: I mean officially. Rakowitz: Robbin has asked us (in a later agenda item) to think about our time codes in general. If we set up a subcommittee to do this, we could think about asymmetry in the length of M/Th vs T/F class meetings. Another thing that would clarify this, if there were no concerns about leases, we could ask faculty about preferences for starting earlier versus having commencement later. Epstein: we have a crowded agenda. I suggest that we do need to address the calendar for 2013-2014.

**MOTION (Epstein/Downie): That the Academic Council form a standing Calendar Review Subcommittee. The subcommittee should consist of two members elected each year from among the members of the Academic Council. The subcommittee is charged with reviewing all Fairfield academic calendars before their publication and making any necessary recommendations for changes to the Academic Council and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.**

Rakowitz: In favor.

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

Downie: Many thanks for this report, Bob, a very informative report.

**7b. Proposal from SOE for new 5-year BS/MS in Computer Engineering (attachment).**

Beal: Doug Lyon is passing out a complete proposal that has more than is in your packet. What we are proposing is a 5-year dual degree BS/MS course of study, by combining the currently-offered SOE curricula for the BS degree and the Master of Science degree. This is driven by industry, that is asking our graduates to have more and more skills. Our engineering advisory board is asking for the same thing. The parents of potential students are asking about this as well, for a 4+2 master’s degree, but this moves toward a shorter framework. We don’t expect this to be a huge program, we will have just a few taking this option. What we are asking is to combine two programs we currently have, in under grad and grad, into a new 5 year dual degree. These two programs require, separately, ABET accreditation. One problem is that of the thesis, as students can do this. By the time students are done with 98 credits, with high academic achievement, they can decide about proceeding into the graduate program. Students could do it a bit faster by adding summers, though they generally need the summer for work and internship experience.

Questions: Lasserter: will the current two-year program be retained? Do you expect to hire additional adjuncts or faculty for this? Lyon: No. Lasserter: what effect will this have on the cross-listing of courses, consolidation of courses. Will there be any impact there? Lyon: no, there would be some good cross-listing of courses. Walker-Canton: so, what is the difference between the five year versus the 2 year and 4 year degree? Lyon: the 5 year degree saves time and money. On a paper point of view, looks like the same degree. To work with other schools, the SOE is retaining their 2 and 4 years programs as well. Walker-Canton: Is the number of credit hours the same? Lyon: the 6 year plan would have a few more credit hours. Winn: an exciting program. But many of the courses seem more like software engineering than computer engineering. Rafalski: minor point, math 351 needs more than calculus 2 as a pre-requisite, yes? Consult with math program, please. Dennin: on original p. 21, MA 231 seems to be out of sequence? Also, the credits are wrong for 131, so there are 3 more credits than in table 2b. Also, the benchmarks -- Berkeley, Carnegie-Mellon? Are these our competitors? What about more immediate competitors? Need better information. Lyon: those schools are aspirational comparisons. What about the student
quality, how large is the potential audience for this? Dennin concludes that he has some serious problems with the presentation.

More questions: Dennin: in the EPC minutes, “the demand for this is high” – where is the data for this assertion? Beal: we do have people asking for this program. Huntley: this is resource neutral? Lyon: yes, this will not require any other lines. Huntley: so are we looking for new students? Lyon: this is our search for a new business model to increase enrollment in general for the SOE, to raise revenue. Epstein: how does the undergraduate core curriculum fit in? The model is jam-packed. I see that the three EN electives are there, HI is on there, but VPA, semester 2? Lyon: That will be graphic design. There is no language requirement for engineers. There are five core classes in the fourth year, but only two in the second year. Is there some reason that more core is offered in the senior year? Beal: we are trying to get our students set up for the fourth year senior project, so the EG courses have to be lined up early. EG students right now are loaded with core courses in their senior year. Rakowitz: 5 year to 6 year comparison. The end is that the proposed MA is 2/3 the size of the 2 year MA.

Lyon: we want students to be able to graduate after 4 years with a bachelor’s degree. We do have some grad courses in the 4th year. Fitzgerald: the students are taking courses that are already offered. Have you talked to GSEAP about their success in developing a five-year program? Lyon: it’s going like gangbusters for them, though I don’t expect to have that success. Lasseter: Why a fourth year senior project versus a fifth year’s master’s thesis. Lyon: it’s an ABET thing, ABET wants a team approach to the project. The ABET accreditation is important, some places like Sikorsky won’t hire our students if we don’t retain our ABET accreditation. Our students can do an optional thesis. Lasseter: these accomplish the 5-year program by overlapping undergraduate and graduate electives. Rakowitz: is there any sacrifice in the number of actual graduate courses, or does this plan simply replace undergrad courses with grad courses that are similar? Lyon: on the electrical engineering side. We do have courses that are the same for grads and undergrads, with cross-listed courses. Vogel: how much will this program boost Fairfield as an option? Huntley: what I remember from ABET is that you can have either the undergrad or the grad program as ABET? Why not the grad program for the thesis? Lyon: as most of our students seek only an undergrad degree, we need to be sure they have an ABET-accredited program. ABET-accredited graduate programs are not as customary. He: I’m curious: how do you cross-list a course between both undergraduate and graduate programs? Lyon: what they can do is to waive a domain requirement, but not the total credit hour requirement. So no double-dipping for the total credit hour question.

Fitzgerald: Is it the will of the council to recess?

MOTION (Fitzgerald/Rakowitz): To recess this meeting of the Academic Council until 3:30 pm on Monday, March 18th, 2013.
MOTION PASSED: 11 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstention

Respectfully submitted,
Nancy Dallavalle, Associate Professor, Department of Religious Studies
Academic Council Meeting Minutes (Draft)
Monday, March 18, 2013
Reconvened from Monday, March 4, 2013

Present: Professors 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, John Lasseter, Joyce Shea, Roxanna Walker-Canton, Wendy Kohli, David Winn

Administrators: SVPPA Paul Fitzgerald, Deans Lynn Babington, Jack Beal, Robbin Crabtree, Susan Franzosa, Don Gibson

Invited Guests: Professors Doug Lyon (Item 7b), Faith-Anne Dohm (Item 7c), Kathy Nantz and Liz Hohl (Item 4c)

Regrets: Professor John Lasseter, Robert Vogel (FUSA Rep)

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

1. To continue on Item 7b as in the Meeting Agenda on March 4, 2013: Proposal from SOE for new 5-year BS/MS in Computer Engineering

Doug Lyon: Additional information was provided to answer some of the concerns during the March 4, 2013 Academic Council Meeting, regarding the types of Benchmark Schools and detailed Prerequisites/Courses.

Bob Epstein: The benchmark schools in the new handouts still do not seem to be the same kind as Fairfield University. Also, will the new program require any new faculty line as a result of new sections or new courses?

Doug Lyon: Since the current class sizes are relatively small, such as 6 or so in each current class, even if the number of students doubled we are still able to handle them without adding new faculty lines.

MOTION (Paul Fitzgerald/David Downie): To approve the proposed new 5-year BS/MS in Computer Engineering Program in the School of Engineering

Susan Rakowitz: Given that SOE has almost as many programs as full time faculty and we've just hired a new dean who presumably will be looking closely at which programs are viable and which aren't, it would be an insult to that person to approve a new program just as he is walking in the door.

Motion (Susan Rakowitz/Joe Dennin): To table the motion in bold above
Motion (To table the motion in bold above) Failed: 3 in favor, 8 opposed, 5 abstentions

Paul Fitzgerald: Speaking in favor of the proposed 5-year BS/MS in Computer Engineering since it is not a new program but rather just a new combination of the current separate undergraduate and graduate programs.

Chris Huntley: Speaking in favor of the motion, but thinking some of the benchmarking schools do not make sense since most of them on the list are major research universities.

Motion (Phil Lane/Wendy Kohli): To call the question

Question is called: 14 in favor, 2 opposed, 0 abstention

MOTION (To approve the proposed new 5-year BS/MS in Computer Engineering Program in the School of Engineering) Passed: 13 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstention.

2. The School of Engineering is asking the Academic Council to approve the ending of the Associate Degree in Engineering (An item originally attached to Item 7b)

Jack Beal: Since the Associate Degree is a part-time program, which is no longer in line with the mission of the university and with decreasing enrollment. In addition, similar programs from local community colleges will fill in the gap.

Nancy Dallavalle: Are there any current students in the program?

Jack Beal: No.

MOTION (Phil Lane/Paul Fitzgerald): To approve the proposal to end the School of Engineering Associate Degree in Engineering by May 2014

MOTION Passed: 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstention

3. Subcommittee on the status of part-time faculty (Item 4c)

MOTION (Bob Epstein/Dennis Keenan): To reorder Item 4c to be before Item 7c.

MOTION Passed: Unanimously

Kathy Nantz: The subcommittee on the status of part-time faculty has divided their work into subcommittees addressing the following issues: i) identifying the profiles of faculty with non tenure-track status at Fairfield, ii) Assessment and evaluation processes for non tenure-track faculty, iii) Time line for non tenure-track faculty, and iv) Governance process for non tenure-track faculty.
The subcommittee members include: Kathy Nantz (chair), Liz Hohl (adjunct, History, co-chair), Wendy Kohli (GSEAP), Meredith Kazer (SON), Mark Ligas (Marketing), Eileen Wilkinson (POP, DMLL), Cinthia Gannett (English), Brian Torff (V&PA, Music).

This subcommittee would like to have institutional support and to continue its work in summer 2013.

Liz Hohl: Many adjuncts are constrained by part-time schedule since they are here on campus when necessary.

Kathy Nantz: We are looking at University of Maryland as a case study. The part-time faculty members there are unionized.

Liz Hohl: They have a budget for necessary activities.

Joyce Shea: The School of Nursing has its unique feature in terms of part-time faculty. They are mostly clinical adjuncts. As a result, their special needs should also be considered.

Joe Dennin: Did the subcommittee count the adjuncts in the Math Department?

Kathy Nantz: The subcommittee is to create different profiles for different departments to meet their special needs.

4. Proposal for GSEAP 5-year BA/MA in Industrial/Occupational Psychology (Item 7c)

Faith-Anne Dohm: In the proposed program, the number of credit hours for MA will be reduced from the current 39 credits to the proposed 30 credits, plus 9 credits from the BA. The potential students pool could also come from Dolan School of Business in the future.

The minimum GPA requirement is 3.0, with a B+ or higher for the 3 required courses taken for the BA.

Joe Dennin: Some discrepancies and inconsistency in the attached documents, such as PY 545* and PY 406*, as well as some of the language on pages 32 and 36.

Faith-Anne Dohm: Yes, there is some clean up to do with the attached documents, as well as some mis-speaking as Joe Dennin pointed out.

MOTION (Ginny Kelly/Phil Lane): To approve the proposed new 5-year BA/MA program in Industrial/Occupational Psychology

Robbin Crabtree: What are the revenue implications of the program for the university?

Paul Fitzgerald: 96% of our students from the undergrad class of 2012 had jobs or went on to graduate schools 6 months after their graduation. If we combine the BA and MA into one for 5
years instead of 6, it is a win-win situation not only financially (by keeping them with us for the graduate program, even though they are going to reduce the graduate credits from 39 to 30), but also with Jesuit values and reputation.

Chris Huntley: Speaking in favor of the proposal since it will help keep high quality students within the university for MA. However, is it really a high demand in the area, especially when the students are still in freshman or sophomore years?

Faith-Anne Dohm: Yes, demand is high in this area. But we are not likely to attract freshman or sophomore students. They don't come in to psychology knowing about this area.

Joyce Shea: Speaking for the motion. Can some of the courses offered in the program be shared with the School of Nursing since there are some possible overlaps?

Faith-Anne Dohm: Yes, if space is available.

Bob Epstein: I did not seem to see a lot of enthusiasm between the lines in the minutes from the faculty of the psychology department, did I?

Robbin Crabtree: There is a new chair in the department, who did not fully understand what was going on initially.

Joe Dennin: Speaking against the motion due to the fact that there were some “mis-speakings” in the proposal, which can be improved before come to the Academic Council for approval.

Motion (Phil Lane/Joe Dennin): To call the question

Question called: 14 in favor, 2 opposed, 0 abstention

MOTION (To approve the proposed new 5-year BA/MA program in Industrial/Occupational Psychology) Passed: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 4 abstentions

5. Budget Committee membership (Item 7d)

Susan Rakowitz: Calling the Academic Council's attention to the e-mail exchange with President von Arx (in the packet) from the Fall of 2012 that indicates that the three faculty members who are elected by the General Faculty to serve on the Budget Committee will continue, but the Chairs of the Faculty Salary Committee and the Educational Planning Committee will no longer be invited to the Budget Committee. The President has the right to make this change, and my concern is not about the number of faculty on the committee because the committee doesn't take votes. But as you can see from the emails, I argued that it's important to have those perspectives represented in the Budget discussions and for those chairs to be able to take information from the Budget Committee back to their committees. This year the President agreed to continue to invite the FSC chair. Does the Council want to make any recommendations for next year?
Phil Lane: It is a mistake by the President to discontinue the practice of including as least the Chair of the Faculty Salary Committee in the Budget Committee.

**MOTION (Joe Dennin/Nancy Dallavalle):** To recommend to the President, on behalf of the Academic Council, that the Chair of the Faculty Salary Committee or his or her designee, continue to be invited to attend Budget Committee meetings.

**MOTION Passed:** 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention

6. Repeat course policy (Item 7e)

Susan Rakowitz: It recently came to my attention that a longstanding academic policy, the repeat course policy, was changed in the Undergraduate Course Catalogue in summer 2012 without consultation with and approval of the faculty.

The new language is in bold below, as opposed to the strikethrough:

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 credit nor the grade will count toward the degree. 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.

Joyce Shea: In the School of Nursing, this change makes sense due to minimum grade requirements.

Ginny Kelly: In GSEAP, it also makes sense to help meet the GPA requirements.

Paul Fitzgerald: Mary-Frances Malone proposed to make the change in order to be humane and fair to students after repeating the course. The GPA will be averaged with the repeated grade and original grade, instead of erasing the original grade.

**MOTION (Phil Lane/Joyce Shea):** To approve the following text for the Journal of Record:

**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.

Nancy Dallavalle: Speaking tentatively in favor of the motion for fairness sake.
Bob Epstein: Speaking against the motion, out of concerns of academic integrity.

Susan Rakowitz: Speaking against the motion because grades are meant to reflect achievement at a particular point in time, not ultimate mastery of material. With the proposed policy students could theoretically sign up for an intro level course after many upper level courses in the same discipline and just show up for tests to boost their GPAs.

David Downie: Speaking in favor of the motion since for the most part, the new language is fairer.

Joe Dennin: Slightly against the motion, hoping to have better language to get it right in the first place.

Chris Huntley: Against the motion, but would like to move to amend the current motion.

Motion (Chris Huntley/David Downie): To add a condition in front of the new language (in bod) as “Upon approval of the department chair” ...

Motion Withdrawn (Chris Huntley/David Downie)

MOTION (To approve the change made on Repeat Course Policy by the administration) Passed: 8 in favor, 4 opposed, 0 abstention

7. Meeting adjourned at 5 p.m.

MOTION (Joe Dennin/Ginny Kelly) to adjourn

MOTION Passed unanimously

Respectfully submitted by:

James He
Date: April 1, 2013  
From: Academic Council Subcommittee on Calendar Issues  
To: Academic Council  
Re: Spring 2014 Academic Calendar  

As the Subcommittee on Calendar Issues reported to the Academic Council, the published Academic Calendar for Spring 2014 is conspicuously shorter than the normal 14 weeks of classes, and is uneven in its distribution of class days among days of the week. In its current form, the Spring 2014 semester begins on 1/21 and ends on 4/30. The distribution of teaching days is:

- Mondays: 11  
- Tuesdays: 14  
- Wednesdays: 14  
- Thursdays: 13  
- Fridays: 13  

In this calendar, Monday-Thursday classes have 3 fewer class meetings than Tuesday-Friday classes, and meet for the equivalent of only 12 weeks. Monday turbos would meet for only 11 weeks.

The subcommittee therefore makes the following motions:

1. That the first day of classes for the Spring 2014 semester be changed from Tuesday, January 21, to Thursday, January 16.
2. That Tuesday, February 18 should follow a Monday schedule rather than a Tuesday schedule for undergraduate day classes. The administration should communicate to faculty that flexibility should be allowed for instructors who have unavoidable teaching conflicts and for students who have obligations that cannot be rescheduled. Professors should be encouraged to demonstrate sensitivity to students with scheduling conflicts, particularly in scheduling exams and other major assignments.
3. That Monday turbos should not be offered as regular undergraduate time codes in the Spring 2014 semester.

If the above motions are adopted, the distribution of teaching days in Spring 2014 would be:

- Mondays: 12  
- Tuesdays: 13  
- Wednesdays: 14  
- Thursdays: 14  
- Fridays: 14
From: Carl A. Scheraga, Chair, Department of Management
To: Academic Council

A budgetary process, when done with rigor and integrity, ties funding priorities to strategic priorities. This requires transparency with regard to the process that generates such strategic priorities, with such transparency being guaranteed by a strategic plan that is accessible to the entire organizational community. When this does not occur, rigorous budgetary processes are replaced by capricious expediency which becomes a barrier to a thoughtful dialogue in which all stakeholders are participants. Unfortunately, this has characterized the Budget Committee the last several years.

MOTION:

The faculty calls on the President and the Board of Trustees to present to the Fairfield University Community a written, formal and comprehensive strategic plan reflecting both a five year and ten year vision for the institution. The document thus generated will reflect professionally accepted format and content guidelines for institutions of higher education. The document will also incorporate best practices assessment mechanisms across all levels and all divisions of the University. It is thus understood that all of the content of this document will span all divisions, without exception, across the institution.
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 that recommendation 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.

Recommends: 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.

Recommends: 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.


Recommends: 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.

Recommends: 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.
[January 23, 2013]

Dear Bob,

Over the past couple of years, faculty have raised the issue of time codes with me, and asked me to bring it forward for discussion. Recently, I brought the general issue to the attention of the Registrar and to you both in an informal way, and I understand a more formal memo would help to move the issue along. Consider this email that memo.

As I was reviewing Dean's Council and CAS Faculty Meeting minutes recently, I see the issue of time codes arises again and again in a variety of ways. The following are a list of issues that warrant consideration, perhaps by a subcommittee of AC:

1. Is our current system of time codes the best for our current curriculum and co-curricular initiatives? We have not done a comprehensive review of our time code systems in a long time, though a number of ad hoc changes have been made: (a) the distribution of time codes by the Registrar, (b) the reduction in the number (and days) of turbos, (c) the blending of the day and evening schedules with new more standard evening time codes, and perhaps others. It seems appropriate to do a comprehensive review every decade or so.

2. Many faculty express interest in a more traditional time code system (MWF/TR/MW and one-day courses). Reasons are varied, but one of the valid (i.e., not self-interested) reasons relates to schedule adjuncts who teach at other institutions. This is a particular challenge in adjunct-intensive programs (EN, MA, MLL, PH, RS). The reduction in the number of turbos has affected the arts, in particular, though the Registrar has worked with them to ensure their workshop courses find places in the schedule.

3. Some faculty would like to see the procedures for scheduling courses in our current time code system changed such that 3-day courses would be scheduled first and given classroom priority, followed by 2-day, and then 1-day. This would encourage (they think) faculty to use more multi-day time codes, and better achieve (and reward) the kind of student-faculty contact we'd like to see (by having faculty on campus and with students more frequently).

4. Many posit that a different time code system would lead to better classroom use, with fewer classroom down times and crunch times.

These are the issues raised, and I think they are worthy of exploration. If AC decides to form a subcommittee, I would suggest that faculty across the schools participate as usual, but also staff members who are most intimately involved in registration and enrollment management. I would nominate Associate Dean Aaron Perkus and Assistant Dean Sue Peterson from the College.

Thank you for your consideration.

Robbin
Robbin D. Crabtree, Ph.D.
Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences
Fairfield University
Date: April 1, 2013
From: Academic Council Executive Committee  
To: Academic Council  
Re: Faculty selling course materials to students

A case has recently come to our attention of a faculty member requiring that students purchase unpublished course materials (a textbook manuscript) directly from him, at a profit. We see this as problematic for a variety of reasons and therefore propose the following policy for the Journal of Record:

If students are required to purchase unpublished course materials generated by the professor, then such materials can only be sold through the university bookstore and only for the cost of printing and publication, with no profit margin for the professor.

Date: April 8, 2013  
To: Academic Council  
From: Committee on Committees  
Re: Educational Technologies Committee

In light of the recent administrative restructuring of information technology services at Fairfield, we recommend that, in the Fall of 2013, the Educational Technologies Committee propose restructuring its ex officio membership. The proposal should add the newly created Chief Information Officer as an ex officio position and decrease the total number of ex officio seats.
NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL:

Visual Arts Administration Concentration, within the Art History Major
Department of Visual and Performing Arts
Proposed by: Dr. Marice Rose, Associate Professor and Director, Art History Program

1. Description, overview, and summary

A Visual Arts Administration Concentration (VAAC) option within the Art History major would offer interested students a program grounded in traditional art history, with practical components that will directly engage them in a variety of sectors, including museums, non-profit cultural agencies, art galleries, and auction houses. The experiential learning that our proposed curriculum will provide through coursework and internships will help students learn about how art works in society and how they might engage in helping it do so, while providing valuable knowledge and skills. This concentration will allow Art History students to take full advantage of our location in Fairfield County/New York City’s gallery- and museum-rich region. The concentration will be an optional four-course concentration with the Art History major.

2. Need. Explain why the new program is needed at Fairfield University, e.g. student driven, faculty driven, special interest.

The establishment of the Bellarmine Museum of Art provides the Art History program an opportunity to use its resources, along with the Art History faculty’s connections to numerous local, national, and international arts organizations, to serve our students in their understanding of visual art’s meaning in society today. The concentration will help attract and retain Art History majors, many of whom are nervous about post-graduation job prospects, by directly addressing contemporary art world dynamics, issues, and career possibilities.

There is student interest in this concentration. In an anonymous survey of 40 current students and recent alumni, 24 responded as follows:

19 would definitely have added this concentration to their Art History major if it were an option. 4 might have. 1 would not have.

Three of the surveyed alumni included comments:

I was both an Art History major and a Marketing major at Fairfield. I believe that an Art History major needs the management background to succeed in the field. I am also pursuing a career in Arts Administration so I would have greatly appreciated classes in that area.

Professor Eliasoph's senior seminar was the first course in which I really saw how I could apply my Art History major to the various careers in the visual arts. Any courses that would
be directed to the professional art world would absolutely have helped me to prepare for
post-graduation plans.

It would have been incredibly beneficial, especially for those interested in pursuing an arts-
related career.

3. **Rationale.** Discuss the reasons for the program, rationale how it meets the mission of Fairfield,
and its particular place in the curriculum.

This concentration fills a lacuna conceptually and geographically. There are few comparable
undergraduate programs in the nation.¹ The only other Visual Arts Administration undergraduate
concentration in the New York metropolitan region is at Baruch College in New York City. Most
Arts Administration undergraduate programs do not have the liberal arts component that ours does.
There are currently only twelve Museum Studies programs (a more narrow field) within Art History
departments at American colleges and universities.

A flexible, interdisciplinary concentration within a liberal arts curriculum that focuses on the visual
arts, but reaches beyond museums to consider other non-profit organizations as well as the commercial
world, will benefit our students by helping them understand and directly participate in today’s art
world. The concentration would be an example of the broad humanistic education, complemented
by more specialized preparation that is an important part of the university’s mission.

4. **Objectives.** What does the program seek to accomplish?

Students will have a strong academic and theoretical background in Art History, and will learn
about issues facing today’s non-profit and commercial art worlds, and learn applicable business and
writing theories and skills. They will participate directly in arts management through an internship
while developing skills and refining career goals.

Learning objectives include:

(Idea)
Learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories
Learning to apply course material
Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field
Learning how to find and use resources for answering questions or solving problems
Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view

(Core Pathways)
Engage in critical reflection on art and culture

¹Most Arts Administration programs focus on the performing arts. There are only a handful of undergraduate
Visual Arts Administration/Management degrees or concentrations: Concordia College in Chicago,
Waynesburg University (PA), Lipscomb (TN) University, Columbia College in Chicago, Drexel University
(PA).
Become familiar with connections between academic study and the “real world” implications of their study

5. Impact. What program(s) if any, will this replace? How will it impact current programs in your discipline or other disciplines? How will it impact the core curriculum? How will it overlap other programs?

The Visual Arts Administration concentration will not replace any program; it will overlap the traditional Art History major in that both traditional Art History majors and Visual Art Administration Concentration students are able to enroll in the same AH courses. Non-VAAC students are not allowed to enroll in the non-AH courses for major credit.

Because two of the required courses will be non-Visual and Performing Arts (VPA) courses, it means the students taking this concentration will not take as many 100-level Art History courses as a traditional major. We do not see this negatively affecting Art History enrollments because 100-level Art History courses count as VPA History core and therefore do not usually have problems filling. With a current average of 15-20 total Art History majors per year, approximately 10-12 of them from the junior/senior classes, we do not anticipate an overwhelm of Art History VAAC students in the non-VPA elective courses. We have had positive responses from the CAS departments where the interdisciplinary electives are housed, and the proposal has been discussed with DSB faculty, the DSB dean and associate dean, who did not see negative impact on their enrollment management if Art History students take DSB courses and look forward to the collaboration. We will coordinate curriculum mapping so that, for example, VPA’s Arts Administration course will not be offered at the same time as DSBs Managing Non-Profit Organizations course.

With all of the courses housed within Art History or being electives, students will still take their regular core courses. We will revisit the impact of the concentration on enrollments after seeing how popular the concentration is.

6. Program Detail. List approved courses required or recommended, discuss course sequence and reasons for including courses. Include other programmatic detail not specifically course-related, such as internships, special university events, etc. Any new courses proposed must be fully detailed, including description, rationale, draft syllabus.

The Art History major is a 30-credit major, the concentration would comprise 12 credits of the major. Students will choose courses toward the concentration from Art History’s courses on the topic, from a selection of DSB courses, and take a grant-writing course and a 3-credit internship as requirements. There are a variety of AH and DSB courses from which to choose, depending on individual student’s interests and career goals. These were chosen based on research of the other undergraduate arts administration programs, and are consistent with electives offered in other undergraduate programs. None of the courses listed are new.

The internship will be arranged collaboratively by the student and the Art History program’s internship coordinator. In addition to the on-site work component, there is an academic component
overseen by the internship coordinator that is composed of a variety of reading and writing assignments, reflections, and a portfolio. Internships are available at the Bellarmine Museum of Art and a wide range of museums, galleries, and auction houses in the region and in New York City. This is the same internship structure that the Art History program currently has.

In the past three years, Art History students have interned off-campus at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, UBS Corporate Art collection in Manhattan, the Pequot Library archive in Southport, the Fairfield Museum and Historical Society, the Fairfield Arts Council, and the Westport Arts Center.

Most students who declare Art History majors do not do so until late sophomore or early junior year, therefore the sequence of courses is flexible after the foundational courses are completed.

CURRICULUM

1. Complete two of the following foundational courses (six credits)
   - AH 10 Origins and Transformations in Western Art
   - AH 11 Visual Culture Since 1400: Expression and Experimentation
   - AH 12 Introduction to the Art History of Asia, Africa, and the Americas
   - AH 15 History of Architecture

2. Complete one art history courses at the 100-level and one at the 200-level (six credits)

3. Complete at least one of the following VPA courses (three credits):
   - AH 192 Introduction to the History, Theory and Practice of Museums
   - AH 292 Museums, Art, Ethics, and the Law
   - AH 295 Museum/Gallery Curating: Behind the Scenes

4. Complete one of the following Dolan School of Business Courses (three credits):
   - AC 11 Introduction to Financial Accounting
   - MG 101 Introduction to Management in Organizations
   - MG 240 Leading and Managing People
   - MG 335 Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management
   - MG 370 Managing Non-Profit Organizations
   - MK 101 Principles of Marketing

5. Complete EN/W 339 Grant and Proposal Writing (three credits)

6. Complete one Art History internship (three credits)
   - AH 310 Internship

7. Complete junior and senior capstone seminars (six credits)
   - AH 320 Junior Seminar
   - AH 330 Senior Seminar
*It is recommended that for fulfillment of Core area III, AE 291 Business Ethics be one of the courses taken. Additional courses in area 4 above are recommended as electives, as are EN/W 214 Professional Presentations: Writing and Delivery and EN/W 332 Business Writing.

7. Administrative Structure and Governance. What faculty grouping has control over curriculum and course development? What individuals have administrative authority? What is the proposed "chain of command"?

The Art History faculty has control over curriculum and course development, any new proposed courses or changes to the curriculum will be discussed by the Art History faculty and then will be brought to the Visual and Performing Arts department faculty for discussion. The Art History program director has administrative authority.

8. Resources. List personnel, space, resources; Library -- both in terms of resources AVAILABLE and resources NEEDED. Prepare a proposed draft yearly budget. Also consider OPPORTUNITY COST. What other programs would the university, or your curricular area, have to sacrifice or delay in order to implement this program?

No additional personnel, spaces, or resources are necessary. The concentration will use existing resources. The Art History program’s annual budget will be used, as it is now, for speakers and events associated with the concentration’s courses.

VAAC Budget: $1000 speakers/events (honoraria, media set-up fees, speaker travel costs, refreshments)

Art History’s annual budget can absorb this cost because the costs that we used to pay for 35 mm slide developing have decreased now that all faculty teach with digital images.

No sacrifices or delays are needed on the part of Art History, VPA, or the university. No additional library funds beyond Art History’s usual allocation are needed.

9. Projections for the Future. What are your anticipated plans for this program down the line: two years? five years? When and how will you evaluate its effectiveness?

After the first students enrolled in the concentration graduate, and for 2 years following, there will be an exit survey and examination of internship portfolios by the full-time Art History faculty. At this time it will be determined if changes to the program’s goals or curriculum are needed, and how and when to implement the changes.
DEPARTMENT OF VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS
Excerpt from the minutes of the meeting of October 10, 2012

Location: CNS 8

In attendance: Eliasoph, Mayzik, Schneck, Porter, Rose, Sage, Sealese, Torff, Schwab, LoMonaco, Walker-Canton, Nash, Yarrington

On Sabbatical: Chamlin

The meeting was called to order at 2:00pm.

A. Visual Arts Administration Concentration (Marice Rose): Professor Rose provided the faculty with some background surrounding the history of this proposal for a concentration in Visual Arts Administration within the Art History major. At the time the Bellarmine Museum of Art was first conceptualized, Professor Eliasoph began planning a Post-doc museum studies and art world professions certificate program. He had already been teaching AH 195, Intro to Museum and Gallery Curating, and a senior seminar that focused on museums and galleries. When Professor Jill Deupi joined the faculty, she joined the planning process, including meetings with Philip, Edna Wilson and Aaron Perkus, and she researched curricula at other institutions. She developed two undergraduate courses, AH 291 (now AH 192) History, Theory and Practice of Museums, and AH 292, Museums, Art, Ethics, and the Law which were approved by VPA and ASCC. This post-doc certificate plan was dropped, mostly because of the phasing out of UC. Art History, as a program, decided that rather than advocating for the certificate, it would best serve our current undergrad majors to give them the option of bundling existing Art History courses (such as Professor Eliasoph’s and Professor Deupi’s), the current internships in the Bellarmine Museum of Art and at local museums/galleries, and interdisciplinary electives, as a concentration in order to give students focused knowledge and experience in visual arts management today. The majority of the concentration’s coursework is made up of traditional Art History courses, so there is still a strong liberal arts background. Additional courses relate to the history and practicality of how visual art works in society today and how students can be engaged in that endeavor. Professor Rose added that based on the research the faculty has done thus far, very few similar concentrations exist at other American colleges. In selecting the interdisciplinary electives, the Art History faculty researched Arts Administration programs at other schools, and saw cross-listed courses such as: Business Ethics, Intro to Management, and Grant Writing. These courses, among others, have thus been selected to serve as non-VPA electives within this concentration--the appropriate departments have been consulted for approval. Professor Nash added that the idea of an “Arts Administration” concentration has been run by father Fitzgerald and Dean Crabtree in passing. Professor Nash noted that interdisciplinary concentrations are an excellent way to connect with other programs of study and schools within this University. Professor Nash met with Deans Gibson and Petraglia from the DSB and they endorse this. Professor Nash added that this model is one that all arts programs can work toward and students can participate in on many levels. Professor Yarrington asked how this
concentration is represented on a transcript. Professor Nash answered that she was not sure and would have to ask Professor Rosivach. Professor Rose noted that she will check the Journal of Record. Professor LoMonaco added that there is real enthusiasm for bringing all of these disciplines together, and that currently one Theatre major is working on an independent major in Theatre Arts Administration with Carl Schlager. Professor Porter asked whether or not you have to be an Art History major to have a concentration in visual arts administration or if you can add the concentration to any major. Professor Rose confirmed that students must be an Art History major in order to concentrate in visual arts administration. Professor Porter asked how students will be able to get into those classes in the business school that are so notoriously hard to get into. Professor Nash answered that many of the courses that are being recommended for the concentration are not the most popular classes and do not have prerequisites. Professor Nash stated that non-art history students are welcome to take the classes as long as they have sophomore status and the classes are open. Professor Mayzik, S.J asked whether or not the three Art History courses presented in the proposal are new. Professor Rose confirmed that all courses listed in the proposal are existing courses. Professor Schwab added that in developing this concentration, the faculty had conversations with former students who all said that this sort of focus would have been a great opportunity to have as an undergraduate. Professor Nash added that there are a large number of students within Visual and Performing Arts who have shown quite a bit of interest in this sort of program focus, as can be seen in the growing interest in Gary Wood’s Arts Administration course that is running next semester. Professor Yarrington asked what information she should provide Studio Art majors who want to have this concentration. Professor Rose stated that once the concentration is approved, they will need to double major in Art History unless Studio Art creates a concentration within the Studio Art Program. Professor Nash expressed her enthusiasm for Art History leading the way in developing this concentration especially given the amount of data available regarding the curriculum to career implications of bridging arts and business. This program seems to be one that will be very attractive to students as well as parents who are looking for arts focused curriculum with “mainstream” business tie-ins. Professor Porter made a motion to approve. Professor Yarrington seconded the motion. The faculty voted enthusiastically in favor of approving the Visual Arts Administration Concentration within Art History (13-0-0)

Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee  
Tuesday, January 29  
3:30 in BCC 203

MINUTES (Excerpts)

Present: Professor Rosivach (Chair), Associate Dean Im, and Professors Fernandez, Garvey, Johnson, Lacy, Peduti, Ruffini, Nantz, and Xie.

Meeting called to order at 3:30pm.
1. Concentration in Visual Arts administration
The Chair introduced Prof. Rose, who presented the proposal to establish a concentration in Visual Arts Administration.

Key points of Prof. Rose’s presentation:
- The proposed concentration in Visual Arts Administration would challenge students to explore, “how art works in society today, and how to engage in that.”
- Because of the interdisciplinary nature of the proposed concentration, the proposers reached out to department chairs and strategic faculty in areas including, but not limited to Business Ethics, Grant Writing, and Industrial Psychology; Rose reported enthusiastic responses from those Chairs and colleagues.
- Visual Arts Administration is a strategic choice over “Museum Studies” (a common model in the US) because it will include for-profit and non-profit sectors, ideal for the greater NYC region.

Prof. Fernandez requested additional information about the internship component of the proposed concentration.

Prof. Rose explained that Fairfield’s alumni network and proximity to New York City provide a wide variety of internship opportunities with organizations such as the Fairfield Arts Council and the UBS Corporate Art Collection.

Assoc. Dean Im questioned whether the Grant Writing class in International Studies would be appropriate for the Visual Arts Administration concentration. He and Prof. Johnson noted that the IS Grant Writing class is now organized around the Fulbright application. Prof. Johnson strongly encouraged the proposers review and reconsider the Grant Writing class component of the concentration.

Prof. Rose reported that prior to submitting the proposal, she asked Prof. Leatherman (instructor of the Grant Writing Class) if her course would be appropriate for the Visual Arts Administration concentration, to which Leatherman responded positively.

Professors Xie and Nantz, along with Assoc. Dean Im inquired about several elective courses, which they felt were essential and should be required.

Prof. Rose said that these courses (e.g. grant writing and accounting) would be appropriate for only a handful of students in the Visual Arts Administration program. She said advising will play a crucial role in helping students balance their concentration courses toward professional interests. Rose explained that the proposers opted for flexibility and electives because their majors often declare later in their Fairfield experience, and that some courses may not be offered often enough.

Prof. Xie asked if the proposers were concerned that it would be difficult for their students to find spaces in courses like management.
Prof. Rose said that the numbers of students seeking such a class would be small.

Prof. Johnson asked about the total number of students in the existing program, and how many of those students would want to do the proposed concentration.

Prof. Rose said there are currently 25 students in the program, and that many were double majors with diverse interests including law and biology.

Assoc. Dean Im asked if the proposers were concerned with offering as BA concentration that typically tends to be taught as post-graduate programs. He asked if our students would be competitive on the job market (with B.A. concentration rather than post-graduate work).

Prof. Rose explained that Fairfield alumni have been a tremendous resource for helped our graduates find employment, and that a number of student internships transitioned into jobs following graduation. Rose added that graduates seeking high-level positions might seek the concentration as a pathway to graduate work and professional experience that would bolster their potential.

With no more questions from committee members, the Chair thanked Prof. Rose for attending.

Prof. Johnson **MOVED** to approve the proposal. Prof. Fernandez **SECONDED** the motion.

The Chair opened the floor for discussion.

Prof. Johnson spoke in favor of the motion because the proposed concentration could make some of our Art History majors more competitive and prepared for the Visual Arts Administration careers.

Prof. Ruffini asked fellow committee members if the concentration actually appears on the diploma. Prof. Johnson said that the concentration would be on the student’s transcript not the degree (a model used for English major concentrations).

**Motion PASSED** (9-0-0)
UCC Meeting Minutes  
March 5, 2013  
3:30 PM Library Conference Room  
[Excerpts]

Attending:  
Professors Mousumi Bose Godbole, Doug Peduti, Bruce Bradford, Shah Etemad, Tommy Xie, Johanna Garvey, Jerelyn Johnson, Scott Lacy, Kathy Nantz, Rajasree Rajamma, Shanon Reckinger, Vin Rosivach  
Giovanni Ruffini (Chair), Deans: Lynn Babington, Aaron Perkus, Jack Beal

c. Arts Administration Concentration

Marice Rose (guest) presented about the reasons why an Arts Administration Concentration would benefit Fairfield University. Started by the opportunity provided by Bellarmine Museum. The ASCC and Dean Crabtree already provided suggestions and they have incorporated them into the report. Rose emphasized that this is a concentration within the Arts History Concentration and, as such, requires no new resources.  
Xie: He didn’t get a chance to compare the differences between the ASCC version and this version, could you explain what you changed?  
Rose: We bundled courses together under common areas and the Grant Writing course is now a requirement given the suggestion of ASCC  
Perkus: Curriculum area 4: have you been in conversation with DSB?  
Rose: Yes, they have been very supportive during this process and I have included letters of support from Gibson and Scheraga.  

- **Motion to approve the proposal: Peduti/Perkus**

Perkus: They made the changes we suggested in ASCC  

- **Motion carries, 13-0-0**
Educational Planning Committee
April 18, 2013
Meeting Minutes

[Excerpts]

Present: Peter Bayers, SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, Cathy Giapponi, Olivia Harriott, Evelyn Bilias Lolis, Diana Mager (scribe), Mark Scalese, Carl Scheraga, Christopher Staecker, Dean Susan Franzosa

Visiting: Dean Jack Beal, and Professor Shahrokh Etemad, Chair, Mechanical Engineering; Professor Marice Rose, Visual and Performing Arts; and Professor Ronald Salafia, Dept. of Psychology

On Sabbatical: Qin Zhang; Sheila Grossman

* * *

3. Concentration on Visual Arts Administration

Chair Scheraga introduced Professor Marice Rose, and asked her to give an overview of this proposal.

Professor Rose described the Bellermine Museum of Art as an opportunity and learning resource for the art itself, but also for teaching about museum management. It is an opportunity to create a concentration in arts management. Only a handful of schools offer such a concentration. The School of Business and English Department have also been involved in the conceived curriculum, along with Dean Crabtree and the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee. The curriculum is built from existing courses, and this is a nice way to build focused and intentional curriculum.

Chair Scheraga added that this proposal is student driven. VPA students say that they can see themselves managing art galleries or museums of their own, which builds into the School of Business's entrepreneurial focus. He then opened the floor to questions/comments.

SVPAA Fitzgerald spoke in favor of the proposal, stating that it is a template to replicate, it is good for students, and a great collaboration between the School of Business and the College, and he asked if it would be easy for the business students to build these courses into their curriculum.

Professor Giapponi concurred that there is interest in collaboration as she gets alot of students in her "Non Profits" course from theatre, who are interested in non profit work.

SVPAA Fitzgerald stated that there are five majors within VPA, and asked how this concentration would fit within those five majors (ie: would theatre, music students, etc) be able to take the concentration?
Professor Rose responded that the concentration is built for art majors, but that she can see it growing in the future.

Professor Bayers stated that this is a model that can be used in other areas, such as English as well, as there is a nice synergy between liberal arts and business at undergrad/grad levels that not only helps to educate the whole person, but is also practical and helps prepare students for work.

Professor Scalese asked what the difference is between a concentration and a minor.

Professor Rose responded that a minor requires going through the State, and is more than just adding courses such as with a concentration.

Professor Rose was then excused from the meeting and Chair Scheraga opened the floor for comments:

Professor Harriott stated it is a great concentration; Professor Mager concurred.

Chair Scheraga stated that he thinks we will see more of these kinds of concentrations and that faculty in the School of Business enjoy working with faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences.

Professor Giapponi stated that we need to figure out ways to get more exposure and encourage students to take courses in other areas for business writing, grant writing, etc.

Dean Franzosa recommended that the Center for Academic Excellence may assist with interdisciplinary dialogue between faculty.

Motion by Professor Harriott to approve the concentration on Visual Arts Administration; seconded by Professor Giapponi. All in favor, motion passed unanimously.
Dear Chair of Academic Council, Executive Secretary of Academic Council, and Secretary of the General Faculty:

I: Request for action by the Academic Council:

The Program on the Environment requests formal approval to change its name to “Environmental Studies.” The Faculty that comprise the Steering Committee of the Program have unanimously agreed that the name should be changed.

Nothing will change except the name. Thus, in the interest of administrative efficiency, and reducing burdens on various committees, we believe the Academic Council can take this purely administrative and extremely straightforward decision directly, without burdening the ASCC, UCC, and EPC with the tasks of taking preliminary decisions on an issue that in no way impacts the content of the academic program.

II: Background:

Six years ago, three interdisciplinary minors that were dormant or in disarray – the Environmental Studies, Environmental Science, and Marine Science programs, were eliminated and replaced with the new and improved “Program on the Environment” – a new interdisciplinary minor with new requirements, new electives, greater faculty involvement, and plans to hire a new Director. An entirely new name was chosen to avoid confusion with the old programs, to create a ‘fresh start,’ and to resolve or avoid potential disputes. The curriculum changes, retirement of the old programs, and creation of the new programs were all approved by the relevant University Committees prior to or immediately after my arrival at Fairfield 5 years ago.

After 5 years of very successful operation of the new program, with new classes and many new students, the program faculty have agreed that changing the name to Environment Studies would be appropriate and advantageous. The reasons include:

1) “Environmental Studies” conforms to the names of nearly all other interdisciplinary minors at Fairfield University, including Asian Studies, Black Studies, Catholic Studies, Classical Studies, International Studies, Irish Studies, Italian Studies, Judaic Studies, Latin American and Caribbean Studies, Peace and Justice Studies, Russian and East European Studies, and Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies.

2) “Environmental Studies” is the common and likely more accurate description of this type of academic program. Similar programs at most other Colleges and University are called “Environmental Studies”

3) The name change will lead to clearer marketing, internal and external communications, etc.

4) Many students, faculty and administrators at Fairfield already call the program “Environmental Studies.”
5) The new name is easier to type.

6) The historic, idiosyncratic, and non-academic reasons behind the choice of the current name no longer exist.

III: Relevant Minutes of the Program on the Environment Steering Committee

The minutes of January 10, 2013 Steering Committee meeting include the following:

Agenda Item “2. Program Name. Director DD brought up the idea of a name change for the program citing that the “Program on the Environment” title is not in use at other institutions. TO proposed a name change back to “Environmental Studies” commenting that he was primarily responsible for the awkward title the “Program on the Environment” and that the name was an artifact of a political situation that no longer exists. PB seconded. Motion passed (8 in favor, plus 3 proxies).

For confirmation, I have copied all the faculty members that serve on the Program on the Environment Steering Committee.

IV: Conclusion

I hope this request will be one of the easier issues that the Academic Council will have on its upcoming agendas. Please let me know if I can provide more information. As a member of the Academic Council, I will be able to present the proposal and answer questions whenever it reaches the agenda. I will of course excuse myself from the vote.

Best regards,

David

=====================================

David Downie
Fairfield University
217 Donnarumma Hall
1073 North Benson Road, Fairfield, CT 06824