ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, April 8, 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 2/4/13 and 2/25/13 (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 final exam policy from UCC (attachment)
   b. Proposed changes to Spring 2014 Academic Calendar (attachment)

7. New business
   a. Report from Committee on Conference on March meeting with Board
   b. Proposal to revise membership of FDEC (attachment)
   c. Presentation by Faculty Research Committee on guidelines revisions (attachment)
   d. Ballot of candidates for Committee on Committees
   e. Procedures governing faculty searches (See attachment on pp. 19-25 of AC packet for 12/3/12)
   f. Regularization of language in Handbook and Journal of Record (Pending Item I, attachment)
   g. Time code issues (attachment)
   h. Issues involving required student purchase of class materials (attachment)

• Lists of Attachments, Pending, and Ongoing Items are on page 2
List of Attachments:
For item 3.a. Academic Council minutes of February 4 (pp. 3-8) and February 25 (pp. 9-16)
For item 4.f. Report of the Academic Council Subcommittee on Community-Engaged Scholarship, with excerpts of AC minutes of 10/1/12 (pp. 17-24)
For item 6.a. Memo from ACEC concerning proposed changes to final exam policy (p. 25)
For item 6.b. Memo from Calendar Subcommittee proposing changes to Spring 2014 Calendar (p. 26)
For item 7.b. Recommendation for revising the composition of FDEC (pp. 27-30)
For item 7.c. Proposal from Faculty Research Committee for changes to application guidelines, with minutes of FRC meeting (pp. 31-34)
For item 7.c. Proposed revised research grant application guidelines (pp. 35-50)
For item 7.f. Memo from ACEC regarding regularization of language in Handbook and Journal of Record (pp. 51-52)
For item 7.g. Memo from Dean Robbin Crabtree regarding time code issues (p. 53)
For item 7.h. Memo from ACEC on sale of course materials to students (p. 54)

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 Meeting Draft Minutes
Monday, February 4, 2013
3:30 - 5:30
CNS 200

Present: Professors: Mousumi Bhattacharya, Joe Dennin, David Downie, Bob Epstein (Executive Secretary), James He, Dennis Keenan (Chair), Ginny Kelly, Wendy Kohli, Phil Lane, John Lasseter, Elizabeth Petrino, Shawn Rafalski, Susan Rakowitz (General Faculty Secretary), Joyce Shea, Roxana Walker-Canton, Dave Winn.

Student: Rob Vogel

Administrators: Deans Lynn Babington, Robbin Crabtree, Don Gibson, SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, S.J.

Guests: Professors Steve Bayne, Giovanni Ruffini, Aaron Perkus.

Regrets: Dean Jack Beal

Chair Keenan called the meeting to order at 3:35

The new members Professors Dave Winn, James He and John Lasseter were introduced.

1. Presidential Courtesy

SVPAA Fitzgerald reported that applications were up about 200 over the same time last year, the ratio was 60-40 female, average SATs were around 1775. Particularly encouraging was that early action was up 12%; these are generally among the brighter students, and we have 4 months to recruit them. Being able to meet with faculty and visit classes was considered a big plus. Graduate enrollment was down slightly from projections.

Prof Rakowitz asked about the national search for an Executive Vice President- how does it relate to the previously announced but unfilled Senior VP for Strategic Initiatives and how is it being paid for?

SVPAA Fitzgerald replied that the situation is fluid and position description was not yet finished. Pres. von Arx originally farmed out the work that had been done by EVP Weitzer. Jim Chambers, a consultant, was doing a small portion of the Executive Vice President’s role. He thought that the previously announced SVP position had morphed into an EVP.

Prof Epstein was concerned that this was a new position, and Prof Lane asked if the position had been approved by the Budget committee.

SVPAA Fitzgerald replied that the Budget committee does not make decisions at this level.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

Prof. Rakowitz explained that in the middle of the Rank and Tenure deliberations, the nursing representative, who was also the fourth required full Professor on the committee, resigned. No other
full Professors from Nursing were available to serve in her stead, and no nursing cases remained pending before the committee. The Committee on Committees therefore decided that it was more important to find a full Professor who was a recent member of the R&T committee, and willing and able to serve, rather than an Associate Professor from Nursing. She thanked Dennis Keenan, who fit these criteria and was appointed by the C on C to the position.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary.

Prof Keenan had a minor correction on page 9, changing "vote on" to "vote in favor".

   Motion (Lane/Fitzgerald) To approve the draft minutes of Dec. 3, 2012

   Motion passed 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 5 abstentions.

4. Council Subcommittee Reports.

Volunteers are needed for item 4e – subcommittee on sexual misconduct policies.

5. No petitions for immediate hearing.

    Motion to reorder the agenda to move to New Business (Rakowitz/Lane).

    Motion passed 15 in favor, 0 against, 1 abstention.

7a Proposal for Master of Liberal Studies

Visitors Bayne and Perkus presented the proposal and answered questions.

Prof Bayne said the roots of the program were in Dean Crabtree wanting a Master’s program, high faculty interest and the interest shown in a market survey. A working group was formed in the fall of 2011 and has worked hard since then. The program will be 33 credits with 2 required courses and 9 electives. It fits the mission of the University. The start-up costs are minor, and the program should show a profit by the second year.

Dean Babington pointed out that there are potentially relevant graduate courses available in the School of Nursing.

Prof Epstein: Applications are down in the CAS Masters programs. Are the profit projections reasonable?

Prof Bayne: The projections were developed in conjunction with Judy Dubai from Enrollment Management.

SVPAA Fitzgerald made several points: Fairfield University has a strong reputation in the area. This program should appeal to people in the area who want to think about big questions. It expands the opportunities for full-time faculty in the Humanities particularly to teach graduate students.

Prof. Rakowitz shared the concerns about the projections; these are the same target audience as American Studies, and they have only 21 students.

Prof. Dennin expressed serious concern that the budget numbers were frequently in the wrong year.
Dean Perkus acknowledged the drop in enrollment in American Studies but the proposed program has broader appeal and will have the energy of a new program.

Prof. Lane asked if there would be a full review at year 4 before the full time hire and is the marketing and recruiting locked down. The latter is crucial.

Prof. Bayne said it is a unique program with no full time faculty in the program but will be taught by faculty interested in teaching in the program. One vision would have the hire be a visiting position rotating among the departments involved in the program and not a tenure track appointment. There are different versions of the full time position.

Prof. Kohli asked if the group would take LS401 together.

Prof. Bayne replied that yes they would. A student would take it the first time it was available after a student signed up.

Prof. Kohli asked who else would take the electives if needed to get them to run.

Prof. Bayne replied that some would be cross-listed with American Studies.

Dean Crabtree said that the issues with American Studies are about management shortcomings and market fluctuations and that the program is currently under external review. The MLS program has potential synergy with American Studies and will share some common faculty. The budget shortcomings need reflection. In hiring a faculty member, the position should interface with other programs.

Prof. Downie asked if undergraduates could take the program.

Dean Crabtree replied that it is against the rules.

Prof. Rafalski asked about the importance and relationship between LS401 and the capstone.

Prof. Bayne replied that the capstone would be returning to LS401.

Prof. Dennin asked if there is a minimum number of strictly MLS courses required.

Prof. Bayne replied no and that many of the courses will be cross-listed after being approved by the program committee.

Prof. Bhattacharya asked what are the differences between American Studies and MLS.

Prof. Bayne indicated that the goals and outcomes are on page 19 and that the focus in the MLS is on global issues rather than just American issues and is more interdisciplinary.

Prof. Petrino pointed out that an interdisciplinary approach is big in both programs.

Prof. Kohli pointed out that there was no similar program in this part of the state. Then she asked what distinguishes it, makes it unique, connects it to adult learning. Finally, she mentioned that adult pedagogy is important.
Prof. Bayne replied that two things make it distinct. One is the team teaching in the fundamental course LS401. The other is building a sense of community all the way through and into the capstone course where the students will be working together.

SVPAA Fitzgerald stressed the academic excellence, the universality and the integrative nature of the program.

Prof. Lasseter asked if a language requirement was envisioned.

Prof. Bayne responded no.

Prof. Lane asked what is the time line; when is a decision needed.

Prof. Bayne responded that the hope is to go to the state in March and, depending on state approval, start in the fall.

**Motion [Lane/Fitzgerald]: The AC approves the proposal for the MLS.**

Dean Babington was for the motion although it was not in the format for submission to the state.

Prof. Dennin was against the motion due to perceived problems with the application, particularly the budget.

Prof. Lane was for the motion for its revenue potential.

Prof. Epstein was for the motion and hopes the money predictions are accurate.

SVPAA Fitzgerald was for the motion because the program will be high quality, will make us new friends and will enable us to hire additional new faculty.

Prof. Petrino was for the motion because of the intellectual value for students and faculty, and the graduate program will allow undergraduates to continue on here at Fairfield. She has a concern about how the courses will be staffed.

**Motion passed 14 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions.**

7 b,c,d

Professor Ruffini presented sections 7 b, c, d (pgs. 68 – 82) for discussion.

(d) UCC representation:

Prof. Ruffini presented the motion on pg. 73 on changing representation for people from the defunct University College. There was no discussion.

(c) Final Examination Policy:

The issue of final exam policy was sent to the UCC initially due to a concern of the FDEC on the weight given to the final exam in the final grade. Prof. Ruffini spoke about motions B and C on pg. 72.
Prof Rakowitz noted that the proposal removed language requiring notification of the dean for formats other than in-class exams, and that seemed to make sense. But she didn't understand why the timing policy (the language stating that whatever the form of the final evaluation, it could not be due before the time assigned by the registrar) had been moved to the section about weighting and had been eviscerated by allowing violation through notification of the dean rather than requiring approval.

Prof. Ruffini indicated that the UCC did not discuss the issue of approval versus notification of the Dean on changes. The proposed motions only require that the Dean be notified of changes. There was a sentiment that only notification to the Dean was too weak but Prof Ruffini disagreed and indicated that many faculty already do not follow the policy.

Mr. Vogel said that the deadline for final evaluations cannot be left to the faculty but needs the approval of the Dean. Students need to know when work is due so as to have materials done when due. They want to avoid having work front loaded on them.

Prof. Epstein said that he appreciated the substitution of the word “evaluation” for the word “exam,” but wondered about the inclusion of the word “comprehensive,” given that the UCC was seeking language to reflect the variety of forms of final evaluation. Prof. Ruffini explained that he took “comprehensive” to have a different meaning from “cumulative,” and that evaluations could be comprehensive by covering ideas or methods central to the course’s goals, rather than simply the content of the entire semester’s materials.

Prof Rakowitz felt the phrase ‘weigh heavily’ in replacing the one-third criterion didn't seem to address the FDEC's concern— some faculty might take it as meaning more than one-third.

Prof Ruffini responded that he and the UCC did not believe that faculty would raise the weight of the final evaluation after the change. He believes that faculty would go for a lower weight rather than a higher one.

(b) Language Core Requirement:

Prof Ruffini said that he and the majority of the UCC believed that the motion of the General Faculty for the UCC to ‘draft a proposal for a core language requirement that will apply to all Fairfield undergraduates’ was ambiguous. Did this mean that there should be a universal core requirement for all undergraduates or four separate core requirements for the four undergraduate schools? He proposed four possible motions for the UCC none of which required a uniform core. He noted that the core requirement for the SOE was not written down anywhere. One proposed motion tried to find a compromise by giving the DSB a three semester option to fulfill the language requirement.

Prof Rakowitz explained that when Prof. Ruffini contacted her in October asking about the intent of the framers of the motion, she didn't answer because it was the faculty discussion not the framers' intention that mattered once the motion passed. She did, however, say that Prof. Ruffini could ask the AC for clarification on the General Faculty motion.
Prof Epstein reiterated this point and felt the motion meant a single requirement for all undergraduates. He asked if the faculty motion was returned to the UCC, would they try to create a uniform language requirement for all undergraduates.

Prof Ruffini responded that the UCC felt it had done its job, that the core language requirement was decided and that it was being asked to do something that had been done. If the UCC was asked to reconsider the issue, he saw two possible outcomes: (1) there was a high probability that the UCC would pass a motion saying it had completed its job on this issue or (2) the result would be a collapse of the UCC discussion because there were not enough votes to pass any different motion.

Prof Epstein said that the UCC can be required to put a motion on the table for one uniform core language requirement and to discuss it.

Prof He said that the UCC had answered the question put forth by the General Faculty and understood that the UCC had decided to leave four core requirements.

Prof Ruffini’s reading of the UCC was that he could not imagine there being enough votes to pass a uniform language requirement.

Dean Crabtree raised the issue of what would the AC do if the UCC designed a proposal which then did not pass.

**Motion to recess to Monday February 11th [Dennin/Rafalski] Passed unanimously at 5:30.**
Present: Professors Mousumi Bhattacharya, Joe Dennin, David Downie, Bob Epstein (Executive Secretary), James He, Chris Huntley, Dennis Keenan (Chair), Ginny Kelly, Wendy Kohli, Phil Lane, Elizabeth Petrino, Susan Rakowitz (General Faculty Secretary), Joyce Shea, and Dave Winn. Administrators: Deans Lynn Babington, Robbin Crabtree, Don Gibson, and SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, S.J..

Regrets: Professors John Lasseter, Shawn Rafalski, Roxana Walker-Canton, Nancy Danvalle; Dean Jack Beal; Student Representative Rob Vogel

The Academic Council reconvened its February 4 meeting on February 25 (the University was closed on February 11 due to weather and closed on February 18 due to a holiday).

The Academic Council resumed its deliberation of agenda items 7 b, c, d, taking note of the information provided on February 4, including the questions and answers with UCC Chair Giovanni Ruffini.

7 (b) Language Core Requirement:

Prof. Epstein reintroduced this item, noting that the UCC appeared uninterested in conducting additional work on this issue. Without prejudging or expressing support for any option, he outlined several possible options that could apply to all students and address the concerns raised by DSB (for example, completing the intermediate level of a language that a student has studied previously or one year of a language not previously studied) and that others could be developed as well. In his view, given the vote of the general faculty, it would be appropriate for the Academic Council to consider creating a sub-committee to examine the issue.

Prof. Keenan outlined the options before the Academic Council. These included entertaining motions: to accept the report and proposal submitted by the UCC; to create a sub-committee of the Academic Council to discuss the issue; or to proceed along another path.

MOTION (Lane/Downie): To accept the recommendation of the UCC and change the language in the JOR regarding Area V of the core curriculum 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.

Prof. Lane spoke in favor of the motion, stating that the issue had received sufficient attention to take a decision. He would prefer that all students follow the DSB requirement but could accept the UCC proposal as a compromise.

Dean Gibson spoke in favor of the motion, stating that the issue had been discussed in detail by UCC, a fully functioning and representative faculty body, on multiple occasions and that UCC had based its conclusions, and taken votes, following extensive deliberations and review of relevant data. He noted that several competitive Universities with common undergraduate core requirements had certain variations within their core language requirements. In his view the current system was working well, citing, as an example, the impact on applications and enrollments and an increase in the number of DSB students taking critical languages.

Joe Dennin spoke in opposition to the motion. If the University is to have an undergraduate core curriculum, then the core should be standard for all students. This did not imply support for a particular language requirement, only that it be common.
Dean Babington spoke in favor of the motion, endorsing points made by Dean Gibson.

Prof. Rakowitz spoke in opposition to the motion. The UCC had not examined the specific issue as instructed by the vote of the general faculty. In addition to supporting a common core, she opposed the proposal due to concerns about the impact on students who seek to transfer between schools.

Prof. He spoke in favor of motion, noting that the appropriate processes had been followed and that it was time to put off further consideration of the issue for a while.

Prof. Epstein spoke in opposition to the motion. The process has not followed the appropriate processes as the UCC had not responded to the specific instructions given by the vote of the general faculty to examine options to create a language requirement that would apply to all undergraduates. Since the UCC had not acted on the instructions given it by the general faculty, it was up to the AC, as a representative of the general faculty, to carry out these instructions. Doing so would follow the path set forth by a legitimate vote of the GF; while choosing not to examine the issue would be a violation of appropriate governance. In addition, the proposal was an attack on the core, which the University advertises as a key part of its educational strengths.

Prof. Shea spoke in favor of motion. As a strong supporter of the core, and a member of the faculty of the School of Nursing, which also supports the core, she believed that the relevant issues go beyond the discussion of the language requirement. Thus, the motion should be approved and plans made for a more comprehensive discussion. In addition, it was important for the language issue not to divide the faculty further, given the importance of maintaining a united faculty this year.

SVPAA Fitzgerald spoke in favor of motion. He noted that the UCC had held extensive and deep conversations about a situation involving competing goods and that many Universities, including Jesuit schools, have variable core requirements. Attention must also be paid to the impact of various requirements on both the competition for students and the reality of what the requirements produce. Most students taking 4 semesters of a language do not become bilingual. The relevant issues should continue to be discussed, particularly within College of Arts and Sciences, but approving this motion was appropriate at this time.

Prof. Huntley spoke in favor of motion, albeit reluctantly. He expressed support for both a common core and a requirement to reach sufficiency in a language other than English. However the issue had gone through UCC twice. In addition, a requirement that DSB students take 16 hours of a language vs. 18 hours of their major was not appropriate. Passing out of a foreign language requirement may also be inappropriate. Thus, the entire issue needed extensive discussion and study but at this point in time the proper decision was to approve the motion.

**MOTION PASSED: 11 in favor, 2 opposed, 0 abstentions**
(c) Final Examination Policy:

MOTION (Rakowitz/ Fitzgerald): to amend the final exam policy in the Journal of Record as follows (additions in bold, deletions struck through):

Final Exam Policy:

1. Each instructor should be given a wide latitude, so as to provide for a degree of creativity and flexibility in how the students will be tested. The form of evaluation should be in keeping with the goals and purposes of the course.

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

3. The normal form of final evaluations is a written examination, two to three hours in length, to be administered at the date and time assigned by the Registrar. Written examinations less than two hours or more than three hours will require written notification of the students, Dean, and chairperson, program director or area coordinator, as appropriate.

4. If the professor chooses a method of evaluation other than the normal 2 to 3 hour written examination on the assigned date and time, the following criteria must be met:
   
   a. A memorandum must be submitted in writing to the chairperson, program director or area coordinator and the appropriate dean, reasonably in advance of the end of the semester, describing the alternate form of the final evaluation to be used.
   
   b. No greater demands should be made of a student's time and effort by an alternate form of final examination than would be required by preparation and taking of the normal 2 to 3 hour written examination.
   
   3. e- No alternative form of final evaluation is to be due prior to the date assigned by the Registrar for that course’s final examination.

4. The final comprehensive evaluation should reflect integration of course materials discussed during the semester.

Final Exam as a Percentage of Total Grade:
The final examination should constitute approximately 1/3 of a grade with exceptions requiring written notification to student, dean, and chairperson.

AC: 12/02/1985
amended AC: 05/15/1989
amended AC: 05/01/2000

CR: 11/02/1987

A variety of additional informal proposals were made to amend the potential text.

Prof. Lane noted that a key concern when the text was created was to establish an upper limit on the weight of the final exam and that this should be maintained.
SVPAA Fitzgerald noted that important differences existed among various fields and schools and flexibility needed to exist for circumstances in which a final portfolio or mastery of a subject was the appropriate evaluation.

Prof. Bhattacharya noted that in the capstone classes she teaches at DSB, the final project is a significant part of the grade but the process is guided by her and structured so that students are graded along the way and the final submission is not too large a proportion of the grade.

Prof. Winn stated that no semester grade should be entirely based on a single assessment.

**MOTION (Lane/He): To table the issue pending development of specific options for new text.**

**MOTION PASSED: 10 in favor, 3 opposed, 0 abstentions**

**(d) UCC proposal on revision of University College representation**

**MOTION (Lane/Winn): To accept the recommendation of the UCC, as set out on page 73 of the packet, that the first paragraph of Section 1.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 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.

Dean Crabtree spoke in favor of the motion, recalling the history of the issue and noting the importance of including someone on the UCC who was fully conversant with issues of relevance to part-time students. She expressed concerns for the term “non-renewable” in the proposal as continuity in this non-voting position could be advantageous in some situations.

**MOTION (Rakowitz /Shea): To amend the proposal to amend the first paragraph of Section 1.c.b.4 of the Faculty Handbook, so that it would read 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 member of the professional staff from University College and 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.

Prof. Lane expressed concern for the amendment in that it removed the possibility that the appointee could be a faculty member.

Prof. Epstein supported the amendment, noting that faculty now have some responsibility to advising part-time students so their views would inform the UCC and thus it was important to add someone with expertise on broader issues.

**MOTION TO AMEND MOTION PASSED: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention**

Discussion returned to the question of approving the overall change to the first paragraph of Section I.c.b.4 of the Faculty Handbook.

Prof. Kohli spoke in favor of the motion, noting the importance of ensuring informed perspectives on the UCC regarding part-time students.

Dean Crabtree Robbin spoke in favor of the motion. The transition from UC was going well. However, part-time students would always have slightly different needs and concerns. For example, they viewed the summer and intersession terms as equally important as the spring and fall terms and thus needed appropriate class offerings during those periods. It would thus be advantageous for the UCC to include an administrator conversant with these types of issues.

SVPAA Fitzgerald spoke in favor of the motion as it would put someone on the UCC who thinks in terms of the needs of part-time students.

**MOTION PASSED: 12 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions**

7 (i) Standard merit for untenured and newly promoted faculty (attachment)

Dean Crabtree outlined the issue, noting that the salary committee had approved the recommended changes, as outlined on page 90 of the packet. The proposed change did not address the issue of
what happens with regard to faculty who did not receive tenure and would be given a terminal contract. This matter should be addressed in the future.

MOTION (Fitzgerald/Lane): To amend Appendix 12 of the Journal of Record as follows:

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.

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

MOTION (Rakowitz/Fitzgerald): To add the following to Appendix 12 of the Journal of Record:

Faculty members who are promoted in rank during the course of an academic year, automatically qualify for standard merit and may apply for additional merit.

SVPAA Fitzgerald, Prof. Rakowitz and Prof. He spoke in favor of the motion as it would eliminate redundant reviews and reduce workload.

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

6. Old Business

6 (a) Student grievance timeline

Prof. Rakowitz drew attention to pages 12 and 13 of the packet and reviewed past discussions on the topic

MOTION (Rakowitz/Lane): To approve the addition of the following to the relevant text that the AC already approved on Academic Grievance Time Limits:

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.

Prof. Petrino confirmed that this change would not impact grievances that are already in process.
SVPAA Fitzgerald noted that it was in a student’s interest for University to move with alacrity. At the same time, it was necessary for the student, and in the student’s interest, to begin the grievance process in a timely fashion. The changes proposed in past meetings and today were designed to address these issues.

Dean Crabtree noted the importance of students responding to and complying with the procedures regarding grievances.

Prof. Rakowitz stated that the procedures were designed to protect student interest, to make sure student had adequate time to initiate process, to allow the process to be completed in a timely fashion, and to protect faculty by specifying the amount of time to preserve records.

**MOTION PASSED: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention**

7e. Academic advising and PINs for registration

SVPAA Fitzgerald drew attention to the information contained on page 83 and 84 of the packet and reviewed the history of the issue. In reference to one aspect of past conversations, he reported that no one in athletics had access to PIN numbers via Banner. With regard to broader proposals for making changes to the process for distributing and activating PINs, he noted that information received from the registrar indicated that some well meaning proposals would lead to unforeseen negative consequences. Given that the matter was under review by a new member of his office, who was also a faculty member, he asked that the Academic Council suspend the previously approved plan, and keep the current system in place until a general review could be completed.

**MOTION (Fitzgerald /Kelly): To retract the changes voted last year by Academic Council and to retain the current system of distributing PINs for registration until a general review of on-line registration be completed**

**MOTION PASSED: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention**

Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,
David Downie
To: Executive Secretary of the Academic Council  
From: Subcommittee on Community-Engaged Scholarship, Jocelyn Boryczka (chair)  
Regarding: Recommended changes to the Guidelines and Timetable for Applications for Tenure and Promotion  
Date: September 18, 2012

In Fall 2010, Deans Robbin Crabtree and Beth Boquet attended an institute hosted by the Eastern Region Campus Compacts on the topic of the Institutionalization of Community Engagement. In Spring 2011, the Center for Academic Excellence, Office of Service Learning, and Office of Academic Engagement hosted a series of events and workshops on community-engagement as scholarship that raised a campus-wide conversation on the topic. These events highlighted the need to address the issue through policy changes as well as professional development. In Fall 2011, Melissa Quan and Dennis Keenan participated in the “Eastern Region Campus Compact Faculty Institute, Making it Count: Strategies for Rewarding Engaged Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure.”

The Academic Council voted in favor of a motion to form a subcommittee to consider the inclusion of language in the Faculty Handbook and/or Guidelines and Timetable for Applications for Tenure and Promotion that recognizes the importance of community-engaged scholarship.

Though the charge of the subcommittee was to consider the inclusion of language in the Handbook and/or Guidelines that recognizes the importance of community-engaged scholarship, we are recommending changes to the teaching and service sections of the Guidelines as well. The rationale for this is that community-engaged scholarship often (though not always) extends across traditional boundaries recognized by rank and tenure committees.

The subcommittee surveyed the vast literature on community-engaged scholarship and best practices at comparable institutions (e.g., Syracuse, Villanova, Marquette, Santa Clara, St Joseph, Loyola Maryland, Holy Cross, University of Denver, and the University of San Francisco). In light of the findings, we are recommending changes to the Guidelines and Timetable for Applications for Tenure and Promotion. We are not recommending changes to the Faculty Handbook. The Handbook is currently written to allow for a broad interpretation of what counts as scholarship, teaching, and service. It is the opinion of the subcommittee that to add language regarding community-engaged scholarship in the Handbook would unduly emphasize this particular type of scholarship, teaching, and service. Changes to the Guidelines are intended to emphasize one viable interpretation of the Handbook.

We recommend the following changes to the Guidelines and Timetable for Applications for Tenure and Promotion (additions in bold, deletions in strikethrough):

Section Four: Outline and Guidelines for Applicant’s Dossier

V. Teaching Accomplishments Since Initial Promotion or Appointment to Present Rank
A. Courses taught at Fairfield University
   Identify and describe new or courses developed or substantially redesigned, including new or existing courses designed for community engagement, and other substantial teaching activities that are counted as part of your assigned course load.

B. Teaching evaluation
   i. Peer review - The applicant is encouraged to request colleagues with firsthand experience of his/her teaching ability to submit written reports based on these observations. Colleagues may wish to address differences between their perceptions of candidate’s teaching and student perceptions if the student perceptions are known to the colleague.
   
   ii. Student Evaluation Summary - If student evaluations are submitted as supporting materials, a summary of the student rating must appear in this section of the application. Sufficient information about the evaluation instrument (especially a department or personal form) and results must be provided to enable the committee to make an informed decision.
   
   iii. Other - As appropriate, include community partner evaluations and community-based peer or student evaluations.

   iv. Teaching Grants, Awards, or Citations

C. Description of involvement in curriculum development and enhancement
   The candidate may include information about innovations in teaching and integrative approaches that bring together teaching, scholarship, and community engagement.

D. Student advising

E. Student supervision
   Include activities such as independent studies, theses, academic student organizations, student teacher/clinical supervision, field trips, community-engaged projects/research, and the like.

F. Participation in courses/seminars of other faculty

G. Other community outreach teaching not counted as part of your teaching load.

VI. Professional Accomplishments Since Initial Promotion or Appointment to Present Rank

   A. A list of publications
      If a publication has multiple authors, explain your contribution to the publication.
The *Faculty Handbook* emphasizes the importance of peer review. For each category in this section, explain the review process. Include both what was reviewed (a complete paper? an abstract for a paper? a draft of a book?) as well as who reviewed the work (double-blind referees? an editor? the conference organizers? community partners?). If possible, describe how competitive was the selection process.

The *Faculty Handbook* requires evidence that the faculty member contributes to the advancement of the scholarly and professional community by engaging in scholarly research or creative activities. Therefore, in addition to the refereed publications, monographs, and other creative works that typically comprise tenure and promotion dossiers, dossiers may include such items as policy reports, patents and licensing documentation, etc. There is an expectation that this scholarship—much like “traditional” scholarship—be a part of a rigorous, coherent body of work aimed at extending knowledge, engaging and informing others, and transforming the community.

In addition to publications that have appeared in print, include in this section accepted publications not in print with a letter of verification from the editor stating that the publication is accepted unconditionally, or accepted pending relatively straightforward revisions. If, in a previous application, a publication has been listed as accepted but not in print, that fact should be noted in this section.

If a publication has multiple authors, explain your contribution to the publication. For community engaged scholarship, demonstrate how work was conducted in partnership with the community and characterized by mutuality, reciprocity, sustainability, and shared goals.

1. Books and chapters of books  
   Include published reviews or publisher reviews and/or letters of evaluation.

2. Professional refereed journal papers

3. **Products of community-engaged scholarship**

3-4. Professional refereed conference proceeding papers

4-5. Professional non-refereed journal papers

5-6. Other publications (magazines, etc.) and public documents

6-7. Book reviews and short notes

B. Accomplishments other than publications
In fields where publications are not the primary expression of professional achievement use this section to explain those activities. These may include art
exhibits, performances, movies or plays written or directed, **community-engaged scholarship**, and so on.

The *Faculty Handbook* emphasizes the importance of peer review. In each case, explain the review process, including what was reviewed (an artwork? a proposal for an exhibit? a draft of a novel or a complete novel?), and who did the review. If possible, describe how competitive was the selection process as well as how the review process worked.

**C. Sponsored research (grants)**

Please also list applications for grants. The *Faculty Handbook* emphasizes the importance of peer review. In each case, explain the review process, including what was reviewed, and who did the review. If possible, describe how competitive was the selection process as well as how the review process worked.

**D. Professional presentations**

Include information such as the date of the presentation, location, to whom, and the topic.

Note whether presentations were to international, national, regional, or local groups, as well as indicating the prestige of the groups addressed.

Indicate whether each address was invited, submitted and refereed, or submitted and non-refereed. Explain what was reviewed (a complete paper? an abstract?) as well as how the review process worked.

**E. Professional honors and/or awards**

**F. Professional contributions/service**

Describe contributions to scholarly associations such as official positions, editorship of journals and review/referee work and committee work.

**F. Sponsored research (grants)**

Please also list applications for grants

**G. Consultantships**

**H. Presentations on media or to a community and non-professional groups**

Present all relevant data.

**VII. University and/or Community Service Since Initial Promotion or Appointment to Present Rank**

**A. Service to Student Organizations**
B. A. University Committees
   For Standing and Ad Hoc committees, list dates of service, name of committee(s) and position(s) held

C. B. School or Departmental Committees
   List dates of service, name committee(s) and position(s) held

C. Community Engagement
   Describe the candidate’s application of knowledge, skills, and expertise to pressing social, moral, and civic issues and problems, by forming and maintaining sustainable working relationships (characterized by mutual benefits and shared goals) with community partners.

D. Other Service to University
   For example, organizing art exhibits, lecture series, faculty seminars, and the like.

E. Service to Non-University Community
   Service to Student Organizations

F. Service Extending beyond the University
   Efforts that relate to one’s academic/professional expertise and are undertaken as a representative of the university; for example: providing consultation services (without remuneration); participation in major committees of a professional society or discipline, etc.

Rationale:

There is growing national attention within higher education on the issue of community-engaged scholarship and its relationship to academic reward systems. Studies of faculty involvement in community engagement show that academic reward systems that do not change to assess and recognize engaged scholarship stand as a barrier to the careers of engaged scholars and to campuses truly institutionalizing the work at their core. The Carnegie Classification of Community Engagement, an elective classification that began in 2006, has been a key driving force for change. In 2008, Fairfield University was one of just under 200 institutions of higher education in the U.S. to receive the Carnegie Classification of Community Engagement. Fairfield will need to reapply in 2015 and we will not be able to maintain this honor without showing progress in better aligning faculty rewards with community engaged teaching and scholarship.

In Fairfield University’s recent NEASC Report, it was noted that “[t]he rules for promotion and tenure as well as those for annual merit evaluations should be revised to better reflect our institution’s strategic priorities. Without a faculty evaluation and reward system that recognizes mission-driven work with students both in and beyond the traditional classroom, it will be difficult to succeed in our efforts to integrate the educational experiences of our students.”
MINUTES (Excerpt)

Academic Council Meeting
Monday, October 1, 2012
CNS 200
3:30-5:30

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

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

...  

4. Council Subcommittee Reports

b. Subcommittee on Community-Engaged Scholarship

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

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

Prof. Bayne raised questions about section VI. A in the document submitted to the AC. He wanted to know the rationale for moving the sentence “If a publication has multiple authors, explain your contribution to the publication” and the rationale for including the “Products of community-engaged scholarship” in the list of types of professional accomplishments.
Prof. Calderwood said that the change was made to clarify what counts as evidence of authorship. She pointed out that engaged scholarship with multiple authors has to be explained in a more robust way.

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

Prof. Calderwood commented that the change was deliberately made to give more weight to sponsored research grants due to the amount of work that faculty put in writing the grants.

Prof. Bayne asked if the committee considered how the peer review process would work in assessing community-engaged scholarship.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**MOTION PASSED: 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention**
Date: February 25, 2013  
From: Academic Council Executive Committee  
To: Academic Council  
Re: Final Exam Policy  

On February 25, 2013, the Academic Council tabled a motion to amend the final exam policy in the Journal of Record as follows (additions in bold, deletions struck through):

Final Exam Policy:

1. Each instructor should be given a wide latitude, so as to provide for a degree of creativity and flexibility in how the students will be tested. The form of evaluation should be in keeping with the goals and purposes of the course.

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

3. The normal form of final evaluations is a written examination, two to three hours in length, to be administered at the date and time assigned by the Registrar. Written examinations less than two hours or more than three hours will require written notification of the students, Dean, and chairperson, program director or area coordinator, as appropriate.

4. If the professor chooses a method of evaluation other than the normal 2 to 3 hour written examination on the assigned date and time, the following criteria must be met:
   a. A memorandum must be submitted in writing to the chairperson, program director or area coordinator and the appropriate dean, reasonably in advance of the end of the semester, describing the alternate form of the final evaluation to be used.
   b. No greater demands should be made of a student's time and effort by an alternate form of final examination than would be required by preparation and taking of the normal 2 to 3 hour written examination.
   c. No alternative form of final evaluation is to be due prior to the date assigned by the Registrar for that course’s final examination.

4. The final comprehensive evaluation should reflect integration of course materials discussed during the semester.

   AC: 12/02/1985  
   amended AC: 05/15/1989  
   amended AC: 05/01/2000

Final Exam as a Percentage of Total Grade:

The final examination should constitute approximately 1/3 of a grade with exceptions requiring written notification to student, dean, and chairperson.

CR: 11/02/1987

The motion was tabled because there was a sense that the final paragraph should be amended rather than being deleted. The discussion considered the FDEC's argument against high stakes testing, and noted that for some types of final assessments or courses (e.g., an independent research course), it might be appropriate for almost all of the grade to be determined by the final project. In such cases, however, there are opportunities for feedback and correction along the way. We therefore propose the following as a possible amendment to the tabled motion. Replace the section, "Final Exam as a Percentage of Total Grade" with:

Weighting of Course Components for Grading Purposes
There is no single formula for the weighting of course components, but in all classes, students should receive feedback on their work at multiple points during the semester. In classes for which the final assessment is an in-class examination, that exam should not count for more than 1/3 of the course grade.
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 2104 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
FDEC’s Recommendation for Revising the Composition of the FDEC Committee
1/31/13

Recommendation
The FDEC recommends: 1) that the slot on FDEC currently designated for the Dean of University College (or appointed representative) be removed; and 2) that one of seven faculty slots be designated exclusively for a faculty member from the School of Engineering.

Current Handbook Language (Amended April 2008)
Seven members elected from the faculty for three-year overlapping terms, according to the following electoral divisions: four from the College of Arts & Sciences and the School of Engineering, at most one faculty member from the School of Engineering may serve at any one time, one each from the School of Nursing, the School of Business, and the Graduate School of Education & Allied Professions. The Dean of University College or the appointed representative of the same shall be an ex officio member with a right to vote. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs or the appointed representative of the same shall be an ex officio member with a right to vote.

Proposed Handbook Amendment
Seven members elected from the faculty for three-year overlapping terms, according to the following electoral divisions: four from the College of Arts & Sciences, one each from and the School of Engineering, at most one faculty member from the School of Engineering may serve at any one time, one each from the School of Nursing, the School of Business, and the Graduate School of Education & Allied Professions. The Dean of University College or the appointed representative of the same shall be an ex officio member with a right to vote. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs or the appointed representative of the same shall be an ex officio member with a right to vote.

Rationale
Recommendation 1: With the dissolution of UC, and the fact that part-time students are now integrated into the other schools, the rationale for having an additional UC liaison for the FDEC is no longer relevant. The needs of part-time students will be represented by the faculty who represent the various schools in which these students are matriculated.

Recommendation 2: Though faculty from the SOE can be elected to fill one of the spots designated for “four from the College of Arts & Sciences and the School of Engineering,” the small size of the SOE makes it difficult for them to get their faculty elected to one of these 4 spots. Rather than positioning a SOE candidate in with candidates from A&S, we recommend that the SOE have a spot of their own, as is the case for SON, SOB and GSEAP. This way, every school would have a designated spot on FDEC, with 3 spots for A&S. Though the SOE is small with respect to its number of full-time faculty, the distinct needs of this school and its faculty and curriculum need to be represented on FDEC.

Excerpted Minutes from FDEC Meetings where Amendment was Discussed
9/12/12 Meeting
In her first act as chair, Emily Smith suggested that FDEC mention to the Committee on Committees that a conversation about adding a slot for the School of Engineering to the FDEC be undertaken.
Mary Frances Malone noted that, indeed, the Committee on Committees would have to decide on the possible addition of a slot for the School of Engineering.”

10/3/12 Meeting
University College (UC) slot on FDEC.

a. At the last meeting, we agreed that Aaron would serve as the liaison for part-time students until a permanent decision is made.

i. We assumed that C on C would make this decision. They have turned it back to us: On 4/30, the AC, on the recommendation of the C on C, passed the following: "For 2012-13, the decision on whether or not the UC slot on FDEC needs to be filled should be determined by the 2012-13 FDEC. The FDEC should make a recommendation to the Council on the permanent disposition of this committee membership slot."

ii. Now, we need to make a recommendation for the disposition of the permanent slot.

iii. Discussion about this slot ensued, including a review of the current roster criteria:

• Mary Frances Malone asked whether this would be the proper venue for deciding the question. Pat Calderwood suggested that part-time faculty, not students, is the appropriate subject for the FDEC.

• Aaron Perkus stated that part-time students now had the same core as everybody else and that the rationale for having a UC liaison for the FDEC was that there be representation from those schools. He did not think that there was a rationale for an additional member to represent what was previously UC.

• Meredith: Kazer suggested that the FDEC may want a part-time faculty member on the FDEC.

• Mary Frances Malone noted that one had to be a voting member of the general faculty to be on a committee and a part-time faculty member was not, also suggesting that the FDEC could make a proposal to have such an ex-officio member.

• Aaron Perkus mentioned that the Academic Council has created a sub-committee on part-time faculty and that Cinthia Gannett and Meredith Kazer were members of it, noting that if the FDEC wanted to make a proposal for shared governance it could do that through them.

• Emily Smith said that it sounded like there is a lot of support for a representative for part-time faculty and asked if there were other recommendations, also stating that the committee did not have to go there.

• May Frances Malone asked to check the faculty handbook to determine the original configuration of what the committee was also checking for what the requirements were for a committee slot.

• Pat Calderwood read from faculty handbook.

• Mary Frances Malone opted to go back to the original motion, mentioning that the fact that every single school is mentioned and that Engineering is not was undesirable.
• Pat Calderwood agreed, stating that they were marginalized in many ways and that this would be the right venue to address that.
• Jessica Davis addressed the issue of representing engineering by putting them in with the sciences, if academic council was not going to provide the engineering, suggesting more specificity of what “arts and sciences” should mean and to have that parsed out.
• Pat Calderwood disagreed, saying that if engineering were clubbed in with Arts and Sciences, there would not be any representation.
• Meredith Kazer noted that Shah filled in for Mike Andreychik last year.
• Emily Smith responded that that was because it was a replacement slot. She asked whether the FDEC should put in for an elected slot designated for engineering and propose an additional permanent, ex-officio, slot (like Mary Frances Malone’s) for part-time faculty; noting that the committee would need to flush out the criteria for the part-time slot.
• Meredith Kazer asked if the committee could hold off till they heard from the part-time subcommittee.
• Pat Calderwood noted that Suzanna Klaf [who is an invited CAE guest] served as PT faculty.
• Suzanna Klaf stated that she got the same limited communication as the PT faculty.
• Gwen Alphonso asked if PT faculty would be interested in formal representation.
• Suzanna Klaf pointed to data on PT faculty, suggesting that if they have been teaching consistently then, in all likelihood, they had a long-time stake.
• Emily Smith agreed, stating that there would be a huge interest and that the committee would need to distinguish between graduate PT faculty and undergraduate PT faculty.
• Mary Frances Malone suggested that the FDEC make a suggestion to the part-time subcommittee.
• Aaron Perkus pointed out that if the FDEC waited till the end of the year, then there would be no effect on 2013-2014.
• Aaron Perkus further mentioned that in the spirit of collaborating with them, the FDEC look for a report to be done by February/March.
• Gwen Alphonso asked what the mission/charge of the PT subcommittee was.
• Meredith Kazer answered that the PT subcommittee pertained to the status, roles, and conditions of PT faculty and were required to report back in Spring and that the Final report was due in September.
• Cinthia Gannett agreed that the committee should make some kind of effort to move things along and to include this issue.

1. We agreed that the 8th elected slot be designated for engineering [Note: this is when we were working from the wrong Handbook].
2. We also agreed to continue to discuss an additional ex-officio spot for a representative for part-time faculty. We suggested sending this suggestion to the AC subcommittee (on the status, roles and conditions of part-time faculty); in the meantime, we’ll continue working on this slot.
3. We will wait to make this recommendation until we know more about the part-time slot so that we can do them together.
a. In the future, we need to determine language for the position for part-time students, since there are graduate part-time students, too.

11/7/12 Meeting
1) Aaron Perkus will serve out this year in his capacity of University College/part-time student/faculty representation.
2) We will seek to ensure representation from each school or college; therefore, we will seek to include membership from the School of Engineering.

11/28/12 Meeting
1. Discussion on the permanent slot for Engineering FDEC
   • Although it is a small school the distinct needs of its faculty and curriculum need to be recognized and represented.
   • Proposal to designate Engineering as 8th spot was approved and will be sent to AC.

The proposal was sent to AC in November 2012. Correspondence from General Faculty Secretary alerted us that we were not using the most recent Handbook description of FDEC’s membership. Thus, on 1/30/13, we revisited this proposal. Notes from this discussion are below:

1/30/13 Meeting
1. Reconstitution of University College (UC) slot on FDEC, take II
   a. Brief discussion of email from Sue R., the amended Handbook description of the FDEC composition, and our recommendation.
   b. All agreed to the revision that Sue proposed.
   c. 5 voted in favor; 3 members were absent; rest non-voting members
   d. Some notes from discussion:
      • Pat: Sue’s interpretation is that we’re looking to reduce reps from A&S from 4 to 3, and we’re identifying the specific engineering slot.
      • Emily: We didn’t realize the new revision already accounted for engineering.
      • All: Our wording ensures there’ll be an engineering rep and that UC is no longer mentioned.
      • Emily: We have talked about representing the needs of part time students, will that be represented?
      • MFM: Part time students are integrated parts of existing colleges. They’re not separate entities.
      • Meredith: the only “fix” to that was to add a part time faculty member to FDEC and that just can’t happen.
      • MFM: Part time faculty and part time students are different issues. It’s impossible from a governance standpoint to add someone who is not a member of the general faculty. These people can be invited as guests.
      Emily: So, we agree with the wording in the last paragraph of Sue’s email.
      • All: Yes.
      • Vote: Unanimous approval. 5 in favor, 3 members were not present.
April 3, 2013
Dear Chair and Members of the Academic Council:

The Faculty Research Committee (the Committee) would like to ask for your consideration of proposed changes to the research grant and stipend award guidelines. The changes seek to deal with the numerous problems and issues that the Committee has encountered in the process of evaluation and decision making in the past four years. The revisions are the result of the hard work by past and current members of the Committee. The goals of the proposed revisions are to make the application materials and procedures consistent, and to clarify the application language, especially in areas pertaining to the University’s mission, identity, and current practices.

All proposed changes to existing guidelines are highlighted in blue. Some changes are editorial in nature. For example, we updated the formatting in all of the guidelines to make all the sections, titles, and descriptions that were in common to all of the forms consistent. For more substantive changes, the Committee developed four categories: additions, clarifications, updating, and specifications. Below we summarize and justify the proposed revisions that are central to the committee’s foremost responsibility: to ensure that all faculty members prepare competitive and complete research applications.

1. Additions (adding some requirements)

In fall 2012 we had a number of sabbatical applications that were turned down initially by the Committee because some of the faculty did not follow the guidelines and seemed to have the expectation that the Research Committee should simply award the sabbatical as long as the applicant met the time requirement. To safeguard the academic rigor and the spirit of sabbatical, we propose the addition of two sentences instructing the applicants to present a clear and coherent case. A sabbatical is not automatic after a passage of time; the applicant has the obligation to make a case that meets the standards of the guideline. A smaller change, for example, is that we would like to require applicants to number the pages of their application to facilitate the evaluative work of the committee. A third example is that to promote equity regarding research funding for faculty, in some cases we clarify if there are two applications of equal merit preference will be given to the person who has not received this award before.

2. Clarifications (to improve the clarity of the guidelines)

We wish to clearly recognize the needs of faculty members who engage in creative activities. We also wish to make sure that faculty members on sabbatical will have time to engage in research and/or creative activity and not be consumed by service duties, so we clarified the language pertaining to the purpose of the sabbatical by stating that a sabbatical leave is to afford the faculty member a release from normal teaching and service duties to pursue scholarly or creative activities that will benefit the individual and the university. In the current guideline for sabbatical, “release from normal service duties” is not mentioned. Another example is that the current guidelines are not uniform as to the deadlines, and we have proposed making them uniform. Furthermore, to make it clear that the pre-tenure leave is to provide time for untenured faculty to do research, we clarify that the pre-tenure leave is a research leave. The current guidelines on Summer Stipends are not clear as to how much time the awardees must spend on research activities; we make it clear that they must dedicate eight weeks of concentrated time on their proposed research projects.

3. Updating (aligning the guidelines with current faculty culture)
In the current guidelines, community service is listed as one of the projects that faculty members could use to apply for sabbatical and research grants. However, the current practice of the University is community-engaged scholarship. To reflect this shift, we propose to rephrase one of the eligibility requirements for sabbatical and research grants from the “community service” to “community-engaged scholarship.” Those faculty wishing to engage in community service can apply for funds elsewhere, such as through the Office of Service Learning.

4. Specifications (indicate specific requirements)

To make the application and evaluation process more consistent, we ask all applications to provide a project summary that is no more than 250 words and a detailed description that includes not only the importance of the project and its relevance to the investigator’s profession life, but also a detailed timeline for completion, expected final product(s), and a plan for dissemination in an appropriate, peer-reviewed venue. Our new language emphasizes the specificity of the project description and timeline to help all faculty members prepare competitive applications. To make the evaluation process uniform, we ask for an abbreviated C.V. of no more than five pages for summer research stipends, pre-tenure sabbaticals, and the research grant applications.

We sincerely hope that the Academic Council will approve the changes so that the guidelines will better serve the faculty and the University as well as reflect the current practices of our academic community.

Faculty Research Committee
Shannon Kelly
Danke Li (Co-chair for spring semester)
Laura McSweeney (Co-chair for fall semester)
Marcie Patton
Min Xu
Susan LaFrance, Liaison
Paul Fitzgerald, Director of Research, ex officio

Minutes of the Faculty Research Committee Meeting (Draft)
March 6, 2013

Present: Shannon Kelley, Danke Li (co-Chair), Laura McSweeney(co-Chair), Marcie Patton, Min Xu, Paul Fitzgerald, Susan LaFrance

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 3:05 PM.

There was only one agenda item.

Discussion of Guidelines.
The Faculty Research Committee (FRC) has been revising the guidelines for the various awards since 2010-2011. One of the main goals is to make the guidelines of the various awards consistent so that the wording and formatting is similar for all of the forms. The committee also wanted to update the forms and to make it more clear what information the committee needs in order to evaluate the applications more efficiently and fairly. In this meeting, the committee reviewed the
revisions that were suggested by 2011-2012 FRC. In particular, the following changes to those revisions were discussed.

**In all forms we added or suggested:**
1. Clarify the date(s) of prior research support to include all awards from the past 10 years (5 years for the pre-tenure leave)
2. Changing the primary focus of the project to read “research, pedagogical development or professional development”
3. Changing the last sentence in the detailed description of the proposed project to read “Indicate resources necessary for completion, any related work already done, a detailed timeline for completion, expected final product(s), and dissemination plan (e.g., in an appropriate peer reviewed venue.)”
4. Have a statement that the CV should list any internal and external grants received in the past 10 years (no timeline given for pre-tenure leave)

**Senior Summer Fellowship:**
1. Explicitly state that the chair’s letter has to be included as part of their application (as item 13 in the proposal).
2. Restricting past winners from applying for the award again.
3. Make it clear that the awardee cannot hold external or internal grants during the summer of the fellowship.

**Summer Research Stipends:**
1. Make it clear that the award is to support 8 weeks of research.
2. Remove the paragraph in the Review section that says the applicant can submit additional data if the committee thinks the application is deficient.

**Research Grants:**
Add a statement that the grant cannot be used to fund publication costs (book or journal).

**Pre-tenure Research Leave:**
1. Add in the purpose that the faculty member is released from service obligations (to be consistent with the Sabbatical form)
2. Specify in the 2nd bullet under eligibility that the project should have potential for scholarly publication “in an appropriate peer reviewed venue”

**Sabbatical:**
1. Add statement in the purpose section that it is expected that the applicant will disseminate their scholarly or creative work in an appropriate peer-reviewed venue.
2. Add a statement that sabbaticals are not automatic. It is up to the applicant to be sure that they make their case.
2. Changed the last bullet in the eligibility section from “community service” to “community engaged scholarship”.
3. On the letters of recommendation guidelines, the formatting needs to be make consistent by removing the commas at the end of each bulleted item.
4. Remove the paragraph in the Review section that says the applicant can submit additional data if the committee thinks the application is deficient.

The committee adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Laura McSweeney

Minutes of the Faculty Research Committee Meeting (Draft)
March 27, 2013

Present: Shannon Kelley, Danke Li (co-Chair), Laura McSweeney (co-Chair), Marcie Patton, Paul Fitzgerald
Absent: Susan LaFrance, Min Xu

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 3:05 PM.

After reviewing the Research Grant applications, the committee revisited the guidelines and discussed additional suggested changes. This discussion began at roughly 3:30pm.

1. Stating in all the forms that the pages in the applications should be numbered.
2. Removing the language from the CV section about including all research grants obtained in the past 10 (or 5 years in the pretenure leave application). This information is redundant since that material is requested in an earlier section.
3. Restricting the CVs for the summer research and research grants to 5 pages.

The committee adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Laura McSweeney

Note: In the material that follows, changes are shown in the Guidelines for Sabbatical (additions underlined, deletions struck through). In the remaining documents, changes are simply incorporated.
FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE
GUIDELINES FOR SABBATICAL

INTRODUCTION
The Faculty Research Committee seeks to recognize the difference between persons, backgrounds, disciplines, orientations, and the possibilities of novel projects in its consideration of proposed sabbatical projects. In evaluating proposals, the committee may consult with appropriately knowledgeable persons inside and outside the university. The committee provides these general norms to assist faculty in drafting their sabbatical proposals and to guide the committee in evaluating the merits of proposed projects. In preparing an application and supporting documentation, an applicant’s principal obligation is to present a clear and coherent case. A sabbatical is not automatic; the applicant has the obligation to make the case.

PURPOSE
Sabbatical leaves are awarded with financial support to increase the usefulness to the University of individuals as teachers and as scholars, and to contribute to their long-term effectiveness as members of the academic profession (HB II.B.2.a). The sabbatical leave affords the faculty member a release from normal teaching and service duties to pursue scholarly or creative activities that will benefit the individual and the university. Such activities may include intensive research and/or writing in one's discipline, academic renewal in one's field, retraining in a different field or methodology related to the person's professional and/or teaching area, training to improve teaching methods, and developing programs that would be of benefit to the university. The scholarly or creative products of the leave will be disseminated in an appropriate peer-reviewed venue.

DEADLINE FOR APPLICATION
The deadlines are generally around November 1 (for the applicant), November 7 (for the Department Chair’s letter of recommendation), and November 15 (for the Dean’s letter of recommendation). The official deadline is published each year by the Research Committee. Applications must be submitted on or before the deadline. Late applications will NOT be reviewed. Applicants must submit their completed proposal and 6 additional copies to the Department Chair. The Department Chair must submit his/her letter of recommendation and the proposal to the Dean. The Dean must submit his/her recommendation, the Department Chair’s recommendation, the original proposal and 6 copies to CNS 300 e/o the Chair of the Faculty Research Committee.

CONDITIONS OF ELIGIBILITY
- The applicant must meet the university and departmental criteria for sabbatical leave release as stated in the latest edition of the Faculty Handbook or amendments thereto (II.B.2.a). In particular,
applications for either or both semesters of an academic year must be submitted in November of the previous academic year.

• Projects that emphasize scholarly research should have value not only to the individual, but should ensure an advance in knowledge in the field, and should have potential for scholarly publication.

• Projects that emphasize artistic creativity such as painting, sculpture, musical composition, writing of poetry, drama, or fiction, or similar endeavors, should have a reasonably direct relation to the person's discipline and be subject to evaluative norms of the profession.

• Projects that emphasize professional development should clearly show promise of improved performance in one's teaching and/or professional responsibilities.

• Projects that emphasize community service engaged scholarship may be considered, where such projects would be of exceptional value to the individual's professional responsibilities, or to the university, or to the broader community.

RESOURCES
The proposed project should demonstrate a reasonable expectation of completion or substantial progress. The applicant should give evidence of the following:

The proper prerequisites to carry out the project.

The resources that are necessary for successful completion. Such resources may include research materials, library collections, laboratory facilities, computer facilities, etc.

The necessary approval and support of the host institution for work to be undertaken at another institution. Explain in detail the resources and facilities offered by the host institution.

PROCEDURE
Check the Faculty Handbook for eligibility.

Consult with department chairperson for planning and evaluation of the proposed project so that the completed application is submitted to the Research Committee by November 15, the deadline. Applicants must submit their completed proposal in the manner indicated on the general faculty secretary's website.

The Research Committee reviews the application and makes recommendations to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

FORMAT
Proposals should be submitted according to the following format: The format is intended to provide the committee with the information necessary for evaluation. It is important that the applicant provide complete and specific information about the project itself, its importance to the applicant's professional life, and its value to the university.

The proposal should use language appropriate to the discipline, but should also use language that clearly communicates to the committee the subject matter, the plan, and the methods involved.

Failure to follow these guidelines and timetable will result in non-review of the application.

An original and 6 copies are required.

REVIEW

If the applicant has not followed the guidelines approved by the faculty, or does not follow the timetable specified in the Faculty Handbook, the application will not be further considered.

If, after first review, the application is deemed to have merit, but is judged by the committee to be deficient in some area, the applicant may be asked to submit additional data for reconsideration.

PROPOSAL

The proposal should be presented in a manner so that persons not acquainted with the field could understand and evaluate the project. It is important that the applicant provide complete and specific information about the project itself, its importance to the applicant’s professional life, and its value to the university. The proposal should use language that clearly communicates to a committee of people not in that person’s discipline the subject matter, the plan, and the methods involved. Please include the following information in clearly labeled sections and paginated contiguously for the whole document is required:

1. Name, department, rank, and date of application

2. Date of initial appointment and date of tenure

3. Date(s) of prior sabbatical(s) and prior external and internal research support of the past 10 years (Append copies of prior the most recent prior sabbatical, pre-tenure, senior summer fellowship, research grant, and summer research stipend reports)

4. First semester eligible for sabbatical and period of proposed sabbatical

5. Title of sabbatical project
6. Primary focus of project: research, pedagogical development, or professional development.

7. Short project summary of no more than 250 words (Indicate focus of project: research, teaching, professional development, community service.)

8. Benefit of the project to the university

9. Detailed description of proposed project. Indicate resources necessary for completion and any related work already done. The tasks to be performed should be described, and the expected results should be outlined in detail. The importance of the project should be discussed and its relevance to the investigator's long-term research plans explained. Indicate resources necessary for completion, any related work already done, a detailed timeline for completion, expected final product(s), and dissemination plan (e.g., in an appropriate peer-reviewed venue).

10. Relevant bibliography

11. Comments

12. IRB review if applicable For projects involving research with human subjects or animals, Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval or Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) approval is not needed at the time of this proposal but it is expected to be obtained before commencement of the project. Indicate here if IRB or IACUC approval is required. A copy of the IRB or IACUC approval letter should be submitted to the Faculty Research Committee Administrative Liaison, CNS 300.

13. Curriculum Vitae (The curriculum vitae should reflect applicant’s record of teaching, research, and service).

16. Letters of recommendation from Department Chair (see attached for recommendation guidelines.)

**REVIEW**
If the applicant has not followed the guidelines approved by the faculty, or does not follow the timetable specified in the Faculty Handbook, the application will not be further considered.

The proposed project should demonstrate a reasonable expectation of completion or substantial progress, with access to necessary resources.

**REPORTING REQUIREMENT**
A final report is due six months following the end of the sabbatical leave. This report should discuss your accomplishments and the immediate outcomes and products of your sabbatical. This should be related back to
the original goals and plans in your proposal, explicitly noting any necessary modifications in their implementation. In addition, you should note any intended future outcomes and products that will likely stem from your sabbatical project.

The final report should be sent to Faculty Research Committee Administrative Liaison (CNS 300). Copies of final report are sent to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, the applicant’s Dean, and the applicant’s Chair.

---

**FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

**GUIDELINES FOR PRE-TENURE RESEARCH LEAVE**

**INTRODUCTION**

The Faculty Research Committee invites applications from untenured, tenure-track faculty, for Pre-Tenure Research Leaves. The leave will be for one semester of the third or fourth year, at full pay. The award may not be used for work connected to the completion of doctoral studies. The semester will count toward the normal probationary period for tenure. The leave must be completed before the academic year in which the faculty member applies for tenure.

**PURPOSE**

The pre-tenure research leave affords the untenured faculty member a release from normal teaching and service duties in order to pursue activities that will be beneficial to the faculty member's long term plans for research and scholarly activity, including, but not restricted to, intensive research, writing in one's field or artistic creativity.

**DEADLINE FOR APPLICATION**

The deadlines are generally around November 1 (for the applicant), November 7 (for the Department Chair’s letter of recommendation), and November 15 (for the Dean’s letter of recommendation). The official deadline is published each year by the Research Committee. Applications must be submitted on or before the deadline. Late applications will NOT be reviewed.

**ELIGIBILITY**

1. All untenured, tenure-track faculty in their second or third consecutive year of full-time teaching at Fairfield University are eligible to apply for the research leave.

2. Projects that emphasize scholarly research should have value not only to the individual, but should ensure an advance in knowledge in the field, and should have potential for scholarly publication.
in an appropriate peer reviewed venue.

3. Projects that emphasize artistic creativity such as painting, sculpture, musical composition or performance, writing of poetry, drama, or fiction, or similar endeavors, should have a direct relation to the person's discipline and be subject to evaluative norms of the profession.

PROCEDURE
Check the Faculty Handbook for eligibility.

Consult with department chairperson for planning and evaluation of the proposed project so that the completed application is submitted to the Research Committee by the deadline. Applications for this award must be made by the deadline printed above of the second or third year of full-time teaching at Fairfield, for leave during either the fall or spring semester of the third or fourth year.

Applicants must submit their completed proposal in the manner indicated on the general faculty secretary's website.

The Research Committee reviews the application and makes recommendations to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

PROPOSAL
The proposal should provide the Research Committee with the information necessary for evaluation. It is important that the applicant provide complete and specific information about the project itself, its importance to the applicant’s professional life, and its value to the university. The proposal should use language that clearly communicates to a committee of people not in that person’s discipline the subject matter, the plan, and the methods involved. The following information in clearly labeled sections and paginated contiguously for the whole document is required:

1. Name, department, rank, and date of application
2. Date of initial appointment
3. Date(s) of prior external and internal research support of the past five years (Append copies of the most recent prior research grant and summer research stipend reports)
4. Period of proposed research leave, and preferred semester
5. Title of project
6. Primary focus of project: research, pedagogical development, or professional development.

7. Short project summary of no more than 250 words

8. Benefit of the project to the university

9. Detailed description of proposed project. The tasks to be performed should be described, and the expected results should be outlined in detail. The importance of the project should be discussed and its relevance to the investigator’s long-term research plans explained. Indicate resources necessary for completion, any related work already done, a detailed timeline for completion, expected final product(s), and dissemination plan (e.g., in an appropriate peer reviewed venue).

10. Relevant bibliography

11. Comments

12. For projects involving research with human subjects or animals, Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval or Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) approval is not needed at the time of this proposal but it is expected to be obtained before commencement of the project. Indicate here if IRB or IACUC approval is required. A copy of the IRB or IACUC approval letter should be submitted to the Faculty Research Committee Administrative Liaison, CNS 300.

13. Curriculum Vitae (The curriculum vitae should be no more than five pages and it should reflect applicant’s record of teaching, research, and service).

**REVIEW**

If the applicant has not followed the guidelines approved by the faculty, or does not follow the timetable specified in the Faculty Handbook, the application will not be further considered.

If, after first review, the application is deemed to have merit, but is judged by the committee to be deficient in some area, the applicant may be asked to submit additional data for reconsideration.

The proposed project should demonstrate a reasonable expectation of completion or substantial progress, with access to necessary resources.

In the event that there are more qualified applicants than it is possible to allow pre-tenure leaves in any particular year, preference will be given to those applying in their third year for a leave in their fourth year.
Ten semesters of active service at Fairfield University must elapse after completion of a pre-tenure research leave before the faculty member is eligible for their first sabbatical leave.

**REPORTING REQUIREMENT**
A final report is due six months following the end of the pre-tenure research leave. This report should discuss your accomplishments and the immediate outcomes and products of your pre-tenure research leave. This should be related back to the original goals and plans in your proposal, explicitly noting any necessary modifications in their implementation. In addition, you should note any intended future outcomes and products that will likely stem from your research leave.

The final report should be sent to Faculty Research Committee Administrative Liaison (CNS 300), and to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, the applicant’s Dean, and the applicant’s Chair.

---

**FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE**
**GUIDELINES FOR SUMMER RESEARCH STIPENDS**

**INTRODUCTION**
The Faculty Research Committee invites applications from tenured and tenure-track faculty from all academic disciplines for a Summer Research Stipend. The program will fund grants of $3,500 each.

**PURPOSE**
The purpose of the Summer Research Stipends Program is to support tenure-track or tenured faculty members during the summer for a concentrated period of at least 8 weeks of research and writing.

**DEADLINE FOR APPLICATION**
The deadline is generally around January 20. The official deadline is published each year by the Research Committee. Applications must be submitted on or before the deadline. Late applications will NOT be reviewed.

**ELIGIBILITY**
- All tenure-track or tenured faculty are eligible for the summer research stipends.
- Awards will be made on the following conditions:
  - professors approved for Summer Research Stipends must teach no more than one summer session course or engage in more than the normal (academic year) one-day-per-week consultative activities during the period from May 30 to August 30;
• professors approved for Summer Research Stipends cannot have duplicate funding that pays for time for the same or a similar project;

• Applications from faculty falling into the following four categories will be considered only if there is not a sufficient number of high quality applications: faculty members (1) who held summer research stipends during the previous summer’s period, (2) who were approved for a sabbatical leave for the two academic years contiguous with that summer, (3) who were approved for a pre-tenure research leave for the two academic years contiguous with that summer, (4) who were approved for a senior summer fellowship during the previous summer’s period, (5) who received the Robert Wall Award for the two academic years contiguous with that summer.

• Members of the Faculty Research Committee are not eligible to apply during their term in order to avoid conflict of interest.

PROCEDURE
Applicants must submit their completed proposal in the manner indicated on the website for the general faculty secretary.

The Research Committee reviews the application and makes recommendations to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

PROPOSAL
The proposal should provide the Research Committee with the information necessary for evaluation. It is important that the applicant provide complete and specific information about the project itself, its importance to the applicant’s professional life, and its value to the university. The proposal should use language that clearly communicates to a committee of people not in that person’s discipline the subject matter, the plan, and the methods involved. The following information in clearly labeled sections and paginated contiguously for the whole document is required:

1. Name, department, rank, and date of application

2. Date of initial appointment

3. Date(s) of prior external and internal research support in the past 10 years (Append copies of the most recent prior sabbatical, pre-tenure, senior summer fellowship, research grant, and summer research stipend reports)

4. Title of project

5. Primary focus of project: research, pedagogical development, or professional development
6. Short project summary of no more than 250 words

7. Benefit of the project to the university

8. Detailed description of proposed project. The tasks to be performed should be described, and the expected results should be outlined in detail. The importance of the project should be discussed and its relevance to the investigator’s long-term research plans explained. Indicate resources necessary for completion, any related work already done, a detailed timeline for completion, expected final product(s), and dissemination plan (e.g., in an appropriate peer reviewed venue.)

9. Relevant bibliography

10. Comments

11. For projects involving research with human subjects or animals, Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval or Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) approval is not needed at the time of this proposal but it is expected to be obtained before commencement of the project. Indicate here if IRB or IACUC approval is required. A copy of the IRB or IACUC approval letter should be submitted to the Faculty Research Committee Administrative Liaison, CNS 300.

12. Curriculum Vitae (The curriculum vitae should be no more than five pages and it should reflect applicant’s record of teaching, research, and service).

REVIEW
If the applicant has not followed the guidelines approved by the faculty, or does not follow the timetable specified in the Faculty Handbook, the application will not be further considered.

The proposed project should demonstrate a reasonable expectation of completion or substantial progress, with access to necessary resources.

Applications are reviewed by the Faculty Research Committee. When the Committee members do not deem themselves qualified to judge the merit of a proposal, consultation with other educators may be undertaken. When ranking two or more proposals of equal merit, the Faculty Research Committee will privilege the applicant who has not received previous funding. Decisions of the Research Committee shall be final.

REPORTING REQUIREMENT
Final report is due March 1, following receipt of the award. This report should discuss your accomplishments and the immediate outcomes and products of your summer research stipend. This should be
related back to the original goals and plans in your proposal, explicitly noting any necessary modifications in their implementation. In addition, you should note any intended future outcomes and products that will likely stem from your project.

The final report should be sent to Faculty Research Committee Administrative Liaison (CNS 300), and to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, the applicant’s Dean, and the applicant’s Chair.

FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE
GUIDELINES FOR RESEARCH GRANT

INTRODUCTION
The Faculty Research Committee invites applications from tenure-track and tenured faculty in all academic disciplines for research grants. The maximum grant amount is $1,000.

PURPOSE
The purpose of the Research Grants is to encourage and assist research and scholarly work of all tenure-track or tenured faculty.

DEADLINE FOR APPLICATION
The deadline is generally around March 1. The official deadline is published each year by the Research Committee. Applications must be submitted on or before the deadline. Late applications will NOT be reviewed.

ELIGIBILITY
• Proposals in all academic areas will be considered.
• Special consideration will be given to work in areas where the researcher has not received previous financial support and in disciplines where outside support is limited.
• Where possible, results from initial work supported by University funds should be used as a basis for seeking outside support of future work, in cooperation with the Grants Office.
• All materials acquired with grant funds become the property of the University.
• Members of the Faculty Research Committee are not eligible to apply during their term in order to avoid conflict of interest.
PROCEDURE
Applicants must submit their completed proposal in the manner indicated on the website for the general faculty secretary.

The Research Committee reviews the application and makes recommendations to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

PROPOSAL
The proposal should provide the Research Committee with the information necessary for evaluation. The proposal should use language that clearly communicates to a committee of people not in that person’s discipline so that they can understand and evaluate the proposal. The following information in clearly labeled sections and paginated contiguously for the whole document is required:

1. Name, department, rank, and date of application
2. Date of initial appointment
3. Title of project
4. Purpose and significance of identified area needing funding: research, pedagogical development, or professional development
5. Plan to accomplish above stated purpose
6. Related work by applicant
7. Relevant bibliography
8. Date(s) of prior external and internal research support of the past 10 years (Append copies of the most recent prior sabbatical, pre-tenure, senior summer fellowship, research grant, and summer research stipend reports)
9. Detailed, itemized budget
10. Comments
11. For projects involving research with human subjects or animals, Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval or Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) approval is not needed at the time of this proposal but it is expected to be obtained before commencement of the project. Indicate here if IRB or IACUC approval is required. A copy of the IRB or IACUC approval letter should be submitted to the Faculty Research Committee Administrative Liaison, CNS 300.
12. Curriculum Vitae (the curriculum vitae should be no more than five pages and it should reflect the applicant’s record of teaching, research, and service).

REVIEW
Applications are reviewed by the Faculty Research Committee. When the Committee members do not deem themselves qualified to judge the merit of a proposal, consultation with other educators may be undertaken.

REPORTING REQUIREMENT
Funds can be encumbered for a period of eighteen months after the grant date. A final report is due at the completion of the project, or after a maximum of two years, whichever is sooner. The final report should discuss your accomplishments and the immediate outcomes and products of your project. This should be related back to the original goals and plans in your proposal, explicitly noting any necessary modifications in their implementation. In addition, you should note any intended future outcomes and products that will likely stem from the project. A financial report itemizing spending should accompany the final report.

The final report should be sent to Faculty Research Committee Administrative Liaison (CNS 300), and to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, the applicant’s Dean, and the applicant’s Chair.

GUIDELINES CONCERNING RESEARCH GRANTS
A. Assistance will normally be given on the basis of the merit of the proposal and funds available to assist in defraying costs of the following:

1. Services, equipment, travel, or supplies considered necessary or beneficial for the pursuit of investigations. Examples include:
   1. Microfilm or other reproduction of source materials
   2. Reasonable travel to libraries or other sources of data (New York City and New Haven are not included)
   3. Equipment and/or supplies, and software
   4. Data collection or other appropriate work by students or technical assistants where payment is a necessity (this does not include payment to such assistants for their research or creative efforts)
   5. Data processing

2. Preparation of an application for outside support of a project when secretarial help, etc., are not available through normal University channels

B. Normally, the Research Committee will not consider support in the following areas, although the University may wish to support them (or already does) through other means and channels (inquiries should be made
to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs for action or referral where alternate procedure is not clear):

- Research and/or manuscript preparation which is directed toward an advanced degree
- Attendance or presentations at conventions, conferences, group meetings, etc.
- Classroom notes (However, after use has made it clear that these notes have begun to take the form of a text, which may be of interest to a publisher, consideration can be given. The problem of royalties in such cases is a complicating factor that may have to be considered.)
- Actual publication costs in a scholarly journal or for a book
- Research previously conducted

FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE
GUIDELINES FOR SENIOR SUMMER FELLOWSHIP

INTRODUCTION
The Faculty Research Committee invites applications from all academic disciplines for a Senior Summer Fellowship from tenured faculty who hold the rank of either associate or full professor. One award of $7,000 will be made per year.

PURPOSE
The purpose of the Senior Summer Fellowship is to allow faculty to pursue advanced work and make a significant contribution to thought and knowledge in his or her respective discipline.

The Fellowship supports creative projects and research activities that can be completed during the summer of the award. The project/activities may be part of a larger research agenda.

It is usually expected that the Fellowship will result in juried performances or peer reviewed publications.

DEADLINE FOR APPLICATION
The deadline is generally around November 1. The official deadline is published each year by the Research Committee. Applications must be submitted on or before the deadline. Late applications will NOT be reviewed.

ELIGIBILITY
• The applicant must be a tenured associate or full professor.
• The applicant must be recommended by the Department Chair. Department Chairs who wish to apply should seek a letter of recommendation from a senior colleague. The applicant must devote two consecutive and uninterrupted months to full-time research or artistic work, and may not hold other major external fellowships or other internal research grants during the summer of the award.
• Recipients are not eligible to teach during the summer of the award.
• Members of the Faculty Research Committee are not eligible to apply during their term in order to avoid conflict of interest. Faculty members approved for sabbatical leave or who receive the Robert Wall Award will not be eligible for a Senior Summer Fellowship for either summer contiguous to the academic year of the sabbatical leave.

PROCEDURE
Applicants must submit their completed proposal in the manner indicated on the website for the general faculty secretary. The Research Committee reviews the application and makes recommendations to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

PROPOSAL
The proposal should provide the Research Committee with the information necessary for evaluation. The proposal should use language that clearly communicates to a committee of people not in that person’s discipline so that they can understand and evaluate the proposal. The following information in clearly labeled sections and paginated contiguously for the whole document is required:

1. Name, department, rank, and date of application
2. Date of initial appointment and date of tenure
3. Date(s) of prior external and internal research support of the past 10 years (Append copies of the most recent prior sabbatical, pre-tenure, senior summer fellowship, research grant, and summer research stipend reports)
4. Title of project
5. Dates for undertaking the work
6. Primary focus of project: research, pedagogical development, or professional development
7. Short project summary of no more than 250 words
8. Detailed description of proposed project. The tasks to be performed should be described, and the expected results should be outlined in detail. The importance of the project should be discussed and its relevance to the investigator’s long-term research plans explained. Indicate resources necessary for completion, any related work already done, a detailed timeline for completion, expected final product(s), and dissemination plan (e.g., in an appropriate peer reviewed venue.)

9. Relevant bibliography

10. Comments

11. For projects involving research with human subjects or animals, Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval or Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) approval is not needed at the time of this proposal but it is expected to be obtained before commencement of the project. Indicate here if IRB or IACUC approval is required. A copy of the IRB or IACUC approval letter should be submitted to the Faculty Research Committee Administrative Liaison, CNS 300.

12. Curriculum Vitae (The curriculum vitae should reflect applicant’s record of teaching, research, and service.

13. Department/Program Chair’s letter of support (must be part of the application.)

**REVIEW**

Applications are reviewed by the Faculty Research Committee. When the Committee members do not deem themselves qualified to judge the merit of a proposal, consultation with other educators may be undertaken. When ranking two or more proposals of equal merit, the Faculty Research Committee will privilege the applicant who has not received previous funding. Decisions of the Research Committee shall be final.

**REPORTING REQUIREMENT**

Final report is due March 1 following the summer of the award.

The final report should discuss your accomplishments and the immediate outcomes and products of your project. This should be related back to the original goals and plans in your proposal, explicitly noting any necessary modifications in their implementation. In addition, you should note any intended future outcomes and products that will likely stem from the project.

The final report should be sent to Faculty Research Committee Administrative Liaison (CNS 300), and to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, the applicant’s Dean, and the applicant’s Chair.
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.

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.
[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.