0. Select a recording secretary. Election of Chair, Election of Executive Secretary.

1. Presidential courtesy

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
   a. Approval of minutes
      i. Meeting of 4/30/12 (attached)
      ii. Meeting of 4/30/12 reconvened on 5/14/12 (attached)
      ii. Meeting of 6/4/12 (attached)
   b. Correspondence
      i. Memo from GFS with roster and meeting dates (attached)
      ii. Guide to taking AC minutes (attached)
      iii. Memo from Mary Ann Palazzi to SVPAA Fitzgerald re: Spring 2012 conflicts between athletic schedules and final exams (Ongoing Item 1) (attached)
   c. Oral reports

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

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

6. Old Business

7. New business
   a. Election of faculty to the Honorary Degree Committee
   b. Closure of School of Nursing Health Care Management Track (attachments)
   c. Addition to Non-Discrimination and Harassment Policy (attachment)
   d. Proposal for a Masters of Public Administration (attachments)
   e. Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees: report of 6/7/12 meeting (Ongoing Item 2)
   f. Calendar issues (attachment)
   g. Request for Task Force on Part-time Faculty (attachment)

• Lists of Attachments, Pending, and Ongoing Items are on page 2
List of Attachments:
For item 3.a.i Minutes from AC meeting of 4/30/2012 (pages 3-16)
For item 3.a.ii Minutes from AC meeting of 4/30/2012 reconvened on 5/14/2012 (pages 17-26)
For item 3.a.iii Minutes from AC meeting of 6/4/2012 (pages 27-32)
For item 3.b.i Memo from GFS with roster and meeting dates (page 33)
For item 3.b.ii Guide to taking AC minutes (page 34)
For item 3.b.iii Memo from Mary Ann Palazzi to SVPAA Fitzgerald re: Spring 2012 conflicts between athletic schedules and final exams (Ongoing Item 1) (page 35)
For item 7.b. Closure of School of Nursing Health Care Management Track (pages 36-37)
For item 7.c. Addition to Non-Discrimination and Harassment Policy (page 38)
For item 7.f. Memo from 2011-2012 ACEC regarding calendar issues (page 91)
For item 7.g. Memo from Liz Hohl and Kathy Nantz requesting task force on part time faculty (pages 92-95)

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

Ongoing Items:
1. Report by SVPAA to AC each semester to inform the council of any approved exceptions to the Athletic Department’s policy of not scheduling athletic events that conflict with final exams.
2. Report from the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees after each meeting with board members. At the end of each academic year, discuss items for the Conference Committee to put on the agenda for their meetings with members of the board the following year.
DRAFT MINUTES
Academic Council Meeting
April 30, 2012
CNS 200
3:30 – 5:00 PM

Present: Professors Bayne, Boryczka, Dennin, Greenberg, Keenan, Nantz, Mulvey (Faculty Secretary), Petrino, Prelè (Chair), Rakowitz (Executive Secretary), Sapp, Shea, Strauss, Tromley, Vinekar, Walker; Deans Crabtree, Franzosa; Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs (SVPPAA) Fitzgerald, S.J.

Student Representative: Nicolette Richardson

Guests: Professors DeWitt, Dohm, Bucki, Downie

Regrets: Professor Lane; Deans Beal, Campbell

Absent: Professor Zera, Dean Gibson

The meeting was called to order by Chair Professor Prelè at 3:35 p.m. She suggested that recessing the meeting and reconvening was a possibility if the Academic Council (AC) does not get through the agenda.

1. Presidential courtesy

SVPPAA Fitzgerald stated that he had two things to report. He has asked the deans to encourage the faculty to include core pathways in their syllabi. Some faculty members have done it and some have not. He would like faculty to be more intent on knitting together the curriculum and be more purposeful in including these pathways.

He reported the current enrollment figures for the class of 2016. There were 716 deposits last year at this time, and there are 806 deposits this year by today’s mail. The figures are tracking about 100 ahead, day to day. It looks good, and we will continue to work on this, but these figures are before the summer melt. Things are looking quite positive.

Professor Sapp asked to what extent we have used the wait list. SVPPAA Fitzgerald responded that we have accepted about 70% of the applicants to the College of Arts and Sciences, the Dolan School of Business and the School of Engineering but only 40% to the School of Nursing. At this point, 25 people have been offered admission off of the wait list, 13 of whom accepted so far, and there will probably be more wait list activity in May.

Professor Bayne stated that on February 8 the AC made a motion that all part-time students be charged at a credit hour rate lower than full time students. It appears that the administration and the Board of Trustees decided not to accept our recommendation. Did the administration consult with faculty or Handbook Committees before making this decision, and did they tell the Executive Committee prior to implementation?
SVPAA Fitzgerald responded, “no” but that he had conveyed the information as that decision was being made, he had consulted with Julie Dolan, and he had sought input from the academic deans and enrollment management. We are keeping summer rates and most part-time rates quite competitive with the local market. He said that he certainly conveyed the AC’s recommendation and his own slightly different recommendation but that he had not subsequently consulted with the Executive Committee of the AC about tuition rates.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

Professor Mulvey announced the following events as a reminder:

- Meeting of the General Faculty on May 3 at 10 a.m.-12 p.m., DSB Room 110A and B, preceded by a breakfast sponsored by the Faculty Welfare Committee at 9:30 a.m.
- Annual address of the President at the General Faculty Meeting on May 9 from 4:30-5:30 p.m. in Gonzaga Auditorium, followed by a reception for retiring faculty in the lobby of the Quick Center from 5:30-7:30 p.m. The retiring faculty are: Professors Jerry Sergent, Winston Tellis, Elizabeth Dreyer, Orin Grossman, and Ed Deak.

Professor Mulvey noted that we are determined to get through all of the work this meeting and not to recess so that we can be done. In the event that occurs, Professor Mulvey would like to thank all of the faculty and administration, as they worked really hard this year, with many extra meetings. She would like to thank every member of the AC.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary

a. Approval of minutes

Professor Rakowitz requested motions to approve three sets of minutes.

i. Meeting of 3/26/12

Professor Keenan requested a correction on page 6, fourth paragraph, to delete the last sentence: “It has been a basis on negotiation, contractual commitment, historical impact, and so on.”

MOTION [Shea/Walker]: To approve the minutes of March 26, 2012 as corrected. MOTION PASSED: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.

ii. Meeting of 4/2/12

MOTION [Walker/Keenan]: To approve the minutes of April 2, 2012. MOTION PASSED: 13 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.

iii. Meeting of 4/16/12

MOTION [Vinekar/Sapp]: To approve the minutes of April 16, 2012. MOTION PASSED: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.

b. Correspondence: none
c. Oral reports: none

4. Council Subcommittee Reports

Professor Preli indicated that there are two Council subcommittee reports.

MOTION [Mulvey/Sapp]: To reorder the agenda to do item 4c first since we have guests, followed by item 4a.
MOTION PASSED: 13 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention.

4c. Subcommittee re: Workers’ Bill of Rights

Professor DeWitt thanked the other members of this subcommittee, Professors Dohm and Bucki, who are at the meeting today, and Professor Rosivach and Vice President Mark Reed, who are unable to attend. He read the charge of the subcommittee, “That the Academic Council direct the AC Executive Committee to form a subcommittee of 3 faculty and 2 administrators to write policy language in the spirit of the Workers’ Bill of Rights language that the General Faculty endorsed on 4/17/98, and to recommend where this policy should be housed.” Professor DeWitt described the background of custodial worker unrest many years ago, including the suicide of a worker and a student occupation of Bellarmine Hall, that culminated in the Workers’ Bill of Rights at the end of the 1990s and in the same year the University Guidelines for Contracted Services (attached on page 28). The endorsement of the Workers’ Bill of Rights as passed by the faculty for the Journal of Record (JOR) appears on page 24.

The subcommittee discussed whether the existing language of the Bill of Rights should be expanded to include minimum wage or a minimalistic reworking into policy language. The subcommittee felt the minimalistic approach was the only one compatible with the charge and is also the better way to go, as there is a great deal of variability around campus with subcontractual workers, and it wouldn’t be possible to write language that would cover it all. So the subcommittee rewrote policy language for the JOR. The second thing the subcommittee decided was where this should be housed. The Handbook requires it to reside in the JOR where policy decisions go.

Professor DeWitt then presented recommendation one, a motion that the AC approves for the JOR the policy below (page 26 of the packet) concerning the Workers’ Bill of Rights:

Workers’ Bill of Rights

All campus workers, including those employed under subcontracting or outsourcing agreements, have the following inalienable rights as defined by Catholic Social Teaching:

- The Right to a Living Wage
- The Right to Working Conditions Suitable to Health, Safety, and Human Dignity
- The Right to Benefits Suitable to Human Dignity
- The Right to Organize

He provided as the rationale that this would be preferable since it is unequivocal policy language and is in the spirit of the original Workers’ Bill of Rights. His second recommendation was that
there should be some sort of recourse in case there is a violation of the Workers’ Bill of Rights (described on the bottom of page 26 to the top of page 27 of the packet for this meeting):

**Oversight Committee on Worker’s Rights**

There shall be an Oversight Committee on Worker’s Rights consisting of two faculty members and two administrative members with staggered three year terms. The Academic Council shall arrange for the initial and ongoing membership on this committee.

Complaints of violations of policies on workers’ rights must first be addressed through normal administrative channels, informal and formal. In the event that an issue is not satisfactorily resolved through normal channels, the function of the Oversight Committee will be as follows:

- To receive complaints of violations of policies on workers’ rights from any member of the University community;
- When a complaint is received, to make a determination as to whether a violation has occurred;
- To recommend a remedy in cases where the committee determines a violation has occurred.

The Oversight Committee may also receive relevant excerpts from the annual reports contractors are required to file in keeping with the University Guidelines for Contracted Services.

Professor DeWitt explained that the Oversight Committee may want to review those reports of complaints. It would be a board that would exist but would be seldom if ever convened, like the Academic Dishonesty Review Board, which would only be brought into play if a complaint hasn’t been resolved through various preliminary channels. This committee would exist as a last recourse in case other means didn’t resolve the issues.

Professor Rakowitz stated that she is confused by the assertion that this is unequivocal policy language. Policy language is clearly implementable, like all workers will be paid at x% over minimum wage. This doesn’t seem to her to be policy language.

Professor DeWitt opined that the language at the beginning, through Catholic Social Teaching, is clearly policy language. At the top of page 24 of the original Workers’ Bill of Rights was a broad based articulation of rights.

Dean Franzosa agreed with Professor Rakowitz. An example of policy language is that “all policy follows the following principle.”

Professor Nantz had a question on the oversight board. She is concerned that no outside members are specified. If she were asked to serve on such a board, how would she have any clue what the normal (for example, Sodexo) practice is according to the industry. Her concern is that there is not enough structure to it.

Professor DeWitt responded that one would expect that conscientious faculty would research and write annual reports and, similar to the Academic Dishonesty Review Board, would have a fair amount of information available to it if it ever a complaint got to them. It seldom if ever would happen and would be fairly easy, as they would be able to initiate their own investigation.
Professor Boryczka had a few questions regarding the oversight committee: (1) how will the committee communicate to workers to let them know that this committee exists to redress their grievances?; (2) would this committee have access to complaints that are filed with other competent bodies but were not filed with this committee? It’s a matter of transparency. How would they know that information, and would there be a process for information sharing?; and (3) what obligation does the administration have to follow the recommendations of the committee?, what would be the standing of the remedy, the jurisdiction of the committee, and why would the administration follow its rulings?

Professor DeWitt commented that the first question is a good question. We would have to work out some process to communicate to workers. This is an unresolved issue but not in the subcommittee’s charge. The third question – what obligation does the administration have – none. It is difficult to imagine a situation that would fall into the faculty purview. One would hope that the administration and faculty members of the committee would find a good faith solution and follow it. He professed that he did not understand the second question.

Professor Boryczka clarified: how does it get to the committee if not through the administration, when the administration doesn’t bring it to the committee because the administration thinks the issue is resolved but the worker doesn’t think it’s resolved.

Professor DeWitt answered that the answer is, communication.

Professor Bucki stated that this structure was part of the original plan students thought was formed after the Bellarmine sit-in (in the Spring of 1998 or 1999), and it looks like this never was formed but rather fell through the cracks.

Professor Walker asked, is the concern that it was in the JOR, and what potentially negative scenario do you envision if this disappears from the JOR. What might happen if this wasn’t there. He is not quite understanding the concern: good ethical behavior versus policy? How would it manifest itself?

Professor DeWitt said this is fairly common. It is hard for a Jesuit Institution not to have one.

Professor Bucki observed, this could be like the last time that the students gathered, thought there was unethical administrative action, and what got resolved was negotiated between the students and the administration as a settlement that the faculty supported. There now would be a mechanism to address it, not a dramatic event.

Professor Walker said he doesn’t understand how this protocol would prevent that sort of action.

Professor DeWitt explained that there was a gutsy worker who gave her pay stub publicly. This might give a remedy.

Professor Vinekar suggested that, in addition, there should be an annual information session with campus workers to inform them of the process and check whether they have any issues still unresolved.

Professor DeWitt thought this was not a bad idea.

Professor Bucki stated this is beyond what we had envisioned. This would encourage and seek out problems.
Professor Vinekar responded that, no, this would just be informative.

Dean Crabtree asked how this is academic policy. The JOR is for academic policy. If the AC might consider reaffirming this because it was removed from the JOR and even forward it to Human Resources, to add to its mission statement, she doesn’t understand why this would be in the JOR. She believes the AC should affirm the value of these things but not that it should be in the JOR.

Professor Mulvey raised a point of order that Professor DeWitt responds to every speaker as opposed to the Chair calling on speakers.

Professor DeWitt insisted it is the duty of the Faculty Secretary to maintain the JOR for all policy decisions, not just academic policy.

Professor Rakowitz read out loud another section of the JOR and opined it is not clear whether we have the right to make recommendations when it is not academic policy, but if we do, it should appear in the JOR.

Professor Nantz is in favor of supporting this but questioned how to define a living wage. If this is implemented as policy, what does it mean, how has the committee defined “living wages?”

Professor Bucki explained that the subcommittee had decided that to expand with definitions would go beyond our charge. The oversight committee would canvass the region to find other living wage examples.

Professor Bayne wanted to address whether only academic policy is in the JOR. He thinks this is false.

Professor Preli asked him to hold his comment until there is a motion to debate.

Dean Franzosa asked, if the AC votes this down, does that mean there will be no recognition of this concept?

Professor Preli explained that a member of the AC can make a motion to forward this to Human Resources. There is no reason that it would disappear.

Dean Franzosa asked whether, in terms of University records, this affirmation of solidarity with the Workers’ Bill of Rights is the only place it appeared?

Professor Preli answered yes, and it already is out because it was removed from the JOR.

Professor DeWitt responded that aside from the University Guidelines for Contracted Services passed by the Board of Trustees, we couldn’t find any other place it appeared.

Professor Dennin questioned, where can we find these documents?

Professor DeWitt said that he found them in his own personal files, and Dr. Mark Reed confirmed that they exist and were correct.

Professor Shea asked, where do these policy statements exist in other universities?
Professor DeWitt replied that he doesn’t know and would have to check on that. Only we have the JOR.

Professor Preli thanked the subcommittee and explained that this is now a discussion for this body.

Professor Shea stated that she would feel more comfortable if she knew where else this can be housed; while she supports the concept, she is not sure that this is the most effective way or place.

**MOTION** [Bayne/Vinekar]: (on the top of page 26 in the 4/30/12 packet) That the Academic Council approves, for inclusion in the Journal of Record, the policy below concerning the Workers’ Bill of Rights:

### Workers’ Bill of Rights

All campus workers, including those employed under subcontracting or outsourcing agreements, have the following inalienable rights as defined by Catholic Social Teaching:

- The Right to a Living Wage
- The Right to Working Conditions Suitable to Health, Safety, and Human Dignity
- The Right to Benefits Suitable to Human Dignity
- The Right to Organize

Professor Bayne spoke in favor of the motion. He stated that the JOR is not only for academic policy. It has governance not just academic policy, for example the newly passed harassment policy a couple of years ago.

Professor Greenberg was opposed to the motion. He declared that, unfortunately, he hates to speak against this, and he is in favor of the spirit. The JOR was a mish-mash of things, some of which didn’t belong there, which gave the administration an excuse to ignore the JOR as not appropriate. We went through a long process to clean up the JOR so as to include only those things the faculty had purview over. There are many good ideas, but this is not appropriate for the JOR and will come back eventually to bite us when we need the JOR for faculty rights and governance issues.

Professor Dennin was a little concerned the workers wouldn’t know it is in the JOR or even that the JOR exists. This belongs in an employee handbook that every employee would get, although he doesn’t know if employees do get a handbook when hired.

**MOTION FAILED**: 3 in favor, 7 opposed, 5 abstentions.

**MOTION** [Mulvey/Fitzgerald]: To refer this matter to the Academic Council Executive Committee to look into where Workers’ Bill of Rights are housed at other universities.

Professor Petrino spoke in favor of the motion. She feared the Workers’ Bill of Rights would be buried. It should be put front and center.
MOTION PASSED: 15 in favor; 0 opposed; 1 abstention.

a. Subcommittee for considering remaining items from ad hoc JOR committee recommendations

Professor Mulvey continued to present the remaining items from the October 25, 2011 report of the subcommittee, noting that Professor Greenberg is correct in pointing out how conscientious the work of the ad hoc JOR subcommittee was. The AC has already considered items 16, 19, 22, 23, and 36. Drawing the AC’s attention to item 44, page 5, line 5, the ad hoc JOR group suggested the revision that begins on line 16 but the AC sent it to the “JOR 9” subcommittee to revise the language. The new proposed language appears on page 5 at lines 25 to 31.

The rationale is that it originally didn’t mean what the JoR group meant it to say and was not in policy language. This makes clear that all work must relate to tenure and promotion. Professor Mulvey would like to make a motion to replace the current entry in the JOR (lines 8-13) with the new revision that begins on line 25.

Professor Dennin would like to add to line 29 tenure “or promotion” because it is consistent with the statement at the beginning of the paragraph. Professor Mulvey will be happy to do that when she makes the motion.

Professor Greenberg is concerned about the “reasonable confidence” language as a loophole if there is a mean-spirited committee. He recounted a past example of such an instance.

Professor Mulvey explained that the Handbook has that language already (line 39) and that they are not trying to make new policy, just to fix the language. Prior service is what it is supposed to be about.

Professor Greenberg asserted that he would like to change the Handbook but that is not in consideration here.

MOTION [Mulvey/Tromley]: That the Journal of Record entry on consideration of prior service for promotion and tenure be replaced with lines 25-31 with the addition of “or promotion” at the end of line 29:

Consideration of prior service for promotion and tenure:
Evaluation for promotion or tenure should be based on a faculty member’s performance in the academic career starting with his/her initial appointment at the rank of full-time instructor or higher at an institution of higher learning. While promotion and tenure are based on performance in the academic career, the committee shall not recommend tenure or promotion unless it has reasonable confidence that such performance will continue at Fairfield University.

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

Professor Mulvey introduced items 50 and 51 on pages 5-6. She read the rationale on the bottom of page 6, lines 46-48. Items 50 and 51 deal with particular benefits for faculty. The JOR may not be an appropriate place for entries on benefits for faculty as most benefits for faculty are now delineated in the Faculty Handbook, the Memorandum of Understanding and the Benefits Plan.
Overview. In light of current circumstances, the “JOR 9” is deeply concerned at this period of time to move any benefits to the Benefits Plan Overview. They would like to ask the Faculty Salary Committee to work with the administration to reach an agreement on language for the JOR and/or the Handbook that would protect benefits in the Benefit Plans Overview from unilateral change by the administration or trustees.

MOTION [Mulvey/Nantz]: On page 7 of the memo, lines 13-16: The Academic Council asks the Faculty Salary Committee to work with the administration to reach agreement on language for the Journal of Record and/or the Faculty Handbook that would protect benefits in the Benefit Plans Overview from unilateral change. Draft language should be vetted by the Faculty Welfare Committee/AAUP.

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

Professor Mulvey presented the last one, item 52 on page 9. The JOR group felt the computer usage guidelines were out dated. They found five documents where policies were passed in documents but not entered into the JOR, but the policies were replaced by Appendix IV and V. They recommended that the AC should review and approve Appendix IV and V as technical and sensible policies that belong in the JOR.

Dean Crabtree asked if these reflected the most recent changes.

Professors Mulvey and Bayne confirmed that they did incorporate the updates in 2004 and 2011.


MOTION PASSED: 16 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions.

Professor Preli thanked the committee for its hard work to unanimous applause.

Professor Mulvey will update the Journal of Record for September 2012 and will be happy to sell copies!!!!

5. Petitions for immediate hearing: none

6. Old Business: none

7. New business

a. 3 items from the Committee on Committees

Professor Preli announced that there were three items from the Committee on Committees (COC). Professor Mulvey referred to pages 30-31 of the packet. The COC met and got the ballots together. They collected the names for the General Faculty Secretary and the COC but it would be a conflict of interest for the COC to set those ballots. Those volunteers must be approved by the AC for the ballot for the election. Item 1 is the General Faculty Secretary.
Professor Mulvey is stepping down from this position and two candidates have volunteered: Susan Rakowitz and Rick DeWitt.

**MOTION [Greenberg/Keenan]: To approve the ballot for General Faculty Secretary.**

**MOTION PASSED:** 15 in favor; 0 opposed; 1 abstention.

Professor Walker asked if it is possible to have nominations from the floor. Professor Mulvey answered yes - at any time. These are just the names that came in to be put on the ballot. Professor Mulvey introduced item two, the ballot for the COC, which has two names: Cheryl Tromley and Joan van Hise for the DSB/Behavioral and Social Sciences slot; these were the only volunteers.

Professor Tromley asked if it would make sense to move her to the at-large slot. Professor Mulvey answered no, she must remain in the Dolan School of Business (DSB) slot, and explained that if one of the candidates is not elected that person is eligible for the at-large vote.

**MOTION [Walker/Shea]: To approve the ballot for Committee on Committees as contained in the packet (on page 30).**

**MOTION PASSED:** 15 in favor; 0 opposed; 1 abstention.

Professor Mulvey indicated that the COC looked at Handbook Committee slots for University College. There are three slots on Handbook Committees reserved for University College administrators: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, FDEC, and the University College Committee has the Dean of University College or the Dean’s delegate. The committee recommends a one year fix during this transitional year. They felt the UC slot on the UCC should be filled by appointment of the SVPAA. The FDEC should decide whether and how its slot should be filled next year and should make a recommendation to the Council on the permanent disposition of this committee membership slot. For the Committee on University College slot, they suggest the immediate past Dean of University College or the immediate past Dean’s delegate.

**MOTION [Walker/Petrino]: To approve the Handbook Committee slots for University College as set forth on the bottom of page 30 to the top of page 31:**

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

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.

During 2012-13, the Committee on University College should continue to have UC representation, specifically, “the immediate past Dean of University College or the immediate past Dean’s delegate shall be a voting member.” The Committee should
undertake an examination of their duties and functions and make a recommendation to the Council concerning the Committee’s future.

**MOTION PASSED:** 16 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions.

Dean Crabtree suggested the FDEC should consider whether part-time faculty might be the representative. She asked that the AC share this suggestion with the FDEC. Professor Preli noted that it will be referenced in the minutes.

b. **Arrange for faculty membership on search committees for Deans of DSB and SOE**

Professor Mulvey introduced Item 7b. The SVPAA informed the AC at the last meeting that there would be a search committee for the Dean of the DSB and the Dean of Engineering. According to the Handbook, the AC decides the faculty representation. Typically the AC selects what the faculty representation should look like and asks the General Faculty Secretary to put out a call for nominations.

SVPAA Fitzgerald listed as the designated members for these search committees the following: SVPAA as chair plus 3 administrators, 1 community member or trustee, and 5 faculty members (2 from the school getting the dean, 1 from the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), 1 from neither CAS nor the school getting the dean, 1 at large with no restriction.

Professor Tromley asked, isn’t it usually more faculty representation from the school getting the dean?

Professor Shea responded that for the search for the dean for the School of Nursing, it was four but one was at large. There were 6 faculty members on that committee.

SVPAA Fitzgerald said “I love faculty” but when the committee is larger, it is harder to meet. He suggested 3 from the school in question, 1 from CAS, and 1 from either school or at large.

Professor Mulvey questioned whether for the School of Engineering the faculty representation should be smaller for such a small school.

Professor Shea asked whether it could include part-time faculty. She supported it still being four.

Professor Dennin observed that with such a small school it puts pressure on the faculty to serve.

Professor Keenan asked how many tenured faculty of the School of Engineering are there?

SVPAA Fitzgerald and Professor Mulvey calculated that the answer was five tenured faculty and four pre-tenure and one full-time faculty.

SVPAA Fitzgerald wondered whether they could be untenured, and the consensus from Professor Mulvey and others was, yes.

Professor Boryczka believed they should want to undertake this work as it is important.
Professor Mulvey suggested more representation from the Mathematics and Computer Science Department, given the significant computer science offerings in the SOE.

Dean Franzosa suggested the School of Engineering be consulted.

Professor Nantz felt we should give it more thought as this was incredibly time intensive. She was worried about science faculty with their other responsibilities of labs.

Dean Crabtree normally would agree but she was very concerned to not have non-tenured faculty on it and the need to have women (the newer faculty) on it. She would like to see a representative from math and science to bring the School of Engineering to the Bannow Center. The need for collaborative integration of the curriculum is critical. The building project and other initiatives depend upon it.

**MOTION [Dennin/Nantz]: That the faculty for the Search Committee for the DSB Dean have the following representation: 3 from DSB, 1 from CAS, 1 from neither CAS nor DSB, and 1 at large with no restrictions.**

**MOTION PASSED:** 16 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions.

The General Faculty Secretary will send out a notice for nominations.

**MOTION [Greenberg/Dennin]: That the faculty for the Search Committee for the School of Engineering Dean have the following representation: 2 from the School of Engineering, 2 from CAS of which one must be math or natural science, 1 from neither CAS nor School of Engineering, and 1 at large with no restrictions.**

Dean Crabtree had questions about the math/natural science representative that Professor Mulvey clarified would be natural science not physical science.

Professor Walker asked whether it was a problem that the School of Engineering might be outnumbered.

Professor Dennin shared this concern. Was the one at large not to be from the School of Engineering? No, the maximum engineering representatives could be three.

**MOTION PASSED:** 7 in favor; 5 opposed; 4 abstentions.

At 5 p.m., Professor Preli had to leave to give an exam and Professor Mulvey took over as Chair. She introduced Professor Downie as a guest to present Item 7c.

**c. Proposed Handbook amendment from the Advancement Committee**

Professor Downie explained that the Advancement Committee for two to three years has been discussing possible changes in its membership. This proposal comes from a need to get more members, especially in the next several years of the capital campaign. They want to have a broader representation, more expertise, including a representative from the DSB, and to insure that we have members from different schools and departments. Advancement no longer looks at community affairs; with the reorganization that part is factually inaccurate.
Professor Bayne asked whether the committee considered rather than the sentence about “no restrictions” that there should be a least 1 member from specifically designated schools.

Professor Downie stated that they want DSB, CAS, and sometimes Nursing but that the committee is agnostic about the language. He noted that there is not a lot of consistency in the language of membership of committees. He doesn’t care about the language as long as it results in the representation they seek.

Professor Nantz observed that there is a new committee on arts, culture, and community engagement.

SVPAA Fitzgerald noted that it is connected to the Public Lectures Committee.

Professor Nantz responded “never mind.”

Professor Sapp, as former chair, indicated that in discussions over several years, maybe greater than three years, some of this language was an effort to keep it simple.

Professor Downie continued in his presentation, highlighting that in the second-to-last line in the bold section, the Vice President for University Advancement as ex officio is automatically a non-voting member, so this language is in keeping with Stephanie Frost’s lack of a vote. The committee is agnostic on this point and that sentence could be eliminated. There are not many votes.

Dean Crabtree asked how many meetings there were.

Professor Downie responded that they meet roughly twice a year.

Dean Crabtree noted that, generally speaking, growing this committee is a fantastic set of events, increasing faculty service, but she would like to see the committee commit to a certain number of meetings, particularly as the campaign heats up.

**MOTION [Sapp/Tromley]: To adopt the new language in bold on page 32 of the 4/30/12 packet to amend the Faculty Handbook.**

Professor Sapp was in favor.

Professor Tromley supported the motion.

Professor Walker questioned, are we sure these schools will be represented.

Professor Mulvey responded no, but we do this all the time.

**MOTION TO AMEND [Rakowitz/Keenan]: By deleting the phrase “keeping in mind a preference for broad faculty participation among members of the Committee” so it ends with “school.”**

Professor Rakowitz explained that this would be the appropriate Handbook language.

**MOTION TO AMEND PASSED unanimously.**
Professor Bayne wanted to offer another motion to amend because he wanted to further define the representation. Professor Mulvey stated the motion would need to be more specific.

**MOTION TO AMEND [Bayne/Walker]:** That the representatives be: one member from the College of Arts and Sciences; one member from the School of Business; one member from neither the College of Arts and Sciences nor the School of Business; and two members at large without restriction as to curriculum area or school.

Professor Bayne spoke in favor of the motion to amend because it is designed to capture with more precision the intention of the portion Professor Rakowitz deleted with her amendment.

Professor Sapp expressed frustration with the new restriction on membership because it has been predominantly School of Business representation.

**MOTION TO AMEND PASSED:** 11 in favor, 3 opposed, 1 abstention.  
**MAIN MOTION as amended PASSED:** 13 in favor, 2 opposed, 0 abstentions.

**MOTION [Rakowitz/Boryczka]:** to Recess the meeting to Senior Week to a day determined by the Executive Committee with the same agenda and a different recording secretary.  
**MOTION PASSED unanimously.**

The meeting was recessed at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra Strauss  
Recording Secretary
Present: Professors Steven Bayne, Joe Dennin, Dennis Keenan, Phil Lane, Irene Mulvey (General Faculty Secretary), Kathy Nantz, Elizabeth Petrino, Rona Preli (Chair), Susan Rakowitz (Executive Secretary), David Sapp, Joyce Shea, Vishnu Vinekar, Brian Walker, David Zera


Invited Presenters: Michael Pagano, Bill Abbott

Regrets: Dean Don Gibson, Professors Jocelyn Borczyka, Don Greenberg, Cheryl Tromley.

Absent: Dean Susan Franzosa, Professor Debra Strauss.

The meeting was called to order at 10:07 a.m. AC Executive Secretary Susan Rakowitz proposed Summer meeting dates June 4th, June 18th, July 16th.

Motion [Rakowitz/Keenan]: To reorder the agenda for the Academic Council meeting on May 14th 2012 to get through items 7e and 7d, and then return to item 7b.

Motion passed: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

7e. Proposal to close the M.A. in Organizational Communication Cohort Program

Professor Mike Pagano reported on the M.A. in Organizational Communication Cohort Program. Prof. Pagano said that this Cohort Program was started in 2003 and ran through 2009. It graduated 50 to 60 students in six years, and then the funding dried up. Because of these limitations, they would like to close the cohort program and keep the on-campus program.

Motion: [Lane/Keenan]: To close the MA in Communication Cohort program.

Professor David Sapp spoke in favor of the motion because of the limitations it faces; but added that he was sad to see it go.

Motion passed: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

7d. Report from FDEC evaluating ongoing use of IDEA and yellow sheets (Pending Items D and E)
Professor Bill Abbott, chair of the Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee reported on the faculty feedback on online versus paper IDEA forms. He said that there were compelling arguments on both sides. Some faculty are busy and cannot take 40 minutes out of class time for a paper-based IDEA form and would prefer the students to do online evaluations outside class time. Other faculty want to use the paper IDEA forms in class as they get a higher response rate. A number of faculty got a very high response rate online; for example, Professor Sara Brill used the online IDEA form and had a very high response rate. The FDEC recommends that Fairfield University continue using both the paper and online options for IDEA. Dr. Abbott said that both options cost around the same, although paper has more people involved.

Professor Bayne asked why the response rate for online has gone down. Dr. Abbott replied that in the first semester the default option was paper IDEA student evaluations, while in the second semester the default option was online IDEA student evaluations. There were 246 courses at Fairfield University with the paper IDEA option in March 2012, slightly above 216 from the previous semester (Fall 2011). It may be that some faculty did not respond to the choice between online and paper, and hence they may have unintentionally chosen online.

Professor Keenan asked whether students could get an incentive to fill out the online evaluation. For example, students who have not yet filled out their evaluation could have their grades withheld until they fill out their online IDEA evaluations. Professor Bill Abbott replied that Dr. Mary Frances Malone said that this may be illegal. In addition, this would involve lots of work to implement this on our computer system. Dr. Keenan said that other schools do this, withhold students' grades until they fill out their evaluations.

Professor Kathy Nantz said that junior faculty should use paper. She also said that the IDEA forms force us to recognize that if sample size is small, reliability is a concern, by specifically stating sample size and reliability on the forms. Dr. Abbott said that he'll talk to the FDEC about these issues. He added that IDEA’s suggestions for small classes is that a professor who teaches these should look at a trend after teaching several of these classes.

SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald asked about IDEA evaluations for graduate and summer courses. Dr. Abbott replied that these courses are all online. In addition, the faculty pass out the yellow evaluation sheets in class. SVPAA Fitzgerald replied that response is abysmal for short summer courses. He added that these courses should use paper to get a better response rate.

Dean Suzanne Campbell stated that evaluations for adjunct faculty has been an issue for deans. Dr. Abbott replied that Jay Rozgonyi of the CNS said every faculty gets a URL that they can give the students. It’s a matter of contacting the adjunct faculty.

Professor David Sapp asked about the IDEA FIF (Faculty Information Form). He said that some faculty were leaving this form blank. Professor Abbott said that the percentage of filled Faculty Information Forms has risen to an acceptable level. In addition, the online version requires the faculty to fill out and send constant reminders.

Professor Rona Preli asked whether the option to opt-out of FUSA survey has been discontinued? Professor Abbott said that Dr. Malone had said that this was a mistake.
A concern was raised that in graduate schools, comparisons to disciplines is a problem. Some faculty could have selected the wrong comparison groups on the Faculty Information Forms.

Dean Jack Beal spoke about the issue of contacting adjuncts. He stated that University Policy is that adjuncts can only be contacted through their Fairfield University email address, but many adjunct faculty use their organization's or personal email.

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

Professor David Sapp said that we need to know cost difference between online and paper. Professor Steve Bayne said that cost is an issue, but data is a bigger value. Valid data is more important than the monetary costs. Professor Phil Lane says that with online IDEA evaluations, we need to give students a lot of incentive to fill them out. Professor David Sapp suggested all paper evaluations except for online classes. Professor Joyce Shea said she objects to this because paper can have an environmental impact; therefore, the option to do evaluations online should be there. Professor Brian Walker said that online IDEA evaluations worked well in labs. SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald said that many people took many hours sorting, boxing and mailing the paper student evaluations. In addition, one of the four original boxes fell off of a truck, onto the road, causing a loss of data. As they have to be sent to Kansas, IDEA paper forms can be insecure. Our earlier paper student evaluation forms were run on campus and were therefore secure. However, IDEA requires paper forms to be sent to Kansas, which is where the problem lies with IDEA paper student evaluations. Junior faculty need to have increased student response rates, and they can have an option to chose online or paper evaluations for this. Tenured faculty also need feedback, but after 30-40 years, they may have a lesser need to increase student response rates and may chose between online or paper based on other factors.

Dean Jack Beal commented that adjunct faculty members sign a contract to teach for one semester. Chairs, deans and adjuncts need to have a sense of teaching evaluations of adjunct professors. Professor Irene Mulvey stated that this comment was not relevant to the motion on the floor.

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

Motion [Lane/Dennin]: To have FDEC consider:
- Junior faculty should be encouraged to use paper evaluation
- An incentive for students to do online evaluations
- Maximizing response rates
- Evaluations for summer and graduate classes
- Online courses should use yellow sheets
- FIF (Faculty Information Forms) not filled in
- FUSA questions opt-out
- Course designations on IDEA
- Evaluations for independent study classes
Professor Abbott stated that the yellow sheet data do not translate very well to the IDEA system. The qualitative answers from IDEA forms cannot be matched between students. The results list all your answers for Question 1, and then all the answers for Question 2.

Professor Sapp asked whether we knew how many professors used yellow sheets. Professor Abbott replied saying that in a study years ago, 16-20% of classes never had an evaluation submitted. It is possible that these may have been independent study classes.

Motion [Walker/Shea]: To continue use of yellow forms for two years, reevaluate in 2014.
Motion Passed: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

The AC thanked the FDEC for all its work on IDEA.

7b. Arrange for faculty membership on search committees for Deans of DSB and SOE

Professor Rakowitz said that a couple of questions have been raised about administrators with faculty status running for faculty seats on the search committees. She has discussed their eligibility with Professor Mulvey and both agree that it's murky. Before finalizing the ballots and voting, the Council should rule on whether administrators with faculty status are eligible to run for faculty seats on these committees. Next year, the Council may want to consider making a clear policy statement on the broader issue of how such people fit into our governance structures.

Professor Mulvey said that there is nothing in our documents that says they cannot be elected, but these faculty slots should be filled by regular faculty.

Motion [Lane/Second]: Administrators with faculty status are ineligible for faculty slots on the search committees.

Motion Passed: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions

Professor Rakowitz said that she had been asked to have the Council reconsider the composition of the SOE search committee. There were 3 slots for DSB faculty on the DSB search committee, but because there are so many fewer faculty in SOE, there were 2 SOE slots plus 1 CAS-Math/Science slot for the SOE search. In light of the contrasting composition of the two search committees, a member of the SOE faculty has asked that "the School of Engineering be permitted to have a majority of members representing the engineering faculty on the selection committee". Engineers have particular expertise that will be valuable for this search.
Professor Lane said that he agrees with the SOE that they may need more engineering faculty on this search committee.

Motion [Nantz/Lane]: to add a SOE faculty member to the search.

Professor Dennin asked how many faculty are in the SOE. Dean Beal replied that there are ten faculty, five tenured faculty.

Dean Beal spoke for the motion, and wanted to discuss the expertise of each of the SOE faculty. Professor Mulvey suggested that the Council suspend the rules and allow Dean Beal to discuss the composition of the search committee. There were no objections. Dean Beal spoke about the differences engineering faculty would bring to the table and described the broad range of expertise of the SOE faculty who were willing to serve on the committee.

Professor Nantz asked Dean Beal what changes he would like to the SOE Dean's Search Committee. Dean Beal replied that the SOE search committee should have the same composition as other schools' search committees.

Professor Lane spoke in favor of the motion, saying that the SOE has the right to have the same number of members on their search committee as the DSB search committee.

Professor Dennin asked if we are adding one faculty to the committee. Professor Nantz replied yes.

Professor Walker then spoke against the motion, saying that this motion would make this search committee larger than the DSB Search Committee. He said that the AC should remove the at-large slot to have the same number of people on the committee as the DSB Committee. Professor Nantz said that she just wants to vote for three SOE faculty on the SOE Dean Search Committee.

Professor Keenan asked SVPAA Fitzgerald if he was ok with having another person on the committee. He said that the Academic Council does not set the number of people on the search committees. SVPAA Fitzgerald replied that he will be ok with as many as the Academic Council decides, but the more people, the more difficult it gets to coordinate meetings. He would be happy if the two committees have the same number of people.

Professor Nantz spoke in favor of the motion. She said that proportionally business has more faculty.

Professor Mulvey also spoke in favor of the motion.

Professor Keenan spoke in favor of the motion. He said that important extenuating circumstances exist in this case. Dean Beal should have three faculty from the SOE. In addition, there's interest in having Math and Science and Engineering work together.

Professor Walker spoke against the motion again because there is a possibility of having four faculty from SOE.
Motion passed: 10 in favor, 2 opposed, 2 abstentions

The AC voted on the ballot for the SOE search committee. The following faculty were elected on the first ballot:
- Shanon Reckinger, Ryan Munden, and Shah Etemad from SOE
- Shelley Phelan, Dave Winn from CAS
- Carl Scheraga from DSB/SON/GSEAP
- Nancy Dallavalle (At Large)

The AC then voted on the ballot for the DSB Dean Search Committee. The following were elected on the first ballot:
- Cheryl Tromley, Cathy Giapponi, Walter Hlawitschka from DSB
- Phil Lane for CAS
- Anne Campbell from GSEAP/SON/ SOE
The following faculty were elected on the third ballot:
- Chris Huntley

7f: Questions from UCC and proposed answers from ACEC.

Professor Rakowitz presented the questions from the UCC. The UCC asked whether every time there is a change in a major requirement, does that come under the UCC’s responsibility to review?

Professor Rakowitz said that degree requirements are at the level of the school or the university. Major requirements are at the level of the department or school; they should not go to UCC for review. Interdisciplinary programs require UCC review. Although the Department of Modern Languages is not an interdisciplinary program, it allows courses from other majors to count towards its majors.

Motion: [Rakowitz/Dennin]: We therefore propose the following changes to Item 7 of Appendix 2 in the 11/09 edition of the JOR (additions underlined, deletions struck through):

7. Changes in School or University Degree Requirements:
   1. Curriculum Area Chair(s) to
   21. School Curriculum Committee(s) or Faculty of School(s) to
   32. Dean(s) to
   43. UCC

Motion Passed: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

The Program in Women’s Studies voted unanimously to change the name of the minor from “Women’s Studies” to “Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies.”

Motion [Rakowitz/Lane]: Women’s Studies name change to be recorded in the Journal of Record.
Motion Passed: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

7h. Question about investigating costs and savings of changing athletic divisions

Dr. Sapp made the following remarks to the Academic Council about Agenda item 7h:

“Fairfield University currently competes in NCAA Division I Athletics. The University supports 20 athletic teams in 12 sports: 9 men’s teams and 11 women’s teams. These 20 teams include more than 400 student-athletes (sharing approximately 100 full scholarships) and over 60 coaches. The total annual expense to support these 20 athletic teams in the NCAA Division I is over $15 million.

During the spring 2012 semester, presentations by the VP of Finance on the University’s budget and the President’s address to the faculty revealed that the budget for varsity athletics has doubled from just over $7 million in 2007 to over $15 million currently. Given the seriousness of the budget crisis described by the President and the VP of Finance, I wonder if the time is right for the University to consider reducing the financial support we spend on varsity sports by moving Fairfield University from NCAA Division I athletics to NCAA Division III athletics.

There are 450 colleges and universities currently competing in NCAA Division III Athletics (including many top-tier academic institutions with enrollments ranging from 500 to 20,000 students). The NCAA Division III requires universities like ours to support only 12 teams (including at least 6 women’s teams), instead of the 20 teams we currently support at Fairfield University. The NCAA Division III does not allow student-athletes to receive financial aid scholarships specifically for athletics. Thus, athletes are only eligible to receive financial aid based on academic qualifications in competition with the entire student body. To enforce this philosophy, the NCAA requires that, to maintain Division III status, the percentage of scholarship aid received by student-athletes must be roughly equivalent to the percentage of scholarship aid received by the entire student body.

As an (admittedly extreme) example of potential savings if Fairfield University moved to NCAA Division III athletics, note that our 12 least expensive teams are Men’s and Women’s Track, Men’s and Women’s Golf, Men’s and Women’s Rowing, Men’s and Women’s Tennis, Men’s and Women’s Swimming, Women’s Field Hockey, and Women’s Softball. The total annual expense for Fairfield University to support just these 12 athletic teams in the NCAA Division III would be approximately $2 million. Thus, the potential maximum savings in annual expenses by moving to NCAA Division III Athletics and funding only the least expensive athletic teams is approximately $13 million per year, funds that could be used to support additional need- and merit-based financial aid, as well as other necessary budgetary expenses.

Given the current budget climate, I believe that the Academic Council should be better informed regarding this as one of many options for the University. As such, I make the following motion.

MOTION: I move that the Academic Council Executive Committee appoint a five-member faculty ad hoc committee charged with gathering specific information regarding costs related to our NCAA Division I athletic programs. The committee will gather information relevant to this
issue and reporting back to the Academic Council during the fall 2012 semester. The committee is instructed to correspond with the Budget Committee, as well as other relevant faculty committees and administrators (e.g., Admissions and Scholarships, Advancement, VP of Finance, Athletics, and anyone else who has knowledge and expertise related to this inquiry). Specifically, the committee is instructed to gather information to answer to the following three questions:

1. What is our current annual budget related to all varsity athletics (including coaches' salaries, student scholarships, equipment/facilities, team travel, and everything else)?

2. What would be the total cost savings if Fairfield University moved from NCAA Division I to Division III (including possible reduction of the number of teams required, salaries of coaches/staff, student scholarships, maintenance of facilities, and everything else)?

3. What would be the anticipated--negative or positive--impact on fundraising/advancement, student admission/recruitment, and campus morale if the University moved from NCAA Division I to Division III athletics?

End of motion.

Sapp continued: To be clear, I am not yet advocating that the University move from NCAA Division I to Division III athletics; however, given the current and very serious budget climate, I feel that it would be wise for the Academic Council to be better informed regarding this as one of many options."

Professor Dennin said that we should investigate whether anyone would want to play us.

Professor Sapp asked which teams should we keep? If we keep men's basketball, which costs $2.5 million for 15 students and 7 coaches, we won’t be saving a lot of money. Women’s track costs $66 thousand per year

Professor Nantz asked if there a division III league for us? Professor Sapp replied yes, there is.

Professor Nantz asked how does this impact admissions? Professor Sapp replied that should be what the committee should investigate.

Professor Nantz said that the trustees trump whatever we do, and she hesitates to engage a large number of faculty in a useless effort. We should engage the trustees from the beginning.

Professor Walker stated that students tell him ‘if I'm not on this team, I'm out of Fairfield’. Professor Sapp replied that we could reposition scholarships.

Dean Crabtree asked, why is an athletic strategic plan unfolding outside the normal strategic plan?

SVPAA Fitzgerald said that seven sports were chosen for special emphasis. The athletic strategic plan includes scholarship money. The coaches sometimes divide the whole scholarships among
more than one student athlete. In addition, athletes have a higher than average GPA. Athletes also have lower incidents of binge drinking, as well as better time management practices. The proposed Health sciences complex, the renovation of the Rec-Plex, and a new Lacrosse stadium are in the comprehensive campaign as gift opportunities. Nor should we ignore the benefit to Fairfield of having 12 televised basketball games last year.

Motion [Sapp/Walker]: That the ACEC appoint members of an ad-hoc subcommittee to investigate issues 3 things:

1. Current annual budget on varsity athletics
2. Costs savings if Fairfield move to Division III
3. What would be the impact on morale?

Professor Preli asked where the members would come from. Professor Sapp replied that they will be comprised of AC members and a few other people, five faculty in all. They will consult with committees that have some of this in their purview. They will report back in Fall of next academic year.

Professor Shea spoke in favor and strongly encouraged there will be at least one female member or more.

SVPAA Fitzgerald spoke against the motion. He said that the handbook charges the Athletics Committee with this, and the AC should send this to the Athletics Committee. Professor Sapp replied that it goes beyond as the Athletics Committee as it involves Finance. Professor Lane said that the Athletic Committee cannot do this as they have a full agenda.

Motion Passed: 13 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.

7i. Memo from FDEC regarding final exam policy

The JoR and the Instructional Handbook state that 1/3 of the total grade is the final exam. We should send this to UCC to look at the whole issue of final assessments.

Dean Crabtree said that the instructional policies should be looked at; the structure of grading does not track well across disciplines. There is no enforcement of these policies. Most faculty are in violation of this policy; most of this is pedagogically sound, some is dereliction. The final exam time period should be used for pedagogy.

Professor Sapp said that exceptions include written notification. The syllabus counts as a written notification.

SVPAA Fitzgerald commented on how this affects us. Half of the professors did not have a final. We should reflect on current pedagogy.

Professor Nantz said that new faculty see this and assume that this should be done.
Professor Rakowitz said that most of us do responsible things with the final exam. Default in the policy is that there should be a final exam.

Professor Petrino said that English has moved to papers instead of an exam. The Policy puts emphasis on 1/3 of the grade to this.

**Motion [Rakowitz/Nantz]: Ask UCC to consider final exam policies, and if appropriate, make recommendations for changes to the JOR.**

**Motion Passed: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.**

Kathy thanked the AC executive committee for their work this year.

Move to Adjourn at 11:51.

Respectfully submitted,
Vishnu Vinekar
ACADEMIC COUNCIL
Emergency Summer Meeting
Monday, June 4, 2012
Draft Minutes of Meeting

Present: Professors Steven Bayne, Joe Dennin, Don Greenberg, Dennis Keenan, Irene Mulvey (GFS), Susan Rakowitz (ACES), David Sapp, Joyce Shea, Debra Strauss, Vishnu Vinekar.


Invited Guests:
  Members of the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees: Professors Chris Bernhardt, Betsy Bowen, Ginny Kelly, and Paula Gill Lopez.

Regrets: Professors Jocelyn Boryczka, Phil Lane, Kathy Nantz, Elizabeth Petrino, Rona Preli, Cheryl Tromley, and David Zera; Dean Don Gibson.

0. Election of temporary Chair.

Dennis Keenan volunteered and there were no objections.

1. Presidential courtesy.

SVPAA Fitzgerald announced that Lynn Babington started today as the new Dean of the School of Nursing. He reported that the NEASC report is pretty much done.—Professor Rakowitz interjected that she is on the NEASC Steering Committee and the NEASC report is nowhere near complete.

SVPAA Fitzgerald mentioned that the first year class looks good (as of last week it stood at 1032). The summer melt has started, but he is hoping it is a light one.

SVPAA Fitzgerald thanked the AC for electing faculty representatives to the two dean search committees.

SVPAA Fitzgerald reported that the Board of Trustees meets on Thursday, June 7th, and Faculty have been invited to send representatives to meet with the entire board.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty.

Professor Mulvey received a letter from Mark Reed on behalf of Paul Huston inviting faculty representatives to meet at 2 p.m. on Thursday with the full board. Prof. Mulvey read the following excerpts from the letter:

On behalf of Paul Huston, chair of the Board of Trustees, I write to you as Secretary of the General Faculty to invite faculty representatives to meet with members of the Board during its upcoming regular meeting on Thursday, June 7, 2012, at approximately 2 p.m.

As you know, the Administration and Faculty Salary Committee have been unable thus far to reach an agreement on a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the next
fiscal year. Therefore, the Board wishes to hear directly from faculty representatives on this matter. Additionally, the Board thinks discussion with faculty representatives about the Board's sense of its own role in exercising fiduciary responsibility for the University would be beneficial.

... 

Please note that this invitation does not replace or substitute for the normal engagement that faculty representatives have with the standing committees of the Board, either as individual representatives to committees or the Committee on Conference. It is my understanding that faculty representatives and the Committee on Conference will meet with their respective committees in the course of normal business on the morning of June 7.

As GFS and organizer of the faculty presentation she invited the two other faculty members of the ACEC (Rona Preli, and Susan Rakowitz), the FSC Chair (Joe Dennin), and the Chair of the Committee on Conference (Betsey Bowen) to join her as the faculty representatives. She also asked Profs Dennin and Bowen each to invite one other faculty member from their respective committees. They have already discussed how to move forward in coming up with a plan for the meeting, and any additional input from the AC would be appreciated.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary.

None.

4. Council Subcommittee Reports.

None.

5. Petitions for immediate hearing.

None.

6. Old Business.

None.


a. Update from the Faculty Salary Committee.

Professor Dennin reported that nothing has happened since the GFM last Thursday. Prof. Dennin said that he received an email from VP Dolan late on Wednesday proposing new language concerning the 95th percentile and the financial package. In that email with regard to the commitment to the 95th percentile VP Dolan said that "mutually approved" could be added back into the "revised benchmarking system" language in the most recent proposal from the administration as long as it includes the "gloss" that if the administration and faculty cannot agree on a mutually approved benchmarking system, the Board of Trustees would then decide what the benchmarking system would be. Prof. Dennin said clearly language regarding the 95th percentile is still a huge stumbling block. Prof. Dennin said that the FSC has not yet met to discuss the changes proposed in the late Wednesday email from VP Dolan.
Professor Mulvey said that she is extremely angry right now. For the administration to chit chat with the FSC as if it were business as usual is unacceptable. The FSC should respond to the administration with terms that the faculty would be willing to accept. We have run out of time because the administration was never empowered to make an agreement that the faculty could accept. The FSC should not act as if it is business as usual.

**MOTION [Mulvey/Sapp]: that the Academic Council suggests that the Faculty Salary Committee respond to VP Dolan after the Board of Trustees meeting on Thursday with terms that the FSC is confident that the General Faculty would accept.**

Prof. Dennin said that he has a slight concern whether he’d be confident in what the faculty would accept.

Prof. Greenberg asked whether the intention with this motion was that, if the administration rejects this faculty proposal that that would be the end of negotiations and we would have no MOU?

Prof. Mulvey responded that she was not thinking as far ahead as that. She would like to get a written response to VP Dolan, and she is uncomfortable with handbook committees working throughout the summer.

Prof. Epstein said that, as we reached midnight, there was a flurry of emails between the administrative team and the FSC, but he thinks that all year long this has never really been a discussion between the FSC and the administration—it has really been a discussion between faculty and the BOT, but that is not the way it is supposed to work.

Dean Franzosa said it would be outrageously inappropriate for faculty to negotiate with the BOT.

Prof. Sapp asked Prof. Mulvey whether she was suggesting a particular time line? Prof. Mulvey said that she would leave that up to the FSC, but her point is that it would be inappropriate to expect the FSC to negotiate all summer back and forth.

SVPAA Fitzgerald said that the administration and FSC have moved toward each other, but when we come to the table each of us has a constituency to answer to. We have been making progress, for example drawing a distinction between a benchmark and benchmarking system. The thing that worries him most is how much trust has been lost. He said that he is confident that we will eventually come up with a deal, but the economic downturn and subsequent loss of trust has really hurt the atmosphere of the university.

Prof. Dennin said, I agree with much of what SVPAA Fitzgerald said, but most of the time it is his constituency that has taken things off the table, so this really raises the issue of whether we are really negotiating with the BOT through an intermediary.

Professor Greenberg said it has never been like this before. Sure, we have gone to the 11th hour before, but nothing like this. He thinks the problem is that we have a very weak President—the very fact that the BOT has invited the faculty to speak to the board on Thursday, and the President would allow this, is evidence of how weak the President is. Whoever is driving this (BOT or President) has fundamentally changed the way the negotiations work. Instead of providing a rationale that makes sense about why it is necessary to move away from a comparison with IIa schools, the administration has said, you will just have to trust us that we...
have your best interest at heart. This is not a good way to operate, and the underlying attitude is to emasculate the faculty to the point that they do not have any meaningful say in their compensation.

Prof. Gil Lopez asked whether it was ever asked straight out who wants to get rid of the commitment to the 95th percentile?

Prof. Greenberg stated that he thinks it is the President.

SVPAA Fitzgerald stated that the President is interested in a benchmarking system that allows adjustment over the course of the next fiscal year—maybe it is the 95th, but maybe it isn’t.

Prof. Epstein asked, haven't we proposed solutions like this from the beginning of the year?

SVPAA Fitzgerald responded that there had been some good proposals.

Prof. Dennin emphasized that the current question is not, is this the right benchmark?, the question is, how is the benchmark going to be arrived at? We said it must be mutually agreed on. The administration in their final proposals say that the BOT will determine the system if there is no agreement, and this is unacceptable.

**Motion passed unanimously: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.**

**7b. Discussion with the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees regarding their 6/7 meeting with the Board.**

The Chair of the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees (Betsy Bowen) said that the CoC will meet with the BOT on Thursday at 8 a.m. The agenda is set by the SVPAA and the CoC. The meeting is allotted two hours. At this meeting the first hour will be devoted to the portfolio review presentation. After that they will present seven handbook amendments approved by the AC (April 16, 2012) and General Faculty (April 27, 2012), and the other issue will likely be the situation with the MOU.

Chair Keenan asked whether new Council members understand that we give advice to the CoC before their meetings with the BOT, and he asked us first to give advice concerning the seven HB amendments.

SVPAA Fitzgerald noted that the CoC will present these HB amendments to the Academic Affairs Committee of the BOT, the chair of the AA committee will subsequently inform the full BOT, and then the motions will go before the full BOT in the fall.

Seeing no advice concerning the HB amendments, Chair Keenan opened the floor for general comments or advice for the CoC.

Dean Franzosa asked whether there is a point at which the AAC reports back to the full BOT concerning what happens in these meetings. SVPAA Fitzgerald reported that the chair of the AA committee summarizes the session for the BOT.

Prof. Dennin said that it might be useful to have Betsy share with them the faculty's unhappiness as illustrated by the faculty's votes in the last two GFMs.
Prof. Mulvey added that perhaps the CoC could talk about what happened at the GFM on Thursday, including the faculty vote to discuss a vote of no confidence in the President at the meeting in September.

Prof. Huntley suggested that before the CoC discusses why we are upset, maybe they could first highlight what the faculty has done over the past year.

Prof. Bowen noted that so far she is hearing the theme of insuring that the AA committee understand the mood of the faculty. So, what do we want out of this beyond their knowing how fraught this is? They will go back not just in their formal presentation, but also in their conversations at lunch—what else do we want?

Prof. Dennin mentioned the satisfaction study from last march—undergraduates clearly love faculty even when they are dissatisfied with the university as a whole.

Prof. Mulvey would like them to know that the 95th percentile is a hill that faculty will die on. The SVPAA says they will continue compensating faculty at a high level—those are just empty words.

Prof. Strauss mentioned that the US News rankings are partly based on the strength of faculty. We need to get the board to realize that we need support for the 95th percentile in order to attract and retain such excellent faculty.

Prof. Shea said prior to making these points, the CoC should make it clear that the faculty is extremely aware of the fiscal situation, and we have tried to respond in a fiscally responsible way, while the administration just keeps insisting that the faculty don't understand.

Prof. Strauss expressed concerned about how the current situation will affect the NEASC report. We had been proud of the progress we were making with our joint governance processes, but now that is in jeopardy, and it is something that will have to be reported back to NEASC.

Prof. Rafalski asked whether everyone on the BOT is aware of the faculty representatives meeting with the full BOT, and whether it would it be meaningful to address the fact that this is happening?

Prof. Bowen asked whether the question was whether this would undercut the CoC's meeting with the AAC?

Prof. Mulvey reiterated that, as per the letter from Mark Reed on behalf of Paul Huston, the meeting with the full board does not does replace the regular committee interactions.

Prof. Gill Lopez noted that much of what we have asked the CoC to discuss, they did discuss at their last meeting, and she noted that with regard to the importance of the 95th percentile, one member of the AA committee said that, in these financial times, the 84th percentile was more realistic. She said that the only thing they haven't raised previously are the votes at the last two General Faculty meetings, because they had not happened by the time of the meeting.

Prof. Rakowitz said it is important for the board to understand three things: 1) how strongly the faculty believes in the importance of the commitment to the 95th percentile; 2) how the failure of the process ties into the NEASC report; and 3) that the faculty is not angry because we being asked to take a cut—we are angry about taking a disproportionate cut when the financial problems are not a result of our own doing.
Prof. Sapp mentioned the vote at the last GFM to put a discussion of a vote of no confidence on the next agenda, and he asked, when was the last time we had such a discussion in a GFM? Prof. Greenberg replied, not in his memory.

Prof. Epstein indicated that this should make it clear that our real concerns are not about compensation, but about the leadership of the university.

Prof. Mulvey suggested that the CoC could mention the things the FWC Action Committee has done: the rally for unity, the signage at the meeting, the leaflets at commencement, and the fact that this committee is still continuing to meet.

Dean Crabtree said that it was her understanding that a motion to boycott orientation was shot down, and she cautioned that the board will be concerned about things that will affect the recruitment of our students.

Prof. Strauss warned, however, that we should not make reassurances, because we simply do not know what the FWC Action Committee will decide to do.

Prof. Dennin noted that the CoC can speak to the history of their actions and how responsibly they have been done.

Prof. Mulvey agreed, but added that they are an independent committee full of young faculty members many of whom are extremely angry. We cannot be sure of what actions they will take and it would be misleading of us to reassure the Board about things we don’t know with any certainty.

Prof. Huntley said it is more important to talk about the motivations behind the actions not the actions themselves—it is for the institutional well-being.

SVPAA Fitzgerald said he would like to make a small suggestion, as a benevolent outsider, that the CoC clearly distinguish the FWC Action Committee from the ad hoc group of faculty responsible for the Trends Memo.

Prof. Mulvey agreed that this is an important distinction that should be emphasized. Then, she reiterated that we should be careful what we say about the FWC Action Committee. People are very angry, and we are not the FWC Action Committee and we cannot speak for the Action Committee.

Chair Keenan asked Prof. Bowen and members of the CoC whether they needed more particular direction from the Council.

Prof. Bowen replied that she thinks the CoC can work with the advice they have heard from the Council.

MOTION [Dennin/Shea] to adjourn.

Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven M. Bayne
Date: September 3, 2012  
To: Academic Council  
From: Susan Rakowitz, General Faculty Secretary  
Re: Academic Council Meetings and Roster

Meeting Dates for 2012-2013

According to the Faculty Handbook,

The first meeting of the Academic Council shall be on the Monday of the first full week of the academic year, and subsequently the first Monday of every month. Otherwise the Council shall determine the frequency of additional meetings and the duration of its meetings, as dictated by the nature and volume of its work, consistent with speedy action on all outstanding issues.

Because the first Monday in April is Easter Monday, and the first Monday in May is after classes end, I propose moving the April meeting to 4/8 and moving the May meeting to 4/29. Those changes will need to be approved by the Academic Council. With that in mind, here are the meeting dates for 2012-2013. Note that the Council always has the right to add meeting dates if necessary. All meetings are 3:30-5 in CNS 200.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 10, 2012</td>
<td>February 4, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1, 2012</td>
<td>March 4, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 5, 2012</td>
<td>April 8, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 3, 2012</td>
<td>April 29, 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic Council Roster

- Phil Lane, Behavioral and Social Sciences, 2013
- Dennis Keenan, Humanities, 2013
- David Sapp*, Arts and Sciences at large, 2013
- Elizabeth Petrino, Humanities, 2013
- Steve Bayne*, Humanities, 2013
- Brian Walker**, Arts and Sciences at large, 2013
- Joyce Shea, School of Nursing, 2013
- Cheryl Tromley, Dolan School of Business, 2013
- Joe Dennin, Natural Science/Mathematics/Engineering, 2013
- David Downie, Behavioral and Social Sciences, 2014
- Shawn Rafalski, Natural Science/Mathematics/Engineering, 2014
- James He, Dolan School of Business, 2014
- Wendy Kohli, GSEAP, 2014
- Roxana Walker-Canton, Arts and Sciences at large, 2014
- Ginny Kelly, GSEAP, 2014
- Chris Huntley, Dolan School of Business, 2014
- Bob Epstein, Arts and Sciences at large, 2014
- Paul Fitzgerald, S.J., Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, ex officio, vote
- Robbin Crabtree, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, ex officio, no vote
- Lynn Babington, Dean, School of Nursing, ex officio, no vote
- Don Gibson, Dean, Dolan School of Business, ex officio, no vote
- Jack Beal, Dean, School of Engineering, ex officio, no vote
- Susan Franzosa, Dean, GSEAP, ex officio, no vote
- Susan Rakowitz, Secretary of the General Faculty, ex officio, vote

CHAIR:  
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY:
*to be replaced Spring 2013  **to be replaced 2012-2013
Taking Minutes of Academic Council Meetings

Below are guidelines for taking minutes of Academic Council meetings, drawn from requirements in the Faculty Handbook and Journal of Record, and on what has worked well in the past.

1. The Faculty Handbook specifies that the Council minutes “shall indicate the votes of members (i.e., tally or roll call) as well as major proposals and their proponents and opponents.” Most votes on the Council are taken by tally, in which case the total number of votes for and against need to be recorded in the minutes. If a roll call vote is taken, the name of each Council member voting in favor and against needs to be recorded in the minutes.

2. As stated in the Handbook, “the Academic Council shall be the executive arm of the General Faculty. As such, it is empowered to consider, make decisions and make recommendations on any matter of academic concern that falls within the purview of the faculty, except for matters specifically reserved to the General Faculty. It shall also provide the opportunity for exchange of opinion between faculty and administration in the ordinary working of the University.” It is important that accurate minutes be recorded, as the Academic Council minutes are generally the only way that faculty will know what the Council has done on their behalf, and why it was done.

3. The Handbook also specifies that records of Handbook committees contain minority as well as majority opinion. This has been a good practice for Council minutes as well, and Council minutes should continue to follow this practice.

4. The Journal of Record (1/22/68) requires that “the gist of all communications to the Academic Council be published in the Council minutes.” The communications themselves, including committee reports, documentation, etc. are included in the agenda and packet distributed before every meeting, copies of which are maintained by the General Faculty Secretary.

5. The Council acts by voting on motions. To avoid misunderstandings at a later date, it is essential that the exact wording of a motion be known before the Council votes and that the exact wording be recorded in the minutes.

6. To facilitate consultation of the minutes:
   a. In the minutes, number the agenda items exactly as the items are numbered on the agenda for that meeting.
   b. Provide a separate boldface caption for each agenda item.
   c. Place each motion in an indented and boldface paragraph, and indicate in boldface the result of any vote on the motion.

7. The Faculty Handbook specifies that “the Recording Secretary shall be responsible for the preparation of the minutes in consultation with the Executive Secretary.” Minutes should be prepared as soon as possible after the meeting, ideally within one week. The minutes should be clearly labeled as draft minutes, and forwarded to the Council’s Executive Secretary. The Recording Secretary is not responsible for distributing the minutes.
To: Fr. Paul Fitzgerald, Senior Academic Vice President  
From: Mary Ann Palazzi, Coordinator of Programs for Student-Athletes  
Re: Spring 2012 Semester Conflicts with Final Exams and Scheduled Athletic Contests 

Men’s Basketball: No Conflicts  
Women’s Basketball: No Conflicts  
Women’s Swimming: No Conflicts  
Men’s Swimming: No Conflicts  
Baseball: Saturday, May 5, 2012 – Finals (Home vs. Manhattan)  
       Sunday, May 6, 2012 – Reading Day (Home vs. Manhattan)  
       Friday, May 11, 2012 – Finals (@ Siena)  
Softball: Saturday, May 5, 2012 – Finals (@ Manhattan)  
       Sunday, May 6, 2012 – Reading Day (Home vs. Seina)  
       Thursday, May 10, 2012 – Finals (MAAC Tournament)  
       Friday, May 11, 2012 – Finals (MAAC Tournament)  
Men’s Lacrosse: Thursday, May 3, 2012- Reading Day- ECAC Tournament  
       Friday, May 4, 2012-Reading Day- ECAC Tournament  
       Saturday, May 5, 2012- ECAC Tournament- Flew back from Denver in the early morning  
Women’s Lacrosse: No Conflicts  
Men’s Rowing: Thursday, May 10, 2012 – Finals – Leave at 1:00 PM  
       Friday, May 11, 2012 - Finals  
Women’s Rowing: Thursday, May 10, 2012 – Finals – Leave at 1:00 PM  
       Friday, May 11, 2012 - Finals  
Men’s and Women’s Tennis went to the NCAA Tournament on the following dates during FINALS.  
       Thursday, May 10, 2012-FINALS  
       Friday, May 11, 2012- FINALS  
Men’s Golf: No Conflicts  
       Women’s Golf: No Conflicts
Memo

To: Rona Preli, Chair, Academic Council
    Susan Rakowitz, Executive Secretary, Academic Council

From: Meredith Wallace Kazer, School of Nursing Graduate Program Director

CC: Suzanne Campbell, School of Nursing Interim Dean
    Joyce Shea, School of Nursing Representative, Academic Council

Date: 4/28/12

Re: Closure of School of Nursing Health Care Management Track

The Healthcare Management (HCM) track in the School of Nursing has experienced low enrollment over the past several years with a current cohort of only three students. This may be for several reasons:

- Students who may have been interested in this program in the past are now seeking Master’s in Business Administration (MBA) or Masters in Public Administration (MPA) degrees.

- The development of the Clinical Nurse Leader program in 2006 presented a potential option for HCM students.

If the track were to continue, substantial revisions would be needed to maintain compliance with the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) standards for graduate education.

Given the low enrollment and need for added resources for program revisions, as well as the availability of several alternative programs within the School and University, faculty in Fairfield University’s School of Nursing voted to close the HCM track on December 9, 2011. The motion moved to the Educational Planning Committee. On February 16, 2012, the Educational Planning Committee unanimously voted to close the HCM Track. We are seeking permission from the Academic Council to formally close the HCM Track.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF NURSING
Faculty Organization and Curriculum Meeting Minutes: Excerpts

MEETING DATE: 12/9/11
TIME: 11:00am-12:30pm (J. Shea – Recorder)

MEMBERS PRESENT: Suzanne Campbell, Suzanne Chaplik, Jacqueline Conelius, Tess Deshefy-Longhi, Sheila Grossman, Meredith Kazer, Alison Kris (Chair), Dee Lippman, Kathleen Lovanio, Diana Mager, Mary Murphy, Eileen O’Shea, Carol Pomarico, Terry Quell, Joyce Shea.

PROXY: Held by Sheila Grossman for Kate Wheeler

GUESTS: Sara Dingman (DNP Student)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Discussion/Decision</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Point Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Motion to close the Healthcare Management Track.</td>
<td>M. Kazer gave a follow-up to the motion made last spring to suspend admissions to the HCM track. All HCM students have now chosen to move either to the CNL program or to a NP program. S. Campbell described efforts to reconfigure the current Masters’ programs to better meet the needs of future students and clinical partners. Motion to approve the closure of HCM track at the SON.</td>
<td>S. Grossman/D. Mager. Motion approved unanimously.</td>
<td>M. Kazer/ S. Campbell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational Planning Committee Minutes 2/16/12: Excerpts

In attendance: Professors Steven Bachelor, Peter Bayers, Cathy Giapponi, Sheila Grossman, Olivia Hariott, Barbara Welles-Nystrom, Michael Pagano, Carl Scheraga (chair), Dean Don Gibson, and SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald.

2. Discussion of closing of the Health Care Management (HCM) Program in the School of Nursing
Dr Grossman presented a document concerning the program in question. She cited low enrollments as the main reason that the program should be closed. The School of Nursing appreciates the opportunity for collaborating with the Dolan School of Business, but the program as it exists currently is not attracting students, probably because the job market for this skill set no longer exists. The program would also have to undergo serious restructuring in order to maintain compliance with AACN standards.

Dr Pagano moved to accept the School of Nursing's proposal to close the HCM program, and Dr Welles-Nystrom seconded.

Dr Gibson asked if there is a consensus in the School of Nursing about this proposal. Dean Grossman replied that the School does not like closing programs in general, but that this is a pretty clear case and that there is consensus to close it. SVPAA Fitzgerald commented that a "health systems administration" within the MPA program would be a good replacement for this program. Dr Grossman agreed, again citing the benefits of interdisciplinary courses for the nursing students.

The motion to close the HCM program passed unanimously.

Date: September 3, 2012
To: Academic Council  
From: Susan Rakowitz, GFS  
Re: Non-Discrimination and Harassment Policy

In 2010, on the recommendation of an Academic Council subcommittee, the AC approved a Non-Discrimination and Harassment Policy for inclusion in the Journal of Record. The same policy is included in the Student Handbook.

This summer, Tom Pellegrino, VP for Student Affairs and a member of the subcommittee that drafted the original policy, added a section on Bias Response at the end of the policy in the Student Handbook. This section was added "in response to a request this past year from the President’s Institutional Diversity Council (PIDC) to look into establishing a protocol for responding to incidences of bias that are not already/otherwise covered by the Non Discrimination and Harassment policy" (email from T. Pellegrino to S. Rakowitz, 6/26/12).

The added text is:

C. Bias Response

There may be instances where acts of bias, which are defined as language or behaviors that demonstrate bias against persons or groups because of race, color, ethnicity, religion, faith, national origin, political orientation, or sexual orientation occur, but the perpetrator(s) cannot be identified and/or the acts of bias do not rise to the level of discrimination or harassment for purposes of Title IX or this policy. In those instances, any member of the University community impacted by the acts of bias are nonetheless encouraged to report the behavior to the Bias Response Team. The Bias Response team serves to advocate for victims of bias, whether individual or group. The Bias Response Team is uniquely situated to assist the University community in situations including, but not necessarily limited to, those in which the perpetrator of the bias cannot be identified and/or when the behavior in question does not constitute discrimination or rise to the level of harassment for Title IX purposes. The Bias Response team is made up of campus partners from academics, student affairs and the student body. The Bias Response team is headed by the vice president for student affairs or her/his designee as well as the Director of Human Resources or her/his designee. Any member of the University community wishing to contact the Bias Response Team may do so by contacting either of those offices.

I propose that the Council approve this text for inclusion in the Journal of Record at the end of the Non-Discrimination and Harassment Policy.
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Proposal for a New Graduate Program

Masters of Public Administration

New Program Routing Process

This report has been prepared in accordance with the EPC’s “Guidelines and Procedures for Submission of New Program Proposals” (Journal of Record, 10/2/95). This document specifies nine separate criteria to be addressed in support of the program proposal:

1) Description, Overview, and Summary of the Program
2) Need for the Program
3) Rationale for the Program
4) Objectives
5) Impact
6) Program Detail
7) Administrative Structure and Governance
8) Resources
9) Projections for the Future

This proposal will be routed according to the procedures delineated in the Journal of Record and confirmed by members of the Executive Committee of the Academic Council. Thus, the proposal will proceed as follows:

1. MPA Working Group; this included consultation among all relevant academic departments
2. Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee (ASCC) – CAS is MPA’s home
3. Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences (with appropriate consultation with the Dean of the Dolan School of Business given listing of DSB courses; DSB Dean also was a member of the MPA Working Group)
4. (CAS Faculty – optional; we are not pursuing this option)
5. Educational Planning Committee (EPC)
6. Academic Council
7. State of Connecticut Board of Higher Education

In each case, the reviewing unit votes if appropriate, attaches minutes and a recommendation, and then routes the proposal to the next unit. Professor Mark LeClair, Chair of the Economics Department and of the MPA Working Group, will be the official shepherd of this proposal.
1. **Description, overview and summary**

It is proposed that Fairfield University create a new graduate program in Public Administration. The Masters in Public Administration is targeted at individuals in the public and nonprofit sectors, including those in state and city governments, public hospitals, and nonprofit organizations. The MPA is now considered the terminal degree for professionals in these sectors of the economy, and is rapidly becoming a requirement for advancement.

The basics of the MPA curriculum were constructed during a workshop in May of 2011, which consisted of interested faculty and administrators (henceforth know as the MPA Working Group – Members are listed in Appendix 1). The Working Group consulted materials from many MPA programs around the country, including the top-ranked programs and programs at institutions similar to Fairfield University. Materials from the accrediting body for MPA programs, the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) were consulted. The MPA Working Group concluded that Nonprofit Management and City/State Administration would be the first two tracks offered, although the potential exists to add additional tracks in the future.

The proposed MPA will require students to complete a 15-credit common Core, a three-credit course in Ethics and Multiculturalism from a menu of options, six credits in Communication, and 12 credits in one of two concentrations (details in section 6 below), which will include a capstone seminar. Students will finish the program with a six-credit internship (may be waived for those with prior experience in a relevant position). Thus, program completion will require 42 credits.

**Summary Features of the Program:**

- The MPA resides in the College of Arts & Sciences. Courses from disciplines within the College as well as from other schools at Fairfield will be considered for inclusion based on the standards developed by the MPA professional associations and needs identified by the Director and Steering Committee in consultation with the relevant Deans.

- Office of Graduate Admission will handle admissions according to all policies and procedures currently in effect for other CAS graduate programs. Proof of successful completion of a bachelor’s degree from a regionally accredited institution is required. GRE is not required.

- Development of program materials and program marketing is managed by the Office of Graduate and Continuing Studies Marketing and Enrollment Management. As much as
possible marketing of Fairfield graduate programs should maximize synergy and centralized budgets.

- To meet the scheduling needs of working professionals, courses will be taught in the evenings, as well as in online and hybrid formats.

- The program is governed according to College of Arts & Sciences governance document and procedures under the supervision of the Office of the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences and in consultation with the appropriate committees of the faculty and academic departments in the College.

- Faculty selection and supervision, curriculum oversight, and student advising are directed by the MPA Director and Steering Committee in consultation with relevant academic departments. See faculty CVs in Appendix 8.

- Within courses, learning activities reflect current theory and trends as well as issues related to the specific tracks of this program.

- Active learning, critical reflection, and experiential pedagogical practices are encouraged to help students in this program gain the knowledge and skills necessary to become effective professionals and lifelong learners.

- The MPA Degree requires a total of 42 credits (11 courses + 6 credits of internship + 3 credits of capstone, which will be offered in a course-based format).

- Upon matriculation and with maintenance of good standing in the program, the students in the MPA program are granted the same rights and privileges as all other graduate students at Fairfield University. They gain access to Stagweb, open a Fairfield University email account, and gain access to the library. They may obtain ID cards that will enable them to join the recreation complex, gain access to the computer labs and receive a printing credit on their Stagcard. Upon graduation they become alumni of the University.

2. Need for the Program

The need for the program can be framed both externally and internally. At present, those wishing to secure an MPA must do so through the University of Connecticut (Storrs) or the University of New Haven. The latter program does not have a track in Nonprofit Management. See Appendix 6 for a brief listing of nearby programs.
Thus, Fairfield County, home to several key cities such as Bridgeport, Fairfield, and Norwalk along with a great number of nonprofit organizations, is without a nearby MPA. As well, programs in the broader geographical area, such as those at Wagner University are not accredited (the Working Group intends for the program to seek accreditation in year 3), and we believe our program as launched will draw from all of Fairfield County, and parts of Westchester County.

The initial interest in creating an MPA at Fairfield was driven by faculty interest in pursuing a program that supports the mission of the University. Many of the nonprofits in Fairfield County have international stature (e.g. Americares and Save the Children). Managers working in the nonprofit sector typically have entered the field as a result of personal interest – few have stopped to get the MPA along the way. Additionally, Fairfield’s MPA will launch with a second focus on city/state government management as an optional track, a field that is expanding as more is required of professionals in public service. As these sectors are increasingly professionalized, the MPA is going to become an expectation for professionals in these fields. The mission of Fairfield University, with its strong emphasis on service to others, suggests that an MPA would fit naturally with our existing programs and with the culture and values of the institution.

Although MPA programs flourish by offering multiple tracks to service multiple constituencies, we propose to launch this program at Fairfield with just two tracks, and to explore adding others as the program grows and in response to student interests. Although Hospital Administration and/or Healthcare Management is a natural track, particularly given the importance and growth of the School of Nursing at Fairfield, the opportunity for synergy with the SON, and the growth of the healthcare segment of the overall economy, we are not ready to propose such a track at this time (waiting for a new Dean to begin her/his tenure, among other factors).

**Market Survey:**

In April, 2011, Institutional Research (with lead faculty input) developed and administered an online panel survey that received a response from almost 600 individuals who met the following four criteria: (1) ages between 25 and 50, (2) Live in surrounding five counties, (3) attained a BA, interested in an MA and (4) Work in a related industry: government, health care management, nonprofit and private research. From the initial number of 586, 165 (28%) indicated that they were potentially interested in an MPA degree. The most popular areas of concentration were nonprofit management and social policy. The 165 students also indicated a strong preference for primarily face-to-face, evening instruction.
From this group of potential students interested in an MPA program, 116 indicated that they were likely to enroll in ANY MPA program within the next five years; moreover, 76 indicated they were likely to enroll in a FAIRFIELD MPA program within the next five years. None of the 40 potential students who responded negatively to attending Fairfield lived in Fairfield county, suggesting that proximity was a top priority in their decision. The results of this survey were presented to the MPA working group over the summer of 2011, and key information including areas and concentration and formatting of classes was taking into consideration in the development of this program proposal.

Further, In March 2012 there was a meeting at Fairfield University about new initiatives in Bridgeport with a presentation from Mayor Bill Finch, his staff, and BRBC's Paul Timpanelli. As discussed in that meeting with representatives from every division of the University, there are many opportunities to partner with the city, some of which are noted below (with potential MPA-related opportunities are highlighted):

- Bridgeport initiatives around Health Sciences (new magnet school, hospitals, Yale-NH expansions, etc.): opportunities for Fairfield for clinical placements, regional sim lab management, potential nurse-managed clinics, curricular planning, teacher ed partnerships, biomedical and medical technology collaborations, etc.
- "Eco" initiatives (partnership with Dupont, GE, Sikorsky): collaborative opportunities with lake remediation, solar park, environmental education, sustainability projects, etc.
- Arts – rehabbed arts space, "City Canvases" public art grant received by Bridgeport
- Centers for Innovations and Entrepreneurship – opportunity to collaborate on “Innovation” grant application, on planning for business incubators and entrepreneurship (energy, technology, transit projects?)
- Fairfield’s new MPA program will create opportunities for student internships, along with advisory group participation from Bridgeport government officials and professionals in related fields
- Fairfield’s Cities focus – multidisciplinary opportunities to collaborate with Bridgeport (with a request to look at cities regionally)
- Grant opportunity – explore Community Outreach Partnership grant (from HUD) based on existing relationships with Bridgeport and focused on 2-3 partnership areas/outcomes.

Bridgeport, CT was recently named among the World’s Most Productive Cities. The Brookings Institute has named Bridgeport as the fifth most productive city in the world joining Hartford, Oslo, Norway, San Jose, and Abu Dhabi in the top five. The report cited Bridgeport’s medical sector as an important source of revenue, “in fact, three of its five top employers are in the medical sector.”

With municipal momentum and a strong vision, the time is ripe for partnership between the City and Fairfield University’s MPA program.
3. **Rationale**

Initiating an MPA program is in line with other current initiatives on the part of the University to expand its graduate offerings. The MPA will be housed in the College of Arts and Sciences, joining a limited number of offerings that have arisen out of CAS. This will be a unique opportunity for the skills of our faculty to be applied to a new endeavor outside of undergraduate teaching, particularly those faculty members in departments across the social and behavioral sciences.

Perhaps more importantly, the MPA degree as it is structured in point 6 below, is an outward-looking program that will deeply involve students in the life of the community, consistent with Fairfield’s Mission Statement:

Fairfield has a further obligation to the wider community of which it is a part, to share with its neighbors its resources and its special expertise for the betterment of the community as a whole. Faculty and students are encouraged to participate in the larger community through service and academic activities. But most of all, Fairfield serves the wider community by educating its students to be socially aware and morally responsible persons.

All MPA programs emphasize careers in the broader community, whether through public service, employment at nonprofit institutions, or working with international institutions. The two tracks that are initially part of the Fairfield MPA, nonprofit management and city/state government, are perhaps the most directed towards service to others, consistent with the University’s mission.

**Placing the MPA into Fairfield’s existing curriculum:**

The MPA does not replace any existing programs. Fairfield undergraduates who are interested in “service” professions would find the MPA an excellent way of continuing their education beyond the bachelor’s degree. The MPA Working Group also expects that there will be significant cross-registration between Public Administration, Grad Communication, and Grad Business students (beyond just simply the required courses), as these programs all offer complementary skill sets.

The MPA would expand Fairfield’s offerings at the graduate level, and provide an additional opportunity for students looking for professional training after completing their BA. As the MPA becomes the expected degree for those working at nonprofits, or in certain divisions of city and state government, the demand for such a program is likely to rise.
The MPA program, as proposed, would have strong linkages with a number of graduate programs at the University. As noted in section 6 below, some courses are drawn from the graduate programs in American Studies, Communication, and Business Administration. The influx of students has the potential to support these programs, as some cross-registration is likely (e.g. MPA students taking an MBA course to strengthen the management component of their studies, or students taking extra Communication courses).

4. Objectives

The MPA program helps achieve goals outlined in the University Strategic Plan, as well as goals and objectives specific to MPA programs and particular learning outcomes for students.

A. University Goals and Outcomes

The University Strategic Plan offers further rationalization for the development of new, innovative, and revenue-generating endeavors such as the MPA program. In the introduction, for example, the Strategic Plan states:

In the highly competitive and extraordinarily dynamic landscape of higher education in the United States, Fairfield University offers a specific and distinctive voice, that of a young, vibrant, student-centered institution with a nationally recognized faculty that is generously grounded in both the breadth of the Catholic tradition and the academic rigor that characterizes Jesuit education. (p. 1)

Related to this larger context, the Strategic Plan calls for specific initiatives to be developed in relation to graduate education:

C. Enhance the quality of our graduate, professional, and part-time evening programs, and define and market that distinguishes Fairfield from other regional competitors, so that Fairfield University in the next decade will be known for our distinctive graduate and professional programs and the exceptional ways they serve our local communities and the society at large.

1. Increase the number of full-time faculty to ensure academic rigor, continuity of mission, and personalized education.

2. Use data to assess and analyze needs of prospective students to ascertain local, state, and regional needs that create opportunities for program
development; and to evaluate how Fairfield can be of service to diverse communities and to the common good.

3. Develop inter-departmental experiences for professional/graduate students to develop a deeper understanding of their vocation, examine pressing ethical issues in their professions, and create leadership for change in the world.

4. Strengthen efforts to develop strong alumni relations with this important segment of the Fairfield student community. (p. 13)

The MPA Working Group (soon-to-be Steering Committee), along with the participating academic departments with the support of the Dean, is prepared to provide an MPA program that is consistent with the character of the Strategic Plan: personal and student-centered learning environment; a rigorous curriculum with highly-qualified faculty; and a curriculum that incorporates global issues, cross-cultural competence, a required ethics course, experiential and community-based learning, and a capstone project. The program explicitly endeavors to help working adults examine pressing social, ethical, and professional issues and develop strong leadership abilities for contributions to and advancement in their chosen fields.

Given the interdisciplinary roots of public administration, students in the program will deepen their appreciation for the liberal arts as they come to see connections between the various academic disciplines that inform the program curriculum and that influence the understanding of issues faced in related professional work. Given the applied nature of the program, students will enhance their professional abilities and prospects, as they develop the skills necessary to address social and organizational problems and assume leadership positions in their chosen fields. Given the focus on community-based settings (such as non-profit organizations and government agencies), students additionally gain knowledge and skills that will strengthen their appreciation for diversity.

Further, the program as piloted and proposed here is grounded in strong professional market research, conducted by the Office of Graduate Program Marketing and Enrollment Management, with organizations in the surrounding area, members of relevant professional associations, alumni, students, and other University constituencies conducted over the past several years. Finally, we believe that this program can enhance Fairfield University’s relationships with the surrounding business communities, perhaps helping to develop partners for future collaborations, development initiatives, and other forms of institutional advancement.
B. MPA Program Learning Objectives

The primary objective of this program is to provide quality graduate education in the Jesuit tradition to constituencies in our surrounding area that serve needs articulated by students as well as those of employers.

Broad objectives of the Program include:

- To support the professional goals and aspirations of students;
- To prepare students for leadership positions through enhancing their knowledge and skills;
- To increase students’ sense of ethical action and appreciation for diversity;
- To foster the intellectual interests of the students and their appreciation for life-long learning;
- To cultivate recognition among organizations and agencies in the surrounding area of the benefits of a relationship with Fairfield University

Individual courses and program components may fulfill these objectives in partial and distinctive ways; the curriculum and pedagogy collectively address these objectives. Individual courses additionally articulate specific learning objectives related to the content area, the literature in the field, and the accepted research practices of the field.

Secondary objectives include enhancing Fairfield University’s ability to generate new revenues, meeting the needs for graduate study in the surrounding community, and helping the University remain competitive within the rapidly changing educational environment and for the diverse student populations in the surrounding area.

C. Student Learning Outcomes

Student learning objectives and outcomes were developed by the MPA Working Group based on understanding the competencies MPA graduates should demonstrate, the environment in which the students would be utilizing the competencies, interface with local professionals during program development stages, and the articulated needs of respondents to the market research.

Specific student learning outcomes

The MPA program has seven demonstrable student learning outcomes, each of which has been mapped throughout the curriculum. Using an ePortfolio template, students will
identify artifacts from their core and concentration courses/internships/capstone, which demonstrate these outcomes. No assessment work will be conducted for the first two years of the program in order to allow time for the inaugural and subsequent cohorts to substantially populate their ePortfolios. Starting year three, and every year thereafter, members of the MPA assessment committee will identify which outcome(s) will be assessed in an annual iterative process that reflects best practices in assessment. The design of the assessment project will be determined by the assessment committee, but it will be informed by the expectation that any project needs to look at achievement at three levels or time intervals: (1) after completion of the core, (2) level of achievement demonstrated by the capstone, and (3) demonstration of growth over time as a result of education. To accomplish this goal, the committee will use identical rubrics when assessing the same outcomes at different levels of the curriculum. In selecting/developing rubrics, the committee will utilize models from AACU’s Value and NASPAA accreditation guidelines. Specific outcomes include:

- Students will successfully compete a complex database analysis of a public issue
- Students will be able to evaluate a working environment in the public and nonprofit sector
- Students will be able to assess the structure and efficacy of an existing nonprofit or government entity
- Students will be able to construct a budget consistent with the guidelines that affect an agency
- Students can evaluate intergovernmental relationships as they related to management of public policies and programs
- Students can appraise the ethical issues and diversity dynamics in a workplace
- Students demonstrate effective communication skills orally and in writing across a variety of assignments

The means by which each of the Core courses meets these goals is indicated in Appendix 4.

5. **Impact on other Fairfield Programs**

The MPA is not intended to replace any existing programs at the University, but is part of the broadening of graduate offerings that has accelerated over the past two decades. The MPA Working Group envisioned some positive cross-fertilization with existing graduate programs at Fairfield, particularly in the Dolan School of Business and Graduate Communication. If the program expands to include a track in Hospital Administration and/or Healthcare Management, cooperation with the School of Nursing would be essential and has already begun for advanced planning (related to reconfiguration of the
current “Health Care Management” track in SON, which could be folded into the MPA as a track). The MPA has no impact on the Fairfield University core requirements.

The MPA is targeted at two very specific groups: Working professionals in either the nonprofit or city/state government, as well as members of the surrounding communities and other individuals with a bachelor’s degree in any field who wish to pursue professional opportunities in the public sector. Individuals may have decided upon an MBA in the past due to the lack of a Public Administration program in the Fairfield County area, but the initiation of a program at Fairfield would enable individuals to seek a degree more appropriate to their field.

6. Program Details

The MPA program would be targeted at working professionals in the nonprofit and local government sectors. Consequently, it would be assumed that most students will pursue the MPA at Fairfield on a part-time basis. There would be no prohibition, however, against a student pursuing full-time study. The MPA is now the recognized preferred degree for those pursuing careers in these two sectors of the economy. The MPA program would be housed in the College of Arts and Sciences, but would draw from departments and programs in both CAS and the Charles F. Dolan School of Business. The program would require one prerequisite, Statistical Methods, which could be taken either at Fairfield or fulfilled during one’s undergraduate education. The program would have a 15-credit (5-course) Core taken by all students, which would include the following courses (the department or school responsible for each course is noted):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Tag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management &amp; Budgeting</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>MP400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>MP405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Public Administration</td>
<td>Dolan School of Business</td>
<td>MP410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Management</td>
<td>Dolan School of Business</td>
<td>MP415 (MG505 or MG525)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Dolan School of Business (MG504)</td>
<td>MP420 (MG504 or CO 522)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Syllabi for all courses in the Core are included in Appendix 7.
Along with completing the 15-credit Core, MPA students will take one course in Ethics and Multiculturalism, and two courses in Communication, for an additional nine credits. While multicultural perspectives and ethical questions will be infused across the curriculum, each student will also take one course that focuses deeply on these issues. Options for this component of the program are in Appendix 2. Please note that there are currently four graduate courses in place for students to choose from in completing the Ethics and Multiculturalism requirement; several others are possible based on faculty interest and expertise.

The remainder of the MPA curriculum involves courses taken in one of two tracks, either Nonprofit Management or State/Local Government Management. Students will complete four courses in the appropriate track, including a 3-credit capstone seminar, for a total of 12 credits. Students in the nonprofit management track will select three courses from a menu including Management for Nonprofits, Law and Ethics for Nonprofits, Philosophy of Philanthropy, and History of Philanthropy. They must then complete the Capstone Seminar in Nonprofit Management. Students on the City/State Government Management Track must pick three classes from Negotiation and Conflict Management, Accounting for Government and Hospitals, Regional Economic Development, Urban Politics and Project Management. Once again, the fourth course in the track is the capstone seminar. The courses that students may choose from are outlined in Appendix 3.

The final component of the MPA is a six-credit internship in a position appropriate to the student’s choice of field. Students who enter the program with appropriate prior experience may have this requirement waived, but no more than 6 credits of academic work may be transferred from another program.

**In summary, the 42-credit MPA curriculum is as follows:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Methods</td>
<td>15 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism and Ethics</td>
<td>3 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>6 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>6 Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42 Credits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Administrative Structure and Governance

A. Program Director

The direct responsibility for the MPA will rest with a Program Director drawn from one of the CAS disciplines involved in the core curriculum. The Director will serve a three-year term, with a new Director nominated by the Steering Committee (see below) and recommended to the Dean of CAS, who makes the appointment, as per the procedures in the College of Arts & Sciences Governance Document. All other Director responsibilities are delineated clearly in the CAS governance document. The Director will serve on the Council of Graduate Programs in the College, also discussed in the CAS governance document (see appropriate passages in Appendix 9). Decisions and/or recommendations to the Dean are made in consultation with the Steering Committee.

B. Steering Committee

In most of the College's interdisciplinary programs, faculty who teach in the program are eligible to serve on the Steering Committee, and that will be true for the MPA, as well. The program Working Group will form the inaugural Steering Committee, and staggered 2-year terms will be developed in the first year. Then, other teaching faculty will rotate onto the Steering Committee in open slots, with nominations coming from Steering Committee members, departments offering MPA courses, and self-nominations. An MPA-SC member may serve no more than two consecutive terms, but may rotate back onto the Committee after a 2-year hiatus. Membership from CAS and DSB is fundamental at all times; at least one member from SON should be added when the track in healthcare administration is developed, and a member from SON and/or GSEAP would be welcome in relation to specific curricular intersections. Within CAS, there should be at least one member from each department that contributes courses that are included in the program. The Dean and appropriate Chair should be consulted regarding the service of pre-tenure faculty members. Steering Committee members should undertake specific tasks in support of the program in addition to attending meetings regularly. Members should not serve on the steering/coordinating committees of more than two or three ID programs at one time. These expectations will be revised in compliance with the CAS governance document at such a time it contains procedures related to ID program steering/coordinating committee membership.

C. External Advisory Council

The MPA will be, by its nature, deeply involved in the community at large, as our students will be primarily working professionals seeking the degree to continue advancement in
their chosen field. As well, the program will benefit from strong connections to local professionals and agencies. Consequently, an external “Advisory Council” composed of representatives from local nonprofits and governmental agencies will be nominated by faculty to work with the Director and Steering Committee in support of the program. Given the professional nature of the MPA program, the Advisory Council will play a crucial role in areas such as: helping to develop the internship program and providing sites and supervisors for it, supporting students and faculty though helping to link classroom work to the everyday work of MPA professionals, providing speakers and other resources to the program, and advising on potential curricular changes that could improve the MPA based on shifts in the professional arena (NOTE: the Advisory Council would have no operational authority over the program or the decisions made by faculty in and for the program. Terms of service and expectations for service will be developed at the time of Advisory Council formation). As well, the positions held by and prestige of Advisory Council members can enhance the marketability and reputation of the program overall.

D. College of Arts & Sciences Dean

CAS provides some administrative support to the graduate programs in the College (currently through Assistant Dean Sue Peterson for enrollment management and course schedule planning, and through Ms. Fran Yadre administrative assistant for the Council of Graduate Programs). The Dean of CAS must approve revenue-sharing models and be apprised of all program details and outcomes through regular reports from the MPA Program Director, and periodic meetings with the Steering Committee. The CAS Dean consults on any major decisions related to program revenues and must approve any permanent faculty lines, including full consultation during recruiting and all hiring privileges afforded the office. The Dean must also monitor and approve the percentage of tenure-track faculty time devoted to part-of-load teaching in the program. The Dean of the CAS reports to the Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs related to any programs and activities of the Communication Department.

E. Offices of Graduate Admissions and Enrollment Management:

Receipt of eligibility documents (e. g., undergraduate transcripts, requests for transfer credits) and other admissions functions are managed by the Office of Graduate Admissions (OGA). The OGA facilitates the process of accepting students into the MPA Program as they would for other graduate programs at the University. The OGA, under the direction of the Vice President for Admissions, will continue to oversee the marketing research process and will participate in the development of financial models for the program. The Vice President
for Admissions reports to the Sr. vice President for Strategic Initiatives on matters related to market research, graduate enrollments, and program outcomes.

8. **Resources**

The MPA, as it is constituted in the document that was developed by the MPA Working Group, is designed to draw upon the current resources of the University as much as possible. Faculty members from CAS and the Dolan School of Business have been identified to teach the Core courses, and the courses offered in the two tracks are drawn primarily from existing offerings in graduate communication and graduate business programs. The expectation is to offer 5 courses in the first year, under the assumption that some MPA students will take existing and already-running courses in the grad Communication and grad business programs as required or elective courses. This will involve a subset of part-of-load teaching (e.g., 2-3) and a proportion of overload teaching (e.g., 2-3, depending on which faculty are willing to do which model). A list of eligible teaching faculty appears in Appendix 1. The administration is committed to adequate staffing so that the resources are sufficient to launch the program, either through replacement/new hires, although existing faculty will be available for the maintenance and growth of the MPA. The new positions could be structured through the split (at a proportion of 1/6-1/3) among authorized searches in departments such as Communication, Economics, Politics, Sociology, and Management, or it could be an open search for a position that would sit within one of those departments (dedicated 1/2-2/3 to the MPA, as per the model used for two positions in International Studies).

The initiation of an MPA program would not require extensive physical resources, other than some additions to DiMenna-Nyselius Library. The inclusion of a GIS course in the tracks will necessitate the acquisition and updating of some software. The offering of the GIS course as part of the elective sequence will require the purchase of GIS (10 user site license is currently $700). As with any new program, initial expenditures on library materials will be high ($5,000), with that expense reduced in year 2.

Overall, the required startup costs would be minor. A timeline of all projected revenues and costs over a five-year is presented in Appendix 5, under an assumption that faculty from other programs will be carried at a 50% weight, while those teaching specific MPA courses will be charged to the program at 100% of cost. Each year includes significant expenditures for program promotion (advertising), although the proportion of total revenue devoted to advertising drops as projected enrollment rises. The net revenue (revenue – expenses) in Year 1 is estimated at $67,000. If a full-time faculty member is hired in Year 2, the net falls to $23,651. If targeted hires in individual departments are
utilized instead (at ½ the cost), the net would rise by just over $50,000. The figures in appendix 5 for years three, four and five, utilize both a “pessimistic” enrollment figure (rising to 60 students by year 5), and a figure that is consistent with the enrollment experiences of other recently launched grad programs. In year five, for instance, the net return is $205,900 with 60 students enrolled, and $264,000 with 70 students enrolled. See further details in the appendix.

The primary resource concern is the reliance upon existing faculty to staff the core courses in the MPA. The Sociology, Economics, and Communication departments in CAS will all be contributing faculty to the program (and contributing courses that can be cross-listed with other programs), as will the Dolan School of Business. Although these contributions are generally minor (1/6 of a faculty line), it is possible that this could delay other initiatives in these departments/divisions. Hence, the proposed hire in year 2 of the program is essential. On the other hand, with judicious searches in open lines and/or expected vacancies within relevant departments, along with a proportion of overload (versus part-of-load) teaching, which some of the involved faculty members prefer, the staffing issues would be mitigated substantially.

9. Projections for the Future

The MPA Working Group that constructed the proposed program recognized the need in Fairfield University’s market for graduate training in nonprofit management and city/state management. It is hoped that the program will develop a solid base of 75-100 students drawn to these two tracks. MPA programs typically offer a number of additional options, such as Hospital Management, Economic Development and Policy Analysis. As the program grows, it may make sense to consider additional tracks based upon the needs of the University and the community, as they intersect with faculty expertise and interests. Restricting the Fairfield MPA initially to two specializations reduces the resources required to initiate the program, but consideration should be given to expansion in the future.

The structure of the program, particularly the use of an external Advisory Council, has been designed to promote integration of the MPA into the community of nonprofits and relevant agencies in the surrounding area and, as much as possible, to involve Fairfield faculty and students in the business of public service. As the program matures, it is hoped these linkages will mature, particularly through the activities of the Steering Committee (e.g., faculty research collaborations and consultancies with local agencies) and through expansion of the internship program. This will open up the possibility of extensive cooperation between faculty, students and those working for nonprofits and local governments in the areas of grant-writing, community asset development, etc.
An effective launch of this program, as well as its future prospects depend on a marketing plan. Promotion of the program will utilize the same integrated marketing strategies used for our other graduate programs: Google Ad Words, radio spots, billboards, email push outs to our inquiry base, printed posters and materials in strategic locations (e.g., downtown bookstore, at all University events, etc.), and leveraging relationships with organizations such as the Rotary Club and internship host organizations, through which we can promote the program. The launch of the MPA is an opportunity to refresh Fairfield’s image as a provider of innovative and high quality graduate programs and to advance the institution’s name among new and regular constituencies.

10. Program Evaluation

As part of program design, the Working Group drafted an assessment document. This includes Program Learning Outcomes, a set of measurable and demonstrable student learning outcomes based on the standards of the field along with plans for ongoing Assessment of Student Learning, and a projected timeline for Program Review and Evaluation. The document also lists specific milestones the program would like to meet by its third year.

A third-year internal evaluation of the program will be carried out by the Steering Committee, in collaboration with the CAS Dean’s Office and others as appropriate, using critical milestones such as:

- Number of students recruited to program
- The growth and strength of the Internship program
- Student learning outcomes as per Assessment Plan
- Placement of the first graduating students in the job market
- Expansion of curriculum (electives) and consolidation of courses across key curricular areas
- Achievement of enrollment and revenue projections

The Program will then undergo the usual procedures for New Program Review as outlined in the Journal of Record in year 5. The Dean has agreed to fund 1-2 outside consultants or reviewers at this stage, as per the Guidelines for Academic Program Review in the College of Arts & Sciences, which were developed by a task force of the CAS Planning Committee and endorsed by ASCC. This would likely be a review more extensive than that dictated by the Journal of Record.
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The MPA Working Group

Colleen Arendt  Communication
Robbin Crabtree  Dean, CAS
Judith Dobai  VP, Enrollment Mgmt, Academic Vice President Office
David Downie  Associate Professor of Environmental Studies
Donald Gibson  Dean, Charles F. Dolan School of Business
Don Greenberg  Politics
Marianne Gumpper  Director of Graduate and Continuing Studies Admissions
Dennis Hodgson  Sociology and Anthropology
Janie Leatherman  International Studies
Sharlene McEvoy  Dolan School of Business
Catherine O’Donnell  Marketing for Admission and Academics; University Advertising.
Michael Pagano  Communication
Marcie Patton  Politics
Aaron Perkus  Associate Dean, University College
David Sapp  English
Kurt Schlichting  Sociology and Anthropology
James Simon  English
Corey Wrinn  Institutional Research

Additional Faculty Members with Expertise and Interest

Gwen Alphonso  Politics
Tom Murray  Economics
David Schmidt  Management and Applied Ethics
Toby Svoboda  Philosophy and Applied Ethics

Searches underway or anticipated that might interface with MPA

Economics  Antitrust and Government Regulation
Politics  American political institutions and research methods
Sociology  Race/class/ethnicity/gender/sexuality
**Appendix 2**

*Courses Available and in Development to Complete Ethics and Multiculturalism and Communication Component of Core*

- **Ethics and Multiculturalism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPA Course</th>
<th>Dept/Program</th>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Ethics</td>
<td>Applied Ethics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics and Communication</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>CO 440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination in the Workplace</td>
<td>Dolan School of Business</td>
<td>To be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in the Workplace</td>
<td>Dolan School of Business</td>
<td>MG520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Ethnic Relations</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>SO162*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender in the Workplace</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>EC 114*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Communication</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>CO 540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in the Workplace</td>
<td>Amer. Studies</td>
<td>ASSO 469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Undergraduate course to be reformulated for the MPA

- **Communication (pick 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Dept/Program</th>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant Writing and Administration</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>EN339*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Relations</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>New Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Technical Writing</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>EN335*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Communication, Influence and Power</td>
<td>Dolan School of Business</td>
<td>MG510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Undergraduate course to be reformulated for the MPA*
### Appendix 3

**List of Courses for Nonprofit Management and City/State Government Tracks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concentrations</th>
<th>Title of Course</th>
<th>Current Course #</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Management</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>IS 520</td>
<td>DSOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Courses</td>
<td>Municipal and Not-for-Profit Accounting</td>
<td>AC 380*</td>
<td>DSOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management for Nonprofits</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law and Ethics for Nonprofits</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy of Philanthropy</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History of Philanthropy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology (u)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure of Philanthropic Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Internal Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Capstone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required unless waived</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/State Government</td>
<td>Negotiation and Conflict Management/Negotiation And Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>CO 524/MG 507</td>
<td>Communication /Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Track</td>
<td>Accounting for Government and Hospitals</td>
<td>AC 530*</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Economic Development</td>
<td>Currently EC 185</td>
<td>Economics (u)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban/Suburban Studies</td>
<td>ASSO 463</td>
<td>American Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Politics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Politics (u)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>IS 520</td>
<td>Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Capstone</td>
<td></td>
<td>MPA Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unless Waived</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Requires undergraduate accounting course as prerequisite
### Core Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>(\times)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management &amp; Budgeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intro to Public Administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Applied Ethics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Ethics</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethics and Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>(\times)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethics and Communication</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination in the workplace</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>Diversity in the Workplace</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and Ethnic Relations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender in the Workplace</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in the Workplace</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Grant Writing and Administration</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Technical Writing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Communication, Influence and Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concentration</th>
<th>Project Management</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal and Not-for-Profit Accounting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management for Nonprofits</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and Ethics for Nonprofits</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Philanthropy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required unless waived</td>
<td>City/State Government Management Track</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Philanthropy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Structure of Philanthropic Sector</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Capstone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Internship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/State Government Management Track</td>
<td>Required Negotiation and Conflict Management / Negotiation And Dispute Resolution</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/State Government Management Track</td>
<td>Accounting for Government and Hospitals</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/State Government Management Track</td>
<td>Regional Economic Development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Urban/Suburban Studies</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Urban Politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required GIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unless Waived Internship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5
Timeline of Projected Costs and Revenues

Year 1 – One Cohort in Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>20 Students, 9 credits average @$635 per credit</th>
<th>$114,300</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>Faculty 3 course releases at $4,500 per</td>
<td>$ 13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ½ course releases at $4,500 per</td>
<td>$ 6,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits (@7.65% FICA)</td>
<td>$ 1,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stipend – Program Chair</td>
<td>$ 4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 22,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Salary</td>
<td>Advertising (approx. 18% of Projected Revenue)</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GIS Upgrade (10 users)</td>
<td>$ 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library Acquisitions</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 25,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 51,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 62,301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Timeline of Projected Costs and Revenues

#### Year 2 – Two Cohorts in Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td>30 Students, 9 credits average @$635 per</td>
<td>$171,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Faculty Hire</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>(@38% of salary)</td>
<td>$28,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3 course releases at $4,500 per</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ½ course releases at $4,500 per&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$6,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipend – Program Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>(@7.65% FICA)</td>
<td>$1,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Salary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$129,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Salary</td>
<td>Advertising (12% of Revenue)</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library Budget (Continuing)</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$152,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET (Revenue – Cost)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$23,651</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Includes FICA benefits.
### Timeline of Projected Costs and Revenues

#### Year 3 – Three Cohorts in Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>40 Students, 9 credits average @$635 per</th>
<th>$228,600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FT Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>$76,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>(@38% of salary)</td>
<td>$29,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>3 course releases at $4,500 per</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 ½ course releases at $4,500 per a</td>
<td>$6,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>(@7.65% FICA)</td>
<td>$1,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipend – Program Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Salary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$131,870</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Salary</td>
<td>Advertising (approx. 9% of Revenue)</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library Budget (Continuing)</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

| Grand Total                                  |                                           | **$154,370** |
|**NET (Revenue – Cost)**                      |                                           | **$74,200**  |
### Timeline of Projected Costs and Revenues

**Year 4 – Four Cohorts in Program, Some have Graduated**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Students, 9 credits average @$650 per</td>
<td>$292,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT Faculty</td>
<td>$78,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (@38% of salary)</td>
<td>$29,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty 3 course releases at $4,500 per</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ½ course releases at $4,500 per</td>
<td>$6,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (@7.65% FICA)</td>
<td>$1,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipend – Program Chair</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Salary</strong></td>
<td><strong>$133,980</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Salary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising (approx. 4% of Revenue)</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Budget (Continuing)</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$148,480</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NET (Revenue – Cost)** $144,000  
**NET (with 60 students)** $202,500
## Timeline of Projected Costs and Revenues

### Year 5 – Part of Five Cohorts in Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$351,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Students, 9 credits average @$650 per</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT Faculty</td>
<td>$79,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (@38% of salary)</td>
<td>$30,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 course releases at $4,500 per</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ½ course releases at $4,500 per^</td>
<td>$6,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (@7.65% FICA)</td>
<td>$1,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipend – Program Chair</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Salary</strong></td>
<td><strong>$136,135</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Salary</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising (approx. 3.5% of Revenue)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Budget (Continuing)</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$150,635</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET (Revenue – Cost)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$201,400</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET (with 70 students)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$259,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ For existing courses in other programs, the MPA has been “charged” ½ the faculty salary cost.
## Appendix 6

### MPA Programs in the Vicinity of Fairfield University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>MPA/MPP</th>
<th>Tracks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of New Haven</td>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>MPA</td>
<td>City Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Clinical Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Health Care Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel and Labor Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace University</td>
<td>Westchester</td>
<td>MPA</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nonprofit Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Health Care Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>MPP</td>
<td>Public Policy Linked to JD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>Storrs</td>
<td>MPA</td>
<td>Nonprofit Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7
Course Syllabi – New MPA Courses

Catalogue Copy

- MP 400 – Financial Management and Budgeting

This course will examine the proper role government has to play in today’s economy and will provide the fundamental and technical skills necessary to understand public budgeting and finances. Topics include the reasons for government involvement in the economy (market failure and redistribution), budgeting techniques at all levels of government, and sources of tax revenue. There will be a strong emphasis on issues related to state/local governments. By the end of this course students should have a strong understanding of the budgetary process at all levels, but in particular at the state/local level of government.
3 credits, no prerequisites

- MP 405 – Research Methods

This course will introduce students to research methodology and hypothesis testing. The first part of the course will focus on understanding basic research techniques in the social sciences, including data collection, data analysis and reporting of results. The second half of the course will emphasize methodology. Students will be required to conduct a major research project in a laboratory setting and produce a finished report.
3 credits, students must have taken a statistical methods class

- MP 410 – Introduction to Public Administration

This course provides an overview of the history, practical nature, function of public administration and policy making at the federal, state at the local levels. It will examine the theories and concepts of bureaucracy, as well as the formulation and implementation of policy. Among the topics covered are organization theory, federalism and regulation, ethics and accountability, decision-making, and leadership and budgeting. Case studies will be used to facilitate class lectures and discussions.
3 credits, no prerequisite

Existing Courses (syllabi already approved):

- MP 415/MG 505/M525 – Human Resource Management
- MP 420/MG 500/CO 522 – Leader
MP 400 – Financial Management and Budgeting  
Masters of Public Administration Program  
Fairfield University, Fairfield, CT 06824

Financial Management and Budgeting  
Professor Thomas Murray  
Office: 324 Donnarumma Hall  
Office Hours: TBA  
Tmurray4@fairfield.edu

Course Objectives:

This course will examine the proper role government has to play in today’s economy and will provide the fundamental and technical skills necessary to understand public budgeting and finances. This course will cover such topics as the reasons for government involvement in the economy (market failure and redistribution), budgeting techniques at all levels of government, and sources of tax revenue. There will be a strong emphasis on issues related to state/local governments with the intent on applying the basic principles learned in class to issues and policies affecting areas in the Connecticut/New York and the Northeast in general. At the end of this course students should have a strong understanding of the budgetary process at levels, but in particular at the state/local level of government.

Required Materials:


This course will have one required textbook and various readings that I will supply as we progress throughout the semester.

Learning Objectives:

Successful completion of this course will allow students to understand the working and limitations of constructing and maintaining a budget at any level of government. In particular, students should leave with a strong knowledge of the basic concepts and terminology associated with public finance. Students should also be able to understand the budget process as well as identify the major sources of government revenue. Finally students should be able to apply the basic principles and concepts associated with public finance to analyze current events/policy issues affecting local and state governments.

Course Policies:

• Regular attendance is strongly recommended.
• Arrive to class on time.
• Turn off cell phones.
• Laptops are allowed for purposes relevant to the class. Please do not use email, social media, etc. during class.
• Academic dishonesty will not be tolerated. I take the University Honor Code very seriously.
• Missed Exam Policy: If you know that you are going to miss an exam, please contact me at least one week in advance so we can discuss a makeup exam. You can only miss an
exam with a university sponsored excuse or by demonstrating extenuating circumstances that are beyond your control. Please do not make travel arrangements during scheduled exams, as this is not an acceptable excuse. You will be given a zero if you miss an exam without a valid excuse. Bottom line: Don’t miss the exam!

Mentor:
I will be using the Mentor system offered by Fairfield University (www.fairfield.edu/mentor). This website will contain all relevant administrative materials, problem sets, and reading assignments. Although most of the classroom discussion will not involve PowerPoint slides, I will provide PowerPoint presentations via Mentor for all major topics covered in this class.

Grading and Evaluation:
Course evaluation will consist of a four problem sets, a midterm, a final paper, and a final exam. (You must have access to a scientific calculator for the midterm and the final exam.) The breakdown of your final grade is as follows:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Sets</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Paper</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problem Sets:
There will be four problem sets assigned throughout the semester. There will be two problem sets before and after the midterm. You will have approximately 2 weeks to complete each assignment.

Term Paper:
Guidelines and topics for the term paper will be discussed in class.

Class Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Topics to be Covered</th>
<th>Readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduction, Proper Role for Government</td>
<td>Mikesell Chapter 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Proper Role for Government</td>
<td>Mikesell Chapter 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fundamental of Budgeting</td>
<td>Mikesell Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Federal, State, and Local Budget Systems</td>
<td>Mikesell Chapter 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Budgeting Techniques</td>
<td>Mikesell Chapter 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Budget Classifications and Reforms</td>
<td>Mikesell Chapter 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Capital Budgeting</td>
<td>Mikesell Chapter 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Evaluating Revenue Options</td>
<td>Mikesell Chapter 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Income Taxes</td>
<td>Mikesell Chapter 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Taxes on Goods and Services</td>
<td>Mikesell Chapter 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>Mikesell Chapter 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Other Sources of Revenue</td>
<td>Mikesell Chapter 11, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Forecasting Revenue, Tax Expenditure Budgets</td>
<td>Mikesell Chapter 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Debt Administration</td>
<td>Mikesell Chapter 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Course Objectives

1. Students will develop an understanding of the role of research in science and the need to test hypothesis with empirical data.

2. Students will understand the basic techniques of social research, both quantitative and qualitative.

3. Students will conduct a research project: define a research question, conduct a literature review, create a research design, conduct data collection, analyze the data, write a research report and present research findings.

4. Integrate course with Fairfield University Core Pathways:
   - Scientific Reasoning - the importance of scientific knowledge and analysis in daily life, while recognizing the responsibility science has in creating a better world for some while compromising the world for others. Students will learn to question, design experiments, and collect, evaluate, and connect real data to theory to find new solutions to real-world problems.
   - Quantitative Analysis - using, interpreting, and presenting quantitative data will lead to competency as a professional and a citizen of society. Students will explore the power and limitations of quantitative reasoning and apply basic skills to support arguments and solve real-life quandaries.

Course Expectations:

✓ Students are expected to attend class, to complete all work on time, to be prepared for class discussions, and to participate in class activities.
✓ Absences will result in a grade reduction or failure for the course.
✓ All students will participate in a major, semester long, research project
✓ Students are expected to meet with their research team outside of class and contribute to the group research project
✓ Research teams will conduct the project, each student will complete an individual research report.
✓ All personal electronic devices will be turned off and put away during class.

Text:  
Earl Babbie, Observing Ourselves (Waveland Press, 1986)
Jennifer Mason, Qualitative Researching (Sage, 2nd ed., 2001)
Course Outline

I. Philosophy of Social Science Research

1. Elements of Science
   Reading: Babbie - Chapter 1, Hoover - Chapters 1 - 4
            Babbie – Observing - Part 1: 1& 2, Part 5

2. Variables, Relationships and Causation
   Reading: Babbie - Chapters 2, 3
            Hoover - Chapter 5
            Babbie – Observing Part 2

3. Paradigmatic Science
   Reading: Hoover - Chapter 6
            Babbie – Observing - Part 1: 3

II. Methodology

1. Ethical Considerations
   Reading: Babbie - Chapter 19

2. Research Applicability, Funding
   - government research
   - grant writing
   - contract research, applied social research

3. Research Design
   - structure
   - definition of concepts
   - measurement
   Reading: Babbie - Chapters 4, 5, 6
            Babbie – Observing - Part 3

4. Sampling

5. Research Procedures
   A. Survey Research
      Reading: Babbie - Chapter 9
   B. Qualitative Research
      Reading: Mason – Part II
   C. Geographical Information System (GIS), Existing Data
      - GIS software, government applications
- Census data
- data mining with governmental information

Reading: Babbie - Chapter 11

III. Data Analysis

1. Quantification
   Reading: Babbie - Chapter 13

2. Qualitative Data
   Reading: Mason, Chapter 8 & 9

3. Data Analysis
   Reading: Babbie - Chapters 14, 17
   Babbie – Observing - Part 4

Research Project

A major part of the course will be the design and execution of a number of research projects. The class will be divided into teams and each team will complete a project. Individual participation in a research project is a basic requirement of the course, will require a significant amount of time outside of the classroom, and will constitute a major part of the final grade. Team members will grade each other as to each team member’s contribution to the project.

The research projects will be directed toward the needs of local government and non-profit organizations. Working with partner agencies and local governments, research questions will be identified and the project designed.

As part of the research project, each student will complete a written research report (15-20 pages) analyzing the data produced by the research project. A presentation of the research findings will be made to the partner organization

Portfolio

Each student will maintain a portfolio of assignments completed during the semester as well as a log of time/activities connected with the research project. The portfolio will be submitted for evaluation at the end of the semester.

Research Lab

Normally, the second half of class will be used as a laboratory session to work on the research projects.

Grading

Research proposal/Grant application 30%
Literature Review 10%
Research Project including paper & presentation Participation - research project 50% 10% (graded by students on team)

**Attendance**

Attendance required in all classes (see University attendance policy)

Attendance and participation in the team research project, including time outside of class, is a crucial part of the course and reflected in the grading as outlined above.

### Course Outline and Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Assigned Reading</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Overview of course</td>
<td>Babbie - Chapter 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy of Science</td>
<td>Hoover - Chapters 1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elements of Science</td>
<td>Babbie – Observing - Part 1: 1 &amp; 2, Part 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Variables, Relationships, Causation</td>
<td>Babbie - Chapters 2, 3</td>
<td>Research teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoover - Chapter 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Babbie – Observing - Part 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Paradigmatic Science</td>
<td>Hoover - Chapter 6</td>
<td>Literature review – Library:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Babbie – Observing - Part 1: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Research Design</td>
<td>Babbie - Chapters 4-7</td>
<td>Research proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sampling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Non-Probability Sampling</td>
<td>Babbie – Observing - Part 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Survey Research</td>
<td>Babbie - Chapter 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Survey Research, Questionnaire</td>
<td>Babbie - Chapter 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Interviewing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Existing Data – GIS</td>
<td>Babbie - Chapter 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 10</td>
<td>Census Data</td>
<td>Mason - Part II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 11</td>
<td>Dating Mining</td>
<td>Babbie - Chapter 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 12</td>
<td>Quantification Qualitative Data Analysis</td>
<td>Babbie - Chapter 13 Mason - Chapter 8 &amp; 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 13</td>
<td>Data Analysis – Research Reports</td>
<td>Babbie - Chapters 14, 17 Babbie – Observing - Part 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 14</td>
<td>Project Presentations</td>
<td>Research Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Communication**

Communication will take place through Stagweb. You must check Stagweb on a regular basis.
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COURSE SYLLABUS

OVERVIEW:

This course is an intensive course on the art and science of leadership practices in organizations. The material covered in this course will include traditional theories as well as contemporary theories of leadership. Specifically we will focus on five leadership practices, identified by Kouzes and Posner, most suited to the development of effective leadership skills.

The course is designed as a combination of lectures, experiential exercises, and activities to provide you with a wide range of leadership experiences and knowledge. You will write your own Personal Best Case describing a leadership experience in which you feel you performed well. A Leadership Practices Inventory, as well as a variety of other leadership questionnaires, also will be administered so that you can assess and evaluate your own leadership potential. You will have the opportunity to assess leadership through a biographical account paper and presentation of a famous leader or CEO you have admired. A leadership journal and self-assessment paper will serve as the final exam in the course.

It is vital that students have a background in organizational behavior as topics such as communication, delegation, and empowerment interface with the course material that will be presented. In addition, for purposes of team-building, I consider class attendance to be mandatory.

TEXTBOOKS:

The primary textbooks for this course are:

The Leadership Challenge, 4th Edition
James M. Kouzes, Barry Z. Posner
Hardcover
US $29.95 plus

The Leadership Challenge Self Inventory and Student pack, from the website:

1 Introduction, 2 Self, 1 Observer-Student Lpi 2/Eset
James M. Kouzes
ISBN: 978-0-7879-9754-0
Paperback
January 2007

Strengths Based Leadership

Also you will need to research a leader whom you admire and write a short paper about your leader. There are many leadership books widely available; it is often hard to tell the “good ones” from the quick reads. You may wish to find a biography of a leader whom you wish to research and discover examples about his or her leadership style. There is also a great deal of information available on the internet but choose carefully from that information. It is useful to find newspaper articles and web blogs that are slightly critical so that you can take a critical stance in the writing of your paper. There will be a short presentation on your leader during the second week of class.

**VERY IMPORTANT! REQUIRED ONLINE BLACKBOARD SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS:**

At the Charles F. Dolan School of Business, we have an in-house document and class management system called Mentor. The university also provides online access through the Blackboard Course Management system. **Currently I am trying the Blackboard system.** Blackboard allows students to connect to their courses and to their professor via email but also provides a “Class Discussion link” that will allow us to have course discussions online during the class times posted for this class. On Blackboard, you will upload your case assignments and your final paper for grading purposes as well. It is very important that you are able to access the system.

Here’s how you can access the Blackboard system - [http://fairfield.edu/blackboard](http://fairfield.edu/blackboard). Your Net ID will be required for access to the system. With luck, you will be able to see my course on your dashboard in front of you. The course is set up so that you can upload assignments online. If you have any trouble at all, contact Mary Kleps at
mkleps@fairfield.edu and she will be available to help you with login problems. This course should show as part of your profile along with other courses you are taking that are on the Blackboard system. If you are not registered for this particular class or if your firm has not paid your tuition, the system will block access. Once you have accessed Blackboard, go to “Content”, which should avail you of the material associated with the course. When it is time to upload an assignment, click on that icon and you will see a page that allows you to upload your work. You can send a file from your computer or you can copy and paste into the box provided (referred on my end of the system.) You can also address my email from the system as well.

LAPTOP POLICY:
Laptops are a necessary convenience in the internet age. You are welcome to bring your laptop to the classroom; however, I expect that you will be raptly paying attention to the powerpoints onscreen on a lecture day. Although we are all accomplished multitaskers, class is not the time to respond to messages, check your Facebook, play solitaire, or search for jobs. If there is anything urgent online that you must do, please remove your laptop and yourself from the class and message outside the room. Ditto for cellphones, which should be set on vibrate or turned off entirely. We ask this as common courtesy as you may not realize the constant clicking and screen minimization serves as a distraction for the rest of us. Politeness rules.

CLASS ASSIGNMENTS:

I. Class Attendance and Participation (20% of grade)
Class participation is critical to understanding leadership and the topics in this course. That does not mean you must raise your hand and ask a question in every class; instead, it is important that you be present and accounted for in a 2 week session. It is also important that you participate in nightly leadership activities associated with the topics. Therefore, consider class attendance and participation mandatory for this course. Should you need to travel during the 2 week period, you should not take the class. Such attendance issues will require that you lose points on your final grade. Also, should you come down with the flu, chances are you will be down for the count for a full week. Extended absences due to illness will impact grading, as in-class participation is required. Finally, we may encounter some snow days during the 2 week session. If the snow is not passable, we may resort to an online discussion of a case assigned in class. The university snow policy seems to be that if 4 inches or more of snow is forecast, classes are cancelled. I will contact you on email if there should be a reason to cancel entirely or to move our class online. Online case discussions will be conducted through Blackboard.

II. The Leadership Personal Best Case (15% of grade)
The Leadership Personal Best case assignment is an opportunity for you to showcase an experience you have had in the past that has involved coordination, organization, motivation, and communication skills that are central to leadership. Personal bests vary considerably, so do not feel constrained that you must pick a recent work experience. Sometimes students choose Leadership Personal Bests from family, undergraduate, friendship, or travel experiences. Your Leadership Personal Best case should involve other actors, and you should be in some kind of a role where you had to challenge the way in which things were done or organize a new effort, although this may vary. If you have questions about which example from your
life to choose for this assignment, feel free to email me to discuss (Professor.Mainiero@gmail.com).

You will write a short descriptive paper disclosing your personal leadership best experience. Your Personal Best case should be "written from the heart". That is to say that you should spin the tale of: 1) why you chose to showcase this particular experience, 2) what it meant to you at the time, 3) the lessons you learned along the way, 4) what you would have done differently in 20/20 hindsight, and finally, 5) the practices that you performed in the case relevant to Kouzes and Posner's model.

Your writeup can, and should be, short (4-5 pages is typical - although it will vary depending on the type of experience you are sharing.) Please include information about the five practices at the end of the case writeup. You will present your Personal Best to the class in an informal manner, so no overheads are required. This class serves as a "test" of the Kouzes and Posner model that is central to the course. Writeups are to be submitted online on Blackboard under the "Assignments" tab. You will present your "case" to the class on the first Saturday class.

III. The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) Profile (10 % of grade)
Observer Forms can be found in the packet associated with the textbook.

The Leadership Practices Inventory Profile (the LPI) is a self-assessment questionnaire that accompanies your text. Its purpose is to help you identify how well you perform the 5 central leadership practices identified in the Koues and Posner text. You will purchase a workbook associated with the textbook that includes: the LPI and the LPI Observer forms. You will need to find 5 individuals who can rate your leadership style. Please choose raters that can evaluate your style in action from a variety of perspectives (your direct reports, your boss, lateral peers, previous employer, etc). If you are a full-time graduate MBA student and are not currently employed, you may utilize peers in the MBA program who may have worked with you on projects as raters.

Note: This class has a new website created by the Fairfield University CNS department specifically for this purpose. Raters should be able to participate in an online website to complete Observer forms. Directions to follow in our first class.

IV. The Biographical Account of a Leader Profile and Presentation (15 % of grade)

You must research a famous leader whom you have had an interest. You may use magazine articles, such as Business Week, Fortune, or Fast Company, newspaper articles in the New York Times or Wall Street Journal, or a biographical book. Feel free to google information about the leader with whom you share an interest online. Read the material, referencing appropriate citations, and describe this leader's style. See what you can discover about this leader's personal background, education, and general leadership style. Offer some examples of his or her leader behavior that you found to be interesting. The more you tie theory to the practice of leadership the higher your grade. It is useful to search online for some critical commentary so that you can take a more critical view of this leader as part of your paper writeup and presentation.

Interesting CEO type leaders to consider, perhaps: Jack Welch, Steve Jobs, Rudy Guiliani, Oprah Winfrey, Meg Whitman, Carly Fiorina, Coco Chanel, Henry Ford, Rene LaCoste, Blake Mykoskie, Herb Kelleher, Lucille Ball, Indra Nooyi, Donald Trump, Michael Eisner, Bill Gates, Quincy Jones, Hillary Clinton, Carol Bartz, Larry Bossidy, Julia Child, Walt Disney, John F. Kennedy, Liz Claiborne, Ursula Burns, Anne Mulcahy, Roberto Goizueta, Andrea Jung, Marion Sandler, Colin Powell, Phil Knight, Ives Chouniard, Larry Ellison, Andy Grove, Sergey Brin or Larry Page, Gloria Steinhem, Sheryl Sandberg, Ginny Rominity, Al Gore, Hetty Green, Marianne Williamson, Lee Iaococca, Nelson Mandela, Warren Buffett, Sallie Krawcheck, Mark Zuckerberg, Reid Hamilton, Tony Hsiang, Jeff Bezos, General Patton, Somaly Mam, Mozdah Jomalzadah "The Oprah of Afghanistan", Margaret Thatcher, Angelina Jolie, Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, Shigeru Miyamoto. You may also include historical or political figures whom you admire on this list- there are lots of different leaders to consider!
Your leader paper profile writeup should be short (4 - 5 pages) and should be submitted online to Blackboard. You will be expected to present your leader to the class during the class session week, preferably by Tuesday or Wednesday, describing why you think this individual exemplifies excellent leadership skills.

V. The Leadership Vision Statement (10% of grade)

The Vision Statement Presentation is a difficult and challenging assignment. This is because the development of a strategic vision is a complicated exercise. To do well on this assignment, you must: 1) develop a vision that is substantive, and 2) present it well, using the best of your inspirational communication skills. If possible, your presentation will be videotaped. This is because I have found that seeing yourself as you give a presentation is the best corrective device.

To complete the assignment, you must first develop your thoughts and ideas in a coherent manner. Begin the vision statement with a "hook", or an exciting or motivating picture or concept. Then develop your ideas and thoughts further in a way that motivates the audience. Consider your core values - which values do you want to communicate? Choose one or two so that the listener does not get lost in your message. Embedded in the middle of the speech should be some "nuts and bolts" about how you intend to accomplish your vision. This helps the speech have a degree of credibility rather than mere prose. Make sure your speech has motivating language throughout - not to the point where it loses credibility, but enough to motivate the listener. End your speech with a motivating thought idea, or question. Using a slogan as part of your speech - repeated carefully, not overdoing it - is also an effective technique.

Once you have wrestled with your ideas (and this takes awhile), you may want to practice your communication skills. When you have a draft, feel free to share it with me (optional, as I recognize many times these are written at last minute). Then practice it as often as you can: in front of the mirror, at home at night, whenever you have a chance. Increased familiarity with the speech improves your presentation. Memorization of much of the speech is also a good idea.

Decide if you want to talk directly to the camera or if you prefer a live audience. If you prefer a live audience, see if you can ask classmates to sit in on your presentation as it is videotaped. Also determine in advance if you are a podium presenter or prefer to wing it. Warn the camera operator as to your style in advance. Note: I will want a copy of your speech for my files. Cue cards, etc., are welcome.

VI. Teach the Class Assignment (10% of grade)

On the second Thursday class, pending snow issues, you may have a chance to “teach the class” one of the articles presented in the Joan Gallos Business Leadership textbook, or a book on leadership that you have found on your own. Develop only 2 – 3 lecture powerpoints ( let’s keep it short, this is the quick wintersession class, ok?) on your favorite leadership article or book, and present it to the class. Upload your powerpoints online ( don’t forget!).

VII. The Leadership Journal (20% of grade)

The final wrapup assignment is the Leadership Journal. There are several reasons why it is important to keep a journal. First, journals reinforce an active learning approach to the material by encouraging reflection about yourself and those around you. Second, journals provide a personal way to respond to ideas about the readings, class activities, the exercises, or personal conversations. Third, your journal entries will help to gauge your opinions of the course and your understanding of various leadership topics.
Your journal will consist of a number of entries which reflect your personal observations or experiences regarding each topic we cover in the course: Traditional, Contemporary, and Strategic Leadership Theories, Kouzes and Posner, Skills and Issues in Leadership. I expect that you will critique each theory presented and discuss each theory to some level in your journal entry based on your work experiences. Each night I will offer the last fifteen minutes of class as an opportunity for you to reflect on the material presented and to capture your thoughts for this journal. A format for each journal entry might include:

1. A recapitulation of the theories learned, and your own critique and work examples as appropriate
2. A reflection on any activities associated with each topic
3. An assessment of your leadership skills relative to the topic

In addition, your journal should include reflections on the Personal Best Case assignment, the Biographical Leader assignment, the Inspirational Communication speech, and any other meaningful class activities that you choose to include. For these journal entries, an assessment of what you learned during the activity is best. Your journal should also include a copy of the LPI chart from your computer analysis profile, and if assigned, a grid of your leadership assessment questionnaire results (if provided.)

When we complete the course, I will ask you to write a **summation section** to conclude your journal. This will serve as your final in the course. The questions I want you to answer in summation include:

1) **Based on the leadership theories presented, can you think "out of the box" and craft your own leadership theory or paradigm?** By putting together elements of different theories, or by developing your own list of skill sets you think are important for leader effectiveness, what defines "effective leadership"? **Write your leadership credo**, including your core leadership values. How can you make your vision statement come true?

2) **Given your self-assessment questionnaire results, what are your strengths as a leader? What areas require improvement?** Describe your LPI results. Can you offer explanations for the highs and lows? What action plan can you put in place to improve your abilities and skills (and specific practices) as a leader? **What specifically will you do to demonstrate your leadership skills and potential on Monday morning?**

3) **Now that you know something about your skills and limitations as a leader, what does this mean for your future leadership style? For your future career?** **Define a career action plan for your next five years.** Should you move into a management position or not? Should you change industries, or change jobs? Should you leave your workplace, and seek greener pastures? If so, what avenues or changes in career direction should you pursue? What does the future hold for you?

There is no required length of journal entry, but usually a page per night is plenty and more than enough; often a paragraph or two will suffice (except for the final summation questions please.) **Quality is as important as quantity.** The quality of a journal entry will be a function of your ability to relate topics covered in class to your own experiences and observations. Your journal entries will be treated confidentially.
Journals are due shortly after the class is completed, to be specified on the syllabus. If you are a graduating student, journal entries must be completed by the Monday that follows the final Saturday class for graduation.

GRADING CRITERIA AND STANDARDS:

Your grade in this course will be based on: 1) the level of effort you put into the course, and 2) the quality of your work. The Personal Best Case and Biographical Account require both a short presentation and a paper; you will receive two grades for each assignment. The LPI Observer Forms require a profile that should be submitted with your final paper. Grades will be weighed as follows:

1. Personal Best Case and Presentation - 15%
2. LPI Profile (effort grade) - 10%
3. Attendance and Participation - 20%
4. Leader Biographical Paper and Presentation - 15%
5. Leadership Vision Presentation - 10%
6. Teach the Class Presentation - 10%
7. Leadership Journal, including LPI profile results grade and Leadership Credo - 20%

Rubrics for most assignments are available online. If you wish, I will email you notice of your final grade once your paper is submitted. Please let me know if you need a letter or statement of your grade for reimbursement purposes when you turn in your final paper.

COURSE TOPICS AND SCHEDULE

WEEK I:

Monday, January 2: 6:00 pm - 9:30 pm

20th Century Traditional/Historical Leadership Theory
Team Building Activity

Tuesday, January 3: 6:00 pm - 9:30 pm (Note: Start time to be determined by class preference)

21st Century Contemporary Leadership Skills
Questionnaires on Leadership Style

Wednesday January 4: 6:30 pm - 9:30 pm

Strategic Leadership
Strategic Activity

Thursday, January 5: 6:30 pm - 9:30 pm

Kouzes and Posner
LPI-Self Questionnaire and Video

NO CLASS FRIDAY January 6

Saturday, January 7: 8:30 am - 4:30 pm All-day Session

PERSONAL BEST CASE PRESENTATIONS (Papers also due/upload online)
9am – 12noon First set of Personal Best Cases  
1pm -4pm Second set of Personal Best Cases  
Lunch break defined by presentation time allotted  

WEEK II:  

Monday, January 9:  6:30 pm - 9:30 pm  
Issues and Challenges in Leadership (Gender, Diversity, Entrepreneurial, Career Management, Managing Performance, etc.)  
Leadership Challenges Activity Discussion and Feedback  

Tuesday, January 10:  6:30 pm - 9:30 pm  
BIOGRAPHICAL LEADERSHIP PRESENTATIONS (Papers due end of week/upload online)  

Wednesday, January 11:  6:30 pm - 9:30 pm  
Inspirational Leadership Communication Skills  
Inspirational Communication Videos and Trials  

Thursday, January 12:  6:30 - 9:30 pm  
TEACH THE CLASS PRESENTATIONS (Don't forget to upload your powerpoints online) - Choose a leadership article you choose to present from the edited book of readings for the course, or a book on leadership you have read on your own  

NO CLASS FRIDAY January 13  

Saturday, January 14:  9 - 4 pm  
VISION STATEMENT PRESENTATIONS  
9 - 12 noon - Recording  
12 noon – 3 pm Lunch and Review of Vision Statements  
3 - 4 pm Final Statements and "Graduation"  

LEADERSHIP JOURNALS DUE: January 16  
Upload on Blackboard; appendices can be dropped off at my office mailbox at DSOB  

Academic Policies  

Academic Honesty:  
As business professionals, you are honor bound to demonstrate your integrity. Therefore, all course work must be based on the highest standards. It is my expectation that your work will conform with the university’s academic honesty policy. This policy, available in the course book, says that all course work must be your own. Plagiarism will be met with severe sanctions. All sources for written work must be documented with appropriate citations. This includes direct quotation, which must be indicated by quotation marks or indented text. For detail, consult the
Fairfield University Library website for a tutorial on proper citation and what constitutes plagiarism.

**Instructor Availability:**
Contact me at Professor.Mainiero@gmail.com. You can use my alternative email as well: lmainiero@fairfield.edu. If you really want to catch my attention, copy to both emails. I will also check on questions from students ahead of class most days. If you are wondering where I am when I am not online, just FYI, I have two children who need to be ferried to school, chess, soccer practice, swimming and music lessons, a new book that places publicity demands on my time, research to complete, meetings to attend, papers to write, a keynote conference trip to prepare, the occasional work as a media spokesperson and television commentator, and a household to run with my wonderful husband with whom it is nice to have the occasional brief conversation or two when he is not traveling around the world. In short, with the demands on my life, it is impossible for me to chain myself to the computer every hour of every day (and I don't want you to, either!) Let's all remember that we have lives to lead that are more important and fulfilling than the work associated with this course.

**Attendance:**
It is critical that you offer your opinions and participate in class discussion. It is my expectation that everyone will be present and accounted for each and every night of class; the Saturday classes are especially crucial. Keep in mind attendance at the Saturday classes is a must or you will lose points on your final grade. For snow cancellations, check online email.

**Proprietary Information:**
The assignments in this course may draw upon information that may, in some contexts, be considered proprietary. As a general rule of thumb, it is best not to present any information that may be viewed by your firm as proprietary. However, it is possible to present information carefully and generally in a way that does not disclose company secrets for the good of the understanding of the class. Sometimes shifting the project focus can help. General comments on line concerning your firm may be helpful. If you have concerns about how to share information about your firm, please see me directly. Should any information be shared that touches upon competitive information that relates to your firm, members of this class will honor the code that what is said inside four walls stays inside four walls and what is disclosed is best forgotten.

**Connection Difficulties:**
In this internet age, we must rise to the challenge of new modes of communication that often cause great angst and difficulty. Try the Blackboard system in advance of the class. For connection problems with Blackboard, make sure your tuition is paid, that you are registered for the class, and contact mkleps@fairfield.edu. THANKS!
ARTS & SCIENCES CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

April 3, 2012
3:30-5:00pm
BCC 204

MINUTES (DRAFT): Excerpts

Present: Dean Crabtree, Professors Johnson (chair), Fernandez, Garvey, Lacy, Peduti, Ruffini, Walker-Canton, Zhang, Xie

III. Masters in Public Administration Proposal

The Chair welcomed Prof. LeClair to present the MPA proposal and answer committee member questions. Prior to the discussion, the Dean announced that Assoc. Dean Perkus is out due to a medical issue; he had planned on participating in this discussion.

The Chair asked if the courses listed as part of the proposed MPA have been approved, or whether or not they need to be approved independent of the MPA proposal. LeClair responded that the program as proposed functions with existing faculty and courses. The Dean clarified that when a program goes through the approval process, all courses listed as part of that program are approved along with the program itself; individual course proposals are not (technically) required.

Ruffini asked LeClair to elaborate on the MPA steering committee. In particular, Ruffini requested an overview of how new steering committee members are elected. Garvey noted that the revised MPA proposal now clearly describes the process for electing new members. Ruffini expressed satisfaction with the revised MPA document.

Xie inquired about the number of students we anticipate enrolling in year one of the MPA program, and LeClair said we expect 20 students, but not all of them will be full time students. LeClair said that the expected average number of semester units per MPA student is approximately six units. Xie noted that 12% of total respondents reported that they were interested in this program; he asked if that was a good number? LeClair said 12% can be considered a significant number considering the size and composition of the study population.

Xie asked about our regional competitors and their MPA programs. LeClair said the availability of multiple tracks will be a popular characteristic of the Fairfield MPA, and that the non-profit management track will distinguish us in a region known for the numerous non-profits that are based here. He said that Pace University has an MPA with a non-profit track, but Fairfield and Pace typically draw from distinct populations.

Dean Crabtree reported that in a recent meeting with the Bridgeport Mayor and various city officials, they all expressed eagerness to partner with Fairfield University through internships.
and innovative programs including the proposed MPA. LeClair mentioned the possibility, albeit a challenging one, of a state and local track for the MPA.

Zhang asked if the statistics requirement was consistent with the number of available statistics courses from semester to semester. LeClair said the MPA model is that students can take statistics across the curriculum, including within the MPA.

The Dean focused the committee on the issue under consideration: MPA syllabi and curriculum. She added that she likes how the MPA program brings departments together across the curriculum, and that this interdisciplinarity will attract students. She hypothesized that students who graduate as teachers from Fairfield could become a core sub-group of our MPA students (graduates who would return to Fairfield to complete the MPA).

The Chair noted that the course on Public Administration and Policy did not have a standard CAS grading breakdown, unlike the other courses within the proposal. LeClair explained that these breakdowns are “more fluid” across graduate programs.

Garvey asked if the “reformulated” version of Prof. Nantz’s course, as listed on page 21 (Appendix 2) will be an entirely new version of the class. LeClair said that Nantz will create a graduate version of her class for the non-profit MPA track, and that this reformulated class will not replace her current undergraduate offering.

The Chair asked about the timeframe and routing of the MPA proposal. LeClair said that the first students would arrive on campus in Fall 2013. That date assumes that the proposal reaches the AC and State in Fall 2012.

Zhang noted the presence of a communications track, but the dearth of actual Communications course offerings in the MPA. The Chair referred to Appendix 7 to show that the MPA curriculum includes CO 522. The Dean added that existing Communications courses could be more visible in the proposal.

The Chair asked about Appendix 7. She questioned whether or not the committee needed to approve those courses as cross-listed (e.g. MP 415). The Dean explained that the committee is responsible for approving course numbering issues, not cross-listing.

LeClair left the room, and offered to answer any additional questions as they may arise.

The Chair opened the floor to discussion.

Ruffini **MOVED** to approve the MPA Proposal. Peduti **SECONDED** the motion.

The Chair reminded the committee that the motion is basically an endorsement of the MPA program, and an approval of the course numbers contained in the proposal.

Zhang spoke in favor of the motion, and praised the research methods component.
Ruffini noted that syllabi and individual new course forms did not come with the MPA packet/proposal. The Dean said that the committee can ask for syllabi and new course forms, but that the existing standard for new program proposals is to approve a new program along with the courses that will be created to launch the new program.

The Chair asked about the impact to CAS undergraduate teaching coverage if a number of undergraduate-oriented instructors begin teaching graduate courses. The Dean said that many faculty interested in teaching in the MPA are also interested in overload teaching, which the Dean reviewed and approved.

Ruffini said that the committee should consider requiring that new program proposals must include individual course proposals for each new course within the proposal. Qin agreed and pointed out that there were no course descriptions in the MPA proposal. The Chair said she would place that on the agenda for future consideration.

The Dean said that prior to launching their program, the MPA proposers should supply a course description and/or a new course cover sheet for each new course contained in the MPA document.

Garvey suggested that we could encourage the proposers to supply these course descriptions when it presents the MPA to the EPC.

Motion **PASSES** (9 in favor, 0 against, 0 in favor)
Educational Planning Committee Meeting

Fairfield University
Minutes: Excerpts
April 19, 2012

Present: Professors Steven Bachelor, Peter Bayers, Cathy Giapponi, Sheila Grossman, Michael Pagano Carl Scheraga (Chair), Chris Staecker, Barbara Welles-Nystrom, Dean Don Gibson, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs Paul Fitzgerald

Visiting: Professor Mark LeClair, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences Robbin Crabtree

2. Discussion of Proposal for a New Graduate Program in Public Administration

The Committee welcomed Dean Crabtree and Professor LeClair, who came before the Committee to speak on behalf of the Master of Public Administration Working Group. Professor LeClair provided an overview of the proposed Master of Public Administration (MPA) program. A working group has worked for over a year designing the program. Market survey data collected by the development office suggests strong local demand for a program that offers training in both not-for-profit and government entities. To the south, the nearest competitor is Pace University in New York City, and to the north the University of New Haven, which given local traffic patterns make Fairfield University more attractive to potential buyers. Professor LeClair emphasized the interdisciplinary nature of the proposed program, whose two tracks will make use of existing faculty in the School of Nursing, School of Business, and College of Arts and Sciences, in particular. The working group suggested that one faculty hire likely will be required in order to maintain curricular coverage. The working group recommends the position be achieved through a split (1/6 to 1/3) among authorized searches in Communication, Economics, Politics, Sociology, and Management.

Professor Scheraga entertained questions from the Committee. Professor Grossman asked about the work-experience criteria for waiving the internship requirement. Dean Crabtree responded that portfolio review is one the working group has considered. Professor Bayers inquired into the probability of budgeting for a new faculty hire given current economic realities. Professor LeClair replied that existing faculty are able to sustain the program in its initial phase. Dean Crabtree noted that new faculty hires would be made strategically to support the MPA program. Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs Fitzgerald noted that the proposed program leverages the University’s strengths and promotes the University mission. The program will serve a useful public good, engage the faculty’s many talents, and generate revenue (upwards of two hundred thousand dollars per annum) once fully operational. Professor LeClair explained that existing faculty are able to sustain the program through its fourth year. Dean Crabtree observed that data indicate one-half of the faculty stakeholders want to teach courses as overloads, which is cost-effective.

Professor Scheraga thanked Dean Crabtree and Professor LeClair for their attendance and opened the floor for discussion. Professor Grossman noted that the proposal’s use of “clinical nurse leaders track” should be changed to “health care management track.” She also wondered whether explicit mention should be made on page fiver regarding when accreditation is expected. She also wondered
whether respective full-time and part-time curricular plans be made included in the proposal. Dean Gibson noted that several of the undergraduate Accounting courses listed in curriculum have prerequisites, which at the least should be footnoted. He also mentioned that, on page eleven, MG 504 should be MG 500. Professor Bayers wondered whether the language concerning new faculty hires should be strengthened. He noted, in particular, the use of the conditional verb and adverbs such as “probably” on page fifteen. Professor Giapponi suggested that both of the program’s tracks, particularly as described on page eleven of the proposal, be fully reflected in the curriculum, noting that past experience shows that both government and not-for-profit entities can be covered in a single accounting class. Professor Staecker mentioned how such integration promotes retention. Several members spoke in favor of the proposal. Professor Scheraga requested that in one week the Working Group return to the Committee a revised proposal, on which members will vote on May 3 at 9 am in the School of Business.

Report from the SVPAA Regarding the Joint Program in Computer Science. SVPAA Fitzgerald reported that he charged the Chair of the Department of Mathematics and Dean of the School of Engineering with, in turn, to charge the respective computer science program directors with constructing a common core of courses for a joint program in computer science. SVPAA Fitzgerald reported that he is awaiting word from the respective program directors.

Chair’s Addendum

The EPC reconvened on May 3rd at 9 am with all present except Welles-Nystrom, Campbell and Fitzgerald. The MPA proposal was passed unanimously with the one following change:

5. **Impact on other Fairfield Programs** p. 12

The MPA is not intended to replace any existing programs at the University, but is part of the broadening of graduate offerings that has accelerated over the past two decades. The MPA Working Group envisioned some positive cross-fertilization with existing graduate programs at Fairfield, particularly in the Dolan School of Business and Graduate Communication. If the program expands to include a track in Hospital Administration and/or Healthcare Management, cooperation with the School of Nursing would be essential and has already begun for advanced planning (related to reconfiguration of the “Health Care Management” track which has been discontinued in SON). The MPA has no impact on the Fairfield University core requirements.
Date: August 27, 2012  
To: Academic Council  
From: 2011-2012 AC Executive Committee  
Re: Academic Calendar Issues

Over the summer, faculty members on the AC Executive Committee brought faculty concerns about the 2012-13 academic calendar to the attention of the Senior VP for Academic Affairs. Specifically that, in July, the Registrar’s office published a revised 2012-2013 academic calendar that presented a number of problems. The start of the Spring 2013 semester was January 14, violating the Journal of Record (JOR) mandate of a break between semesters of “approximately one month”. Furthermore, the Spring semester, by eliminating Tuesdays following a Monday schedule, had markedly different numbers of classes meetings on different days of the week. Though there are good reasons for eliminating these “administrative Mondays,” the resulting inequities are problematic for once a week classes/labs. They also lead to a week’s difference in the length of semesters following the common undergraduates schedules of M/Th versus T/F.

The AC Executive Committee discussed these issues at its most recent meeting. At that time, the SVPAA addressed one of the faculty concerns by agreeing to move the start date of the spring 2013 semester to after the Martin Luther King, Jr. holiday.

The AC EC acknowledges, as many faculty are aware, that these sorts of calendar problems arise periodically because the construction of the calendar is constrained by a number of policies:

- The JOR specifies that the first semester begins in September and must be completed before Christmas, and that there be approximately one month between semesters.
- Faculty contracts begin on September 1 so the Fall semester cannot begin any earlier.
- The JOR specifies a minimum of 3 reading days per semester and says that students cannot be required to take more than 2 final exams in a day.
- Commencement is held the weekend before Memorial Day weekend.
- Various accrediting bodies have requirements about the minimum lengths of semesters.

Furthermore, these problems typically surface after the calendar is published because there is no regular faculty review of the calendar built into our governance structures.

In order to address these matters once and for all, the AC Executive Committee recommends that the Academic Council set up a two-person subcommittee each Fall to review proposed academic calendars and report back to the Academic Council before these calendars are published. In 2012-2013, this subcommittee could also review the constraints described above and, if appropriate, propose policy changes and/or guidelines for calendar construction. During 2012-13, the subcommittee should draft Journal of Record language that would articulate the subcommittee’s permanence as well as its ongoing charge.

MOTION. That the Academic Council elects a two-person subcommittee from its 2012-13 faculty membership to:

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

From: Liz Hohl and Kathy Nantz

Re: Request for Task Force on the Status, Roles, and Employment Conditions of Part-time Faculty at Fairfield

Date: August 31, 2012

Attachments: Summaries of CAW and AAUP Reports

MOTION: That the Academic Council appoint a task force to explore the status, roles, and conditions of part-time faculty at Fairfield. This task force shall report back to the Academic Council at each of its meetings in the spring 2013 semester, and provide a final report along with recommendations for action to the Council at its September 2013 meeting. This task force shall be composed of full-time tenured faculty, part-time faculty, and appropriate administrators.

RATIONALE: In the past few months, two important new documents were published on the topic of contingent faculty. The first, issued by the Coalition on the Academic Workforce (CAW), sketched a much-needed profile of non-tenure track, part-time faculty through a survey of over 10,000 professionals in the United States. The second was a draft report calling for the inclusion of contingent faculty in governance systems produced by a joint committee of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). The work of the CAW and the AAUP provides us with fresh impetus for an examination of the status, roles and conditions of the nearly 300 part-time faculty employed across all schools at Fairfield. The reasons for initiating such a study, with the purpose of making recommendations, are numerous and speak to the nature of how we might best serve students.

Continuing Presence of Part-time Faculty

According to the CAW Report, the instructional workforce in higher education during 2009 was composed of 25% tenured/tenure track and 75% non-tenure track faculty. The employment of professors on a part-time basis is an ongoing, national trend that has only accelerated in the past

decade. The practice is neither temporary nor short term. While the majority of courses at Fairfield are taught by those employed on a tenured or tenure track basis, a larger number of instructors on campus are working on a part-time basis. A 2007 survey of part-time faculty concerns on our campus conducted by the Office of Institutional Research and the Center for Academic Excellence and funded by the Humanities Institute, portrayed the average contingent employee at Fairfield as an experienced professional with longstanding ties to the university. Some efforts have been made to engage in outreach and to offer professional development opportunities, but little attention has been paid to the professional needs of these members of our academic community.

**Increased Service Responsibilities for Faculty**

The service component for those who are tenured or are on the tenure track has grown significantly at many institutions in recent years. Extensive efforts to recruit and retain students along with increases in enrollment, the addition of residential colleges and a greater linkage between curricular and extra-curricular activities, the development of interdisciplinary majors and minors as well as new assessment and program review requirements from accrediting bodies, are among the major new projects that demand full-time faculty time. On the current application form for those seeking adjunct positions at Fairfield, the following statement refers vaguely to non-teaching tasks: “the University may, from time to time over the course of the appointment term, request adjunct faculty members to participate in various performance oriented evaluation initiatives.” The language appears to cover course evaluation forms and assessment exercises. However, it could also be read to include participation in designing and implementing assessment programs, in reviewing student artifacts, and/or in reporting back on the results of those activities. Ongoing projects that measure student-learning outcomes suffer without greater input from contingent faculty. If those who are employed part-time simply supply data for analysis without taking a role in implementing necessary changes, the whole process is shortchanged. Given the range of expertise among part-time faculty and in many cases, the long-term nature of their affiliation with the university, part-time faculty...
might be the particularly suited to engaging in this work, partnering with full-time tenured and
tenure track colleagues as important decisions are made about curriculum and delivery.

**Quality of Instruction**

There are a host of serious issues raised by part-time status that include questions about curriculum
development, program review and academic freedom – all of which affect the quality of instruction
at any college or university. In addition, as the AAUP suggested in their 2010 report, it is “time to
stabilize the faculty” and address the working conditions for those off the tenure track. According
to Dr. Donald Rogers, Chair of the OAH Committee on Part-time, Adjunct and Contingent
Employment: “adequate financial support and job security will uphold a high standard of
educational quality and academic discourse.”

The report from the NEASC reviewers who visited Fairfield for our most recent accreditation report
cited the importance of “… reexamining faculty roles and responsibilities and, as appropriate,
implementing changes in faculty reward systems to support increased expectations for scholarship
and participation in strategic initiatives” (Letter dated April 29, 2008). Any response to this call
should reflect careful reconsideration of the entire teaching faculty, including both those on the
tenure track and those in all non-tenure track positions. Resources must be made available so that
all faculty can contribute to the academic mission of the institution going forward.

**Need for Defined Role in Governance**

Given the consistent presence of part-time faculty in higher education and the AAUP draft under
consideration, an examination of the role or rather the lack thereof played by part-time faculty in
university governance should be undertaken. Many professional academic associations including
the Modern Language Association (MLA) and the Organization of American Historians (OAH)
have pointed to this deficiency and called for the appropriate inclusion of contingent faculty in
governance bodies from the departmental to the institutional level. The absence of part-time faculty
in structures of governance denies them voice in decision-making, as well as a venue for

---

4 Dr. Rogers shared his thoughts in an email communication circulated among committee members.
collaborating with full-time colleagues. Furthermore, life on the margins interferes with performance and deprives institutions of part-time faculty expertise. In fact, a 2003 report from the AAUP recommends that contingent appointments include “the full range of faculty responsibilities”: teaching, scholarship, and service (2012 report, p. 8).

Conclusion
To better serve our students and enrich the life of university, the Academic Council should explore the status, roles, and employment conditions of part-time faculty employees at Fairfield. There is a wealth of research being done currently that will inform our practice and there is leadership emerging across the disciplines that can guide our decisions. Right now, Fairfield has the opportunity to join the conversation and show leadership in the academic community by initiating reforms that improve student learning and collegiality across our departments and schools. In a recent issue of Liberal Education, “Confronting Contingency: Faculty Equity and the Goals of Academic Democracy”, authors Maria Maisto and Steve Street argue, “What is needed is a revitalization of the concept of academic democracy, one rooted in the social contract that has traditionally defined faculty work and that embodies the values of liberal education.”5 This task force would be a first step in this journey at Fairfield.