MINUTES

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

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

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

1. Presidential Courtesy
   • SVPAA Fitzgerald congratulated the School of Nursing for winning a $700,000 HRSA grant.
   • SVPAA Fitzgerald reported that the proposal for the MPA has moved to the state level.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty
   Prof. Rakowitz reported that the committees are up and running.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
   a. Approval of minutes
      i. Meeting of September 10, 2012

      Corrections:
      • Professor Downie p. 8 wanted to clarify his statement on page 8 of the minutes. “Prof. Downie stated that he wanted to make sure that we don’t prejudge the outcome and become an advocacy group."

      • Professor Downie pointed out that on the ninth page of the minutes the statement “Prof. Downie stressed that we also need full-time faculty representation as some departments have very few adjuncts” needed to be changed to “Prof. Downie stressed that we also need to improve full-time faculty representation as some departments have very few adjuncts.”

      MOTION (Petrino/Dennin): To approve the minutes of September 10, 2012 as amended.

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

   The subcommittee (4d) was formed to discuss moving to Division III athletics. Professors Sapp, Huntley, Rosivach, Bardos and Harriott sit on the committee.
   Professors Kathy Nantz and Elizabeth Hohl will arrange the first meeting of the new task force (4e) for part-time faculty.
b. Correspondence: None

4. Council Subcommittee Reports

b. Subcommittee on Community-Engaged Scholarship

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

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

Prof. Bayne raised questions about section VI. A in the document submitted to the AC. He wanted to know the rationale for moving the sentence “If a publication has multiple authors, explain your contribution to the publication” and the rationale for including the “Products of community-engaged scholarship” in the list of types of professional accomplishments.

Prof. Calderwood said that the change was made to clarify what counts as evidence of authorship. She pointed out that engaged scholarship with multiple authors has to be explained in a more robust way.

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

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

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

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

Prof. Dennin asked for a description of a typical product.
Dean Crabtree suggested that the creation of guiding principles for community development, organizational policies and executive structure could be an example of community-engaged scholarship.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Prof. Dallavalle asked if community-engaged scholarship is the same as engaged scholarship.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. Petitions for immediate hearing: None

6. Old Business: None

7. New Business

a. Election of faculty to the Honorary Degree Committee

Prof. Rakowitz reported that the committee on committees nominated Professors Ron Salafia, Rick Dewitt and Dawn Massey to serve on the Honorary Degree Committee.

MOTION (LANE/DENNIN): To accept the nominated members to the Honorary Degree Committee

MOTION PASSED: 16 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions

b. Committee on Conference with Board of Trustees

(Committee Members present at AC meeting– Professors Phil Lane, Wendy Kohli, Paula Gill Lopez)

Prof. Keenan opened the floor for discussion of points the Committee on Conference should make to the Board at their upcoming meeting.

Prof. Rakowitz stated that in following up on last year's issues, the Board should understand that the faculty was divided at the September 7 vote on the MOU only over how best to protect the 95th percentile, not about the importance of the 95th percentile.

Prof. Dennin commented that the faculty didn’t feel the MOU was a good deal financially.

Prof. Sapp wondered if no confidence comes up how do we want committee to react.

Prof. Epstein pointed out that just because members are on the Board does not mean that they have purchased shares in the university.
Prof. Lane reminded the council that the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees used to put together a joint agenda with the Board of Trustees. The direction of their discussions were supposed to be about academic matters. The committee would have an hour with the Academic Affairs committee from the Board of Trustees. Faculty should talk about a real strategic plan and where we want to go in the academic mission of the university.

Dean Crabtree mentioned that the committee only meets with academic affairs part of board and not with whole group. This particular group is more engaged with this section. She added that too much of the public discourse on cost containment focuses on the academic division and salary. The committee should work to preserve the academic division as opposed to seeing the academic division as a budget problem.

Prof. Shea commented that she senses that the Board of Trustees believes that the faculty does not understand the business component of running a university. She stated that the academic component is interested in partnering with the Board to address the issues. She asserted that the faculty are vital to achieving goals, but feel shut out of the discussion.

SVPAA Fitzgerald stated that the point of the committee is to put faculty in front of trustees to build their understanding of what faculty are doing. The administration and the faculty need to work together. We want the trustees to understand and to appreciate the academics of university. In terms of the academic portfolio review process, we need to show the trustees that we have a solid business model. Not every academic program has to have a lot of majors; some departments have few majors but work effectively and efficiently for the core. We do have to show that we are innovating and being good stewards.

Prof. Kohli proposed that we educate the Board about what we do. She noted that the Board needs to know the faculty as people for whom they should have respect. She senses that there was a lot of contempt for faculty as a group. The hour spent with them needs to focus on educating them to see us more than as just an expense.

Dean Gibson suggested that the committee present data from alumni regarding the role of faculty in their experiences at the university.

Prof. Paula Gill Lopez remembers that the last meeting of the committee was tense because of the 95th percentile issue. They had frank discussions with President von Arx and Paul Huston in attendance. She felt like the committee was on the defensive. She would like a more collaborative discussion. They talked about how to engage with the trustees in more meaningful ways.

Prof. Huntley stated that the Board treats the faculty like an expense rather than using the faculty as a resource to learn about where the university needs to do. If the faculty is able to assert perspectives about the direction of the university, then we could make the argument that the university is unable to get where it needs to be with substandard faculty.

Prof. Tromley suggested that we create a larger mission to move away from defensiveness.

**MOTION (EPSTEIN): To reorder the agenda to address item 7d before 7c.**

**MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

d. IRB changes to Journal of Record
Prof. Naser reported that the IRB (Institutional Review Board) committee was asked to revise entries for the IRB. The committee observed that the Code of Federal Regulations should not be included in the Journal of Record. The committee developed a set of standard operating procedures. Those procedures should not be in the JOR since they must change if the law changes. The committee produced another document that should replace all of the entries in the JOR regarding IRB. Prof. Naser pointed out that since the IRB is in a unique position to stand in the way of research and academic freedom, the IRB should take minimal stances in reviews of research. The main point is to resist applying standards beyond the regulations to avoid making obstacles to undertaking research.

MOTION (RAKOWITZ/FITZGERALD): To replace the section in the JOR regarding the IRB with the policies found in the document submitted by the IRB committee on pages 19 and 20 in the Academic Council Meeting Packet for October 1, 2012.

Prof. Kohli spoke in favor of the motion providing more detail of procedure.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Dean Crabtree asked if Item 10 of the policies also include the Office of Institutional Research.

Prof. Naser responded that everyone has to submit something.

e. Calendar issues

Prof. Rakowitz suggested that we elect a two-person subcommittee to address calendar issues such as the pros and cons of having classes meet the same number of days during a semester, the Monday schedule for Tuesdays, and semesters of unequal length. This committee would be ongoing.

Prof. Epstein was concerned that another calendar committee from the AVP's office already exists. The SVPAA said he didn't think so.

Prof. Dennin asked if the policies are flexible. He wanted to know if commencement could be moved to Memorial Day weekend.

SVPAA Fitzgerald suggested that the committee also address timecodes.

Prof. Keenan commented that timecodes are not a calendar issue.

MOTION (RAKOWITZ/DALLAVALLE): That the Academic Council elects a two-person subcommittee from its 2012-13 faculty membership to:

(1A) Review all of Fairfield’s policies related to the academic calendar;
(1B) Examine how our academic calendar issues are addressed by other schools;
(1C) If appropriate, propose policy changes and/or guidelines for calendar construction to the AC.
(2) Review any academic calendars proposed in 2012-13 before publication and report concerns to the AC.
(3) 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.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Profs. Epstein and Lane volunteered to serve as this year's subcommittee.

f. Grievance procedure timeline

Prof. Rakowitz reported that she was contacted by Prof. Laura Nash regarding the timeline for filing grievances due to a student submitting a grievance past the time outlined in the JOR regarding procedures for grievances. It was suggested that the wording in the JOR regarding procedures for filing grievances be revised to resolve possible contradictions between language that indicates how long professors should retain student work after the end of the course, and when a grievance should be initiated. Presently, the wording states that faculty should retain written assignments until the end of the following semester and that a grievance “must be initiated within a reasonable period (usually a semester) after the event … and for graduating seniors, no later than one semester after a degree is awarded.”

Prof. Dennin asked if semester also refers to the summer.

Prof. Rakowitz replied that semester refers to the fall and spring.

Prof. Sapp suggested that those situations should be spelled out more clearly.

Dean Crabtree added that if the procedure is not definitive, then issues may arise.

Prof. Kohli commented that students should have the opportunity to legitimately grieve a grade. The procedure needs to be specified as much as possible.

Prof. Lane pointed out that if this is a catalog policy, then it has to be approved.

MOTION (DALLAVALLE): To amend the language of the “Time Limits” section of the grievance process to “The procedure herein defined must be initiated by the end of the fall or spring semester subsequent to the event that is the subject of the grievance.”

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Prof. Rakowitz continued the discussion to establish a timeline for filing a grievance by asking when the informal process begins.

Dean Crabtree stated that once a grievance is articulated, the next steps of the process would have to begin within the next few weeks.

Prof. Bhattacharya asked how will students know if the problem is resolved.

Dean Crabtree suggested that the faculty member will communicate with the student, but the resolution will come from the Dean’s office in the form of a letter.

Prof. Kohli asked if this policy is for all students at Fairfield University.
Dean Crabtree replied that the policy is for all students at Fairfield University.

Prof. Bayne suggested that in step 2 and step 3 of the suggested timeline, after meeting with the faculty member, two weeks is too short of a time for students to then meet with the department chair or program director. After the student meets with the department chair or program director, Prof. Bayne also thought that two weeks was too short of a time to have a meeting with the dean of the school.

Prof. Dennin suggested that step 2 doesn’t make sense without step 1, so we need to take care of Step 1 before handling steps 2 and 3.

Prof. Bhattacharya agreed that it may take more than 2 weeks for students to gather more evidence to support their grievance.

Prof. Keenan asked what would be a more reasonable amount of time.

Prof. Bhattacharya suggested one month.

**MOTION (BHATTACHARYA/SAPP): To amend step two of the timeline for filing grievances to read, “Within one month of the meeting with the faculty member, the student consults with the chair or program director, bringing written documentation of the process to this point. If the student continues to assert that a grievance exists after attempted reconciliation, she or he advances to step three.”**

Prof. Dallavalle asked for clarification about the link between step 1 and step 2. What if the student’s materials are thrown out?

Prof. Rakowitz suggested that once a grievance is initiated, then the faculty member needs to know that she/he has to retain the student’s materials until the end of the process.

Prof. Petrino commented that she thought that it was commonplace for faculty to keep student work for one year.

Prof. Rakowitz replied that it is only required that faculty keep student work for one semester.

Prof. Petrino was concerned about the short amount of time allotted from the time that the grievance begins.

**MOTION (LANE/PETRINO): To table the motion until the next meeting.**

**MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

Meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Roxana Walker-Canton
Recording Secretary