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

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

7 (b) Language Core Requirement:

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

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

MOTION (Lane/Downie): To accept the recommendation of the UCC and change the language in the JOR regarding Area V of the core curriculum as follows:
Area V: Modern and Classical Languages

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dean Gibson spoke in favor of the motion, stating that the issue had been discussed in detail by UCC, a fully functioning and representative faculty body, on multiple occasions and that UCC had based its conclusions, and taken votes, following extensive deliberations and review of relevant data. He noted that several competitive Universities with common undergraduate core requirements had certain variations within their core language requirements. In his view the current system was working well, citing, as an example, the impact on applications and enrollments and an increase in the number of DSB students taking critical languages.
Joe Dennin spoke in opposition to the motion. If the University is to have an undergraduate core curriculum, then the core should be standard for all students. This did not imply support for a particular language requirement, only that it be common.

Dean Babington spoke in favor of the motion, endorsing points made by Dean Gibson.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**MOTION PASSED: 11 in favor, 2 opposed, 0 abstentions**

(c) **Final Examination Policy:**

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

Final Exam Policy:

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Final Exam as a Percentage of Total Grade:**

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

CR: 11/02/1987

A variety of additional informal proposals were made to amend the potential text.
Prof. Lane noted that a key concern when the text was created was to establish an upper limit on the weight of the final exam and that this should be maintained.

SVPAA Fitzgerald noted that important differences existed among various fields and schools and flexibility needed to exist for circumstances in which a final portfolio or mastery of a subject was the appropriate evaluation.

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

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

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

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

(d) UCC proposal on revision of University College representation

**MOTION (Lane/Winn): To accept the recommendation of the UCC, as set out on page 73 of the packet, that the first paragraph of Section I.c.b.4 of the Faculty Handbook be amended as follows:**

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

Dean Crabtree spoke in favor of the motion, recalling the history of the issue and noting the importance of including someone on the UCC who was fully conversant with issues of relevance to part-time students. She expressed concerns for the term “non-renewable” in the proposal as continuity in this non-voting position could be advantageous in some situations.
MOTION (Rakowitz /Shea): To amend the proposal to amend the first paragraph of Section I.c.b.4 of the Faculty Handbook, so that it would read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MOTION PASSED: 12 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions
7 (i) Standard merit for untenured and newly promoted faculty (attachment)

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

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

Because they are already extensively reviewed each year and they should be focused on longer-term, rather than annual, goals, untenured, tenure-track faculty members automatically qualify for standard merit in their first three years as long as their continuing (tenure track) contracts are renewed. In years when further merit is available, they may apply for it. In addition, the merit assessments for untenured, tenure-track faculty should recognize that they do not have as many opportunities for leadership in service as tenured faculty do.

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

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

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

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

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

6. Old Business

6 (a) Student grievance timeline

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

**MOTION (Rakowitz /Lane): To approve the addition of the following to the relevant text that the AC already approved on Academic Grievance Time Limits:**
If the grievance moves forward, all subsequent steps of the informal process must be completed and the formal process must be initiated before the end of the second semester subsequent to the event that is the subject of the grievance.

Prof. Petrino confirmed that this change would not impact grievances that are already in process.

SVPAA Fitzgerald noted that it was in a student’s interest for University to move with alacrity. At the same time, it was necessary for the student, and in the student’s interest, to begin the grievance process in a timely fashion. The changes proposed in past meetings and today were designed to address these issues.

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

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

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

7e. Academic advising and PINs for registration

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

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

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

Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,
David Downie