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

Student: Rob Vogel

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

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

Regrets: Dean Jack Beal

Chair Keenan called the meeting to order at 3:35

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

1. Presidential Courtesy

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. Report from the Executive Secretary.

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

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

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

4. Council Subcommittee Reports.

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

5. No petitions for immediate hearing.

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

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

7a Proposal for Master of Liberal Studies

Visitors Bayne and Perkus presented the proposal and answered questions.

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

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

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

Prof Bayne: The projections were developed in conjunction with Judy Dubai from Enrollment Management.
SVPA Fitzgerald made several points: Fairfield University has a strong reputation in the area. This program should appeal to people in the area who want to think about big questions. It expands the opportunities for full-time faculty in the Humanities particularly to teach graduate students.

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

Prof. Dennin expressed serious concern that the budget numbers were frequently in the wrong year.

Dean Perkus acknowledged the drop in enrollment in American Studies but the proposed program has broader appeal and will have the energy of a new program.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Prof. Downie asked if undergraduates could take the program.

Dean Crabtree replied that it is against the rules.

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

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

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

Prof. Bayne replied no and that many of the courses will be cross-listed after being approved by the program committee.
Prof. Bhattacharya asked what are the differences between American Studies and MLS.

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

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

Prof. Kohli pointed out that there was no similar program in this part of the state. Then she asked what distinguishes it, makes it unique, connects it to adult learning. Finally, she mentioned that adult pedagogy is important.

Prof. Bayne replied that two things make it distinct. One is the team teaching in the fundamental course LS401. The other is building a sense of community all the way through and into the capstone course where the students will be working together.

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

Prof. Lasseter asked if a language requirement was envisioned.

Prof. Bayne responded no.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Motion passed 14 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions.**
Professor Ruffini presented sections 7 b, c, d (pgs. 68 – 82) for discussion.

(d) UCC representation:

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

(c) Final Examination Policy:

The issue of final exam policy was sent to the UCC initially due to a concern of the FDEC on the weight given to the final exam in the final grade. Prof. Ruffini spoke about motions B and C on pg. 72.

Prof Rakowitz noted that the proposal removed language requiring notification of the dean for formats other than in-class exams, and that seemed to make sense. But she didn't understand why the timing policy (the language stating that whatever the form of the final evaluation, it could not be due before the time assigned by the registrar) had been moved to the section about weighting and had been eviscerated by allowing violation through notification of the dean rather than requiring approval.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Prof Rakowitz explained that when Prof. Ruffini contacted her in October asking about the intent of the framers of the motion, she didn't answer because it was the faculty discussion not the framers' intention that mattered once the motion passed. She did, however, say that Prof. Ruffini could ask the AC for clarification on the General Faculty motion.

Prof Epstein reiterated this point and felt the motion meant a single requirement for all undergraduates. He asked if the faculty motion was returned to the UCC, would they try to create a uniform language requirement for all undergraduates.

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

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

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

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

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

**Motion to recess to Monday February 11th [Dennin/Rafalski] Passed unanimously at 5:30.**