Academic Council Meeting Minutes  
Monday, April 8, 2013  
3:35-5:10pm

Present: Professors Shawn Rafalski, Elizabeth Petrino, Phil Lane, David Winn, Roxana Walker-Canton, David Downie, Bob Epstein (Executive Secretary), Wendy Kohli, Dennis Keenan (Chair), Susan Rakowitz (General Faculty Secretary), Chris Huntley, John Lasseter, Mousumi Bhattacharya, James He, Nancy Dallavalle, and Joe Dennin

Student: Rob Vogel

Administrators: Deans Susan Franzosa, Lynn Babington, SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald SJ

Guests: Prof. Jocelyn Boryczka, Melissa Quan, Prof. Paula Gill Lopez, Assoc. Dean Meredith Kazer Wallace, Prof. Danke Li, Prof. Laura McSweeney

Chair Keenan called the meeting to order at 3:35pm.

1. Presidential Courtesy.

SVPAA Fitzgerald said that the recent Open House was a great success, with almost 3000 people attending. Evaluations were very positive, with good comments about the faculty involved. In addition, graduate admissions numbers are ahead of last year.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty.

Prof. Rakowitz indicated that Academic Council may need to meet during finals week and perhaps over the summer. She suggested May 28 and/or June 26.

Prof. Rakowitz pointed out that the current and longstanding practice regarding the awarding of transfer credits for incoming freshmen does not match the Journal of Record (JOR). Apparently the JOR policy would put us at a competitive disadvantage with other schools. There is a committee planning on bringing forward a proposal to change the policy, but in the meantime, she authorized the continuation of the longstanding practice, with the understanding that the policy and practice will be aligned by Fall of 2014.

Prof. Rakowitz reported on the search for a new EVP/COO. She summarized the President’s description of the position along with concerns she had expressed to him about the need for the position, the expense (especially in light of the current budget context), and the emphasis on business over higher education experience. She said that the Academic Council will likely be involved in an advisory capacity in the search.

Motion (Lane/He): Academic Council is on record that it opposes the addition of the new EVP position at this time to Fairfield University as a Jesuit and Catholic University.

Prof. Epstein expressed confusion over the new organizational chart. How does the EVP position differ from the VP for Administration? SVPAA Fitzgerald said that the new position
expands the previous Executive VP position to include oversight of Enrollment Management and Marketing and Communication.

Prof. Bhattacharya expressed concern that the position did not require previous academic experience. The failure rate for positions that do not require relevant experience is pretty high. Prof. He agreed, saying that a COO manages production, which would seem to be academics at a University.

The motion passed, 10 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary.

Prof. Epstein submitted the minutes from the February 4 and February 25 meetings.

The minutes were approved 13-0-1

4. Council Subcommittee Reports.

Item 4f. Subcommittee on Community-Engaged Scholarship (CES).

Prof. Rakowitz agreed to chair the Academic Council so that Prof. Keenan could speak to the matter at hand.

Prof. Keenan reviewed the history of the committee and the recommended changes to the rank and tenure guidelines. There are no recommended changes to the Faculty handbook but only to the Journal of Record.

Jocelyn Boryczka noted that Fairfield University received a Carnegie Classification as a Community Engaged Campus in 2008. The university now needs to formalize a policy that recognizes and rewards CES in order to retain the classification into the future.

Melissa Quan said that the recommended evaluation criteria for CES in the rank and tenure process were based on what other schools that also have the designation have done. The subcommittee’s discussions about the criteria are described in the Subcommittee minutes.

Motion (Epstein/ Lane) to approve the proposed changes to the Guidelines and Timetable for Applications for Tenure and Promotion presented on pages 17-21 of the AC packet for 4/8/13. [attached to these minutes as Appendix 1]

Prof. Dennin criticized the language of the guideline as being too vague. It was unclear how CES differed from consulting. SVPAA Fitzgerald said that it is up to the faculty member to submit his or her work for peer review, which should address whether the work meets the guidelines. Prof. Dennin again noted that the language did not indicate what exactly was being peer reviewed. Prof. Keenan responded by saying that it was up to the faculty member to make his or her case in the Rank and Tenure process. All the CES guideline does is provide a place for it in the dossier. Prof. Boryczka then gave an example of how a faculty member might make his or her case.
Prof. Petrino asked about the connection between service learning and CES. Melissa Quan said that service learning is about teaching, while CES is about research. Prof. Keenan described the guidelines as providing a bridge between teaching and scholarship that clarifies things for junior faculty.

Prof. Bhattacharya noted that the guideline can complicate assessment. Prof. Keenan again said that providing evidence remains the responsibility of the faculty member. SVPAA Fitzgerald then stated that the new guideline codifies what has been intended recent practice at Fairfield University. Prof. Kohli agreed, saying that the CES guideline is no different from any other tenure criteria, in that it’s always up the faculty member to make the case.

Prof. Dennin asked for clarification regarding payment. Why should it matter if the faculty member is getting paid for the work? Prof. Boryzcka responded that it is a matter of intent.

Prof. Lane called the question.

Motion passed, 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

5. No petitions for immediate hearing.

A motion passed to reorder the agenda, taking up 7a, b and c before 6a.

7a. Committee on Conference with the Trustees.

Prof. Paula Gill Lopez recounted the activities at the recent trustees meeting. The main agenda item was academic priorities, with the discussion and tone being quite positive. Fr. Baldovin, SJ, Trustee and Chair, said in the end that there were two takeaways from the meeting: i) faculty feel that there is no compelling strategic plan; and ii) the morale issue with faculty was not solely about salary and compensation. The observed balance between academic and non-academic priorities was troubling to the faculty. Prof. Lane and Dean Babington confirmed Prof. Gill Lopez’s summary. SVPAA Fitzgerald concurred, saying that the meeting was fruitful and respectful, with the report by the chair to the full board of trustees reflecting Prof. Gill Lopez’s account.

Prof. Gill Lopez said that the crux of the discussion came down to the financial allocation given to academics, citing the current rebranding effort as an example of a costly activity that has no bearing on academics.

Prof. Lane, Prof. Dennin, and Prof. Downie described similar conversations at other Trustees committee meetings. There were further discussions of financial priorities and budgets, with Prof. Downie noting that sports seem to be a focus because of the fundraising implications.

7b. Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee (FDEC)

Prof. Kazer Wallace described proposed membership changes in the FDEC. With the closing of University College, the committee recommends allocating its slot to the School of Engineering.
Motion (He/Winn) to accept the proposal to change the Handbook description of the membership of the FDEC as follows (additions in bold, deletions struck through):

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

**Motion passed, 16 in favor, 0 against, and 0 abstentions**

**7c. Faculty Research Committee (FRC)**

Profs. Danke Li and Laura McSweeney summarized the FRC’s changes to the grant application process. The intention is to get more faculty funded for research. The new application forms clarify the process to improve the quality of the applications.

Prof. Rakowitz directed everyone to the revised sabbatical application process provided in the meeting agenda. Prof. Lane expressed concern that there was no appeals process if the proposal was denied. Prof. Dallavalle responded that appeals were outside the scope of the work being discussed. Prof. Epstein suggested that the FRC could be directed to consider an appeals process after the vote on the current proposal.

Prof. He returned to Prof. Lane’s concern, saying that it is possible to get denied even when the faculty member follows the rules. Prof. Li gave an example in which a proposal was returned to a faculty member for clarification. The intent is always to accept the proposal unless there is a reason to deny it.

Prof. Rakowitz noted the differences between pre-tenure sabbatical applications and the post-tenure sabbatical applications. Dean Franzosa noted that pre-tenure sabbaticals are mentioned in the offer letters to junior faculty hires. SVPAA Fitzgerald and Prof. McSweeney responded that the opportunity to apply is guaranteed but acceptance is not.

**Motion (Fitzgerald/Epstein) to approve the changes to the JOR as presented on pages 35-50 of the AC packet for 4/8/13.** [attached to these minutes as Appendix 2]

SVPAA Fitzgerald spoke in favor of the motion, saying that the revisions have been a focus of the FRC for four years. Fairfield University does not set a fixed budget for sabbaticals but awards all that are worthy. For the grants, we want more applicants.

Prof. Lasseter asked about academic renewal. Is that a justification for requesting a sabbatical? Prof. Li responded that it is justified only if it is specified as scholarship. It can’t be a vague request for time to renew a hobby. We want to reward faculty for being
intentional in their scholarship. The new language is to give more guidance to faculty that the sabbatical application should address specific professional goals.

**Motion passed 14 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstention.**

**Motion (Lane/Dallavalle): The AC requests the Faculty Research Committee to deliver to the Academic Council a proposal for an appeals process for sabbaticals and pre-tenure research leaves.**

Prof. Dennin and Prof. Lane spoke in favor of the motion, saying that it is important to have a transparent appeals process. Dean Franzosa agreed, saying that we need to have due process in the matter of appeals. Prof. Walker-Canton added that both the decision and the appeal should be in writing. Prof. Keenan said that the need for written record should be taken as a recommendation to the FRC.

**Motion passed, 14 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.**

**6a. Proposed changes in final exam policy from the UCC**

Prof. Rakowitz asked to untable the motion about the final exam policy. The issue centered around the percentage of the course grade to be determined by an in-class final exam. Under the proposed policy an in-class final exam could not constitute more than one-third of the overall course grade.

**Motion (Rakowitz/Second): to amend the final exam policy in the JOR as follows (additions in bold, deletions struck through):**

Final Exam Policy:
1. Each instructor should be given a wide latitude, so as to provide for a degree of creativity and flexibility in how the students will be tested. The form of evaluation should be in keeping with the goals and purposes of the course.
2. In every case the form of the final, end-of-semester comprehensive evaluation (such as written examination, take-home, oral exam, paper, etc. or a combination of these) must appear on the syllabus at the beginning of the semester.
3. The normal form of final evaluations is a written examination, two to three hours in length, to be administered at the date and time assigned by the Registrar. Written examinations less than two hours or more than three hours will require written notification of the students, Dean, and chairperson, program director or area coordinator, as appropriate.
4. If the professor chooses a method of evaluation other than the normal 2 to 3 hour written examination on the assigned date and time, the following criteria must be met:
   a. A memorandum must be submitted in writing to the chairperson, program director or area coordinator and the appropriate dean, reasonably in advance of the end of the semester, describing the alternate form of the final evaluation to be used.
   b. No greater demands should be made of a student's time and effort by an alternate form of final examination than would be required by preparation and taking of the normal 2 to 3 hour written examination.
3. e. No alternative form of final evaluation is to be due prior to the date assigned by the Registrar for that course’s final examination.

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


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

CR: 11/02/1987

**Weighting of Course Components for Grading Purposes**

There is no single formula for the weighting of course components, but in all classes, students should receive feedback on their work at multiple points during the semester. In classes for which the final assessment is an in-class examination, that exam should not count for more than 1/3 of the course grade.

Prof. Petrino asked about the intention of the motion. Is the change mostly about in-class vs. out-of-class final exams. Prof. Rakowitz confirmed, referring to the original concerns raised by the FDEC about high stakes testing.

Rob Vogel asked if a final presentation (instead of a an exam) with 50% weight conform to the proposed policy. Prof. Rakowitz responded that the focus is on final exams and that other kinds of assignments could be considered separately.

James He spoke against the motion, saying that there might be some cases where having a final exam with more than 33% weight might be reasonable. He saw the proposed policy as being too restrictive.

David Downie called the question.

**Motion passed, 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 3 abstentions**

The meeting adjourned at 5:10pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Chris Huntley
Appendix 1: Approved changes to the Guidelines and Timetable for Applications for Tenure and Promotion

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

Section Four: Outline and Guidelines for Applicant's Dossier

V. Teaching Accomplishments Since Initial Promotion or Appointment to Present Rank

A. Courses taught at Fairfield University

Identify and describe new ones courses developed or substantially redesigned, including new or existing courses designed for community engagement, and other substantial teaching activities that are counted as part of your assigned course load.

B. Teaching evaluation

   i. Peer review - The applicant is encouraged to request colleagues with firsthand experience of his/her teaching ability to submit written reports based on these observations. Colleagues may wish to address differences between their perceptions of candidate's teaching and student perceptions if the student perceptions are known to the colleague.

   ii. Student Evaluation Summary - If student evaluations are submitted as supporting materials, a summary of the student rating must appear in this section of the application. Sufficient information about the evaluation instrument (especially a department or personal form) and results must be provided to enable the committee to make an informed decision.

   iii. Other - *As appropriate, include community partner evaluations and community-based peer or student evaluations.*

C. Description of involvement in curriculum development and enhancement

   The candidate may include information about innovations in teaching and integrative approaches that bring together teaching, scholarship, and community engagement.

D. Student advising

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

F. Participation in courses/seminars of other faculty

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

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

A. A list of publications
   If a publication has multiple authors, explain your contribution to the publication.

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

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

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

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

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

   2. Professional refereed journal papers
3. **Products of community-engaged scholarship**

3. 4. Professional refereed conference proceeding papers

4. 5. Professional non-refereed journal papers

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

6. 7. Book reviews and short notes

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

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

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

C. D. Professional presentations
   Include information such as the date of the presentation, location, to whom, and the topic.

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

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

D. E. Professional honors and/or awards

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

F. Sponsored research (grants)
   Please also list applications for grants

G. Consultantships

H. Presentations on media or to a community and non-professional groups
   Present all relevant data.

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

A. Service to Student Organizations

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

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

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

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

E. Service to Non-University Community

F. Service Extending beyond the University
   Efforts that relate to one’s academic/professional expertise and are undertaken as a representative of the university; for example: providing consultation services (without remuneration); participation in major committees of a professional society or discipline, etc.
Appendix 2: Approved changes to applications to the Research Committee

Note: In the material that follows, changes are shown in the Guidelines for Sabbatical (additions underlined, deletions struck through). In the remaining documents, changes are simply incorporated.

FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE
GUIDELINES FOR SABBATICAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- The proper prerequisites to carry out the project.

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

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

PROCEDURE
Check the Faculty Handbook for eligibility.

Consult with department chairperson for planning and evaluation of the proposed project so that the completed application is submitted to the Research Committee by November 15, the deadline.

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

**FORMAT**

Proposals should be submitted according to the following format: The format is intended to provide the committee with the information necessary for evaluation. It is important that the applicant provide complete and specific information about the project itself, its importance to the applicant's professional life, and its value to the university. The proposal should use language appropriate to the discipline, but should also use language that clearly communicates to the committee the subject matter, the plan, and the methods involved. Failure to follow these guidelines and timetable will result in non-review of the application. An original and 6 copies are required.

**REVIEW**

If the applicant has not followed the guidelines approved by the faculty, or does not follow the timetable specified in the Faculty Handbook, the application will not be further considered. If, after first review, the application is deemed to have merit, but is judged by the committee to be deficient in some area, the applicant may be asked to submit additional data for reconsideration.

**PROPOSAL**

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

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

2. Date of initial appointment and date of tenure

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

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

5. Title of sabbatical project

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

8. Benefit of the project to the university

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

10. Relevant bibliography

11. Comments

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

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

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

**REVIEW**

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

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

**REPORTING REQUIREMENT**

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

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

FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE
GUIDELINES FOR PRE-TENURE RESEARCH LEAVE

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

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

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

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

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

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

PROCEDURE
Check the Faculty Handbook for eligibility.

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

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

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

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

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

2. Date of initial appointment

3. Date(s) of prior external and internal research support of the past five years (Append copies of the most recent prior research grant and summer research stipend reports)

4. Period of proposed research leave, and preferred semester

5. Title of project

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

7. Short project summary of no more than 250 words
8. Benefit of the project to the university

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

10. Relevant bibliography

11. Comments

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

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

**REVIEW**

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

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

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

In the event that there are more qualified applicants than it is possible to allow pre-tenure leaves in any particular year, preference will be given to those applying in their third year for a leave in their fourth year.

Ten semesters of active service at Fairfield University must elapse after completion of a pre-tenure research leave before the faculty member is eligible for their first sabbatical leave.

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

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

FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE
GUIDELINES FOR SUMMER RESEARCH STIPENDS

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

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

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

ELIGIBILITY
• All tenure-track or tenured faculty are eligible for the summer research stipends.
• Awards will be made on the following conditions:
  • professors approved for Summer Research Stipends must teach no more than one summer session course or engage in more than the normal (academic year) one-day-per-week consultative activities during the period from May 30 to August 30;
  • professors approved for Summer Research Stipends cannot have duplicate funding that pays for time for the same or a similar project;
• Applications from faculty falling into the following four categories will be considered only if there is not a sufficient number of high quality applications: faculty members (1) who held summer research stipends during the previous
summer’s period, (2) who were approved for a sabbatical leave for the two academic years contiguous with that summer, (3) who were approved for a pre-tenure research leave for the two academic years contiguous with that summer, (4) who were approved for a senior summer fellowship during the previous summer’s period, (5) who received the Robert Wall Award for the two academic years contiguous with that summer.

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

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

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

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

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

9. Relevant bibliography

10. Comments

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

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

**REVIEW**

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

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

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

**REPORTING REQUIREMENT**

Final report is due March 1, following receipt of the award. This report should discuss your accomplishments and the immediate outcomes and products of your summer research stipend. This should be related back to the original goals and plans in your proposal, explicitly noting any necessary modifications in their implementation. In addition, you should note any intended future outcomes and products that will likely stem from your project.
The final report should be sent to Faculty Research Committee Administrative Liaison (CNS 300), and to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, the applicant’s Dean, and the applicant's Chair.

AC: 02/12/2001
AC: 11/03/2003
AC: 09/11/2006
AC: 04/30/2007
AC: 04/28/2008

FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE
GUIDELINES FOR RESEARCH GRANT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AC: 10/04/1993
AC: 11/03/2003
AC: 09/11/2006
AC: 04/30/2007

FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE
GUIDELINES FOR SENIOR SUMMER FELLOWSHIP

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

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

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

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

DEADLINE FOR APPLICATION
The deadline is generally around November 1. The official deadline is published each year by the Research Committee. Applications must be submitted on or before the deadline. Late applications will NOT be reviewed.
ELIGIBILITY
- The applicant must be a tenured associate or full professor.
- The applicant must be recommended by the Department Chair. Department Chairs who wish to apply should seek a letter of recommendation from a senior colleague. The applicant must devote two consecutive and uninterrupted months to full-time research or artistic work, and may not hold other major external fellowships or other internal research grants during the summer of the award.
- Recipients are not eligible to teach during the summer of the award.
- Members of the Faculty Research Committee are not eligible to apply during their term in order to avoid conflict of interest.

Faculty members approved for sabbatical leave or who receive the Robert Wall Award will not be eligible for a Senior Summer Fellowship for either summer contiguous to the academic year of the sabbatical leave.

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

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

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

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

9. Relevant bibliography

10. Comments

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

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

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

**REVIEW**

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

**REPORTING REQUIREMENT**

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

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

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