ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, October 7, 2013
CNS 200
3:30 – 5:00 PM

1. Presidential courtesy

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
   a. Approval of minutes of AC meeting on Sept. 9, 2013 (attached)
   b. Correspondence
      i. Correspondence between DSB Dean and AC Executive Secretary (attached)
      ii. Memo dated 9/18/13 from Prof. DeWitt to AC (attached)
      iii. Memo dated 10/2/13 from VP Reed to AC (attached)
   c. Oral reports

4. Council Subcommittee Reports
   a. Subcommittee on broader academic freedom language for governance documents (AC 2/27/12)
   b. Subcommittee to consider proposing IDEA form for administrators (AC 4/4/11)
   c. Subcommittee on grievance procedures (AC 5/8/13)
   d. Subcommittee on maternity leave policy (AC 5/8/13)
   e. Subcommittee to review hiring procedures (AC 4/29/13)
   f. Subcommittee on time codes (AC 5/8/13)
   g. Subcommittee on Mission Statement re non-tenure track faculty (AC 9/9/13)
   h. Subcommittee to consider Faculty Handbook committee on non-tenure track faculty (AC 9/9/13)

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

6. Old Business

7. New business
   a. Election of faculty members to the Honorary Degree Committee
   b. Motion on Subcommittee on Calendar Issues, and election of members (attachment)
   c. Proposed revision to JoR language re Midterm Estimates (attachment)
   d. Recommendations from the Committee on University College (attachments)
   e. Proposal for joint Sociology-Anthropology Major (attachments) (Note: Anthropology minor was approved by AC.)

• Lists of Attachments, Pending, and Ongoing Items are on page 2
List of Attachments:
For item 3.a. Minutes of AC meeting of 9/9/13 (pages 3-7)
For item 3.b.i. Correspondence between DSB Dean and AC Executive Secretary (pages 8-9)
For item 3.b.ii. Memo from Prof. DeWitt to AC (pages 10-17)
For item 3.b.iii. Memo from VP Reed to AC (page 18)
For item 7.b. Motion on calendar issues (page 19)
For item 7.c. Proposal to revise JoR language (page 20-21)
For item 7.d. Email from Chair of University College Committee (page 22); Memo 4/5/13 re Proposed Dissolution of the Committee on University College (page 23); Memo 4/5/13 re Lifelong Learning and Continuous Education (page 24); Strategic Vision for Online Education, Spring 2013, by Associate Dean of CAS and Acting Director of Distance Education (pages 25-32)
For item 7.e. Proposal for joint Sociology-Anthropology Major (page 33-37); Excerpts of Minutes from meetings at which the proposal was considered (pages 38-44)

Pending Items:
A. Faculty Data Committee (AC 12/3/07).
B. MFA in Creative Writing, Five-Year-Review due in 12/2012 (AC 12/3/07).
C. Re-evaluation of offering both paper and online options for IDEA forms, spring 2014 (AC 5/14/12)
D. Re-evaluation of continued use of “yellow sheet” qualitative evaluations, spring 2014 (AC 5/14/12)
E. AC revisits the accessibility of teaching evaluation data, Due spring 2012. (AC 4/19/10)
F. AC three year review of Merit Appeals Policy, fall 2013. (AC 11/1/10)
G. AC three year review of Intellectual Properties Policy, spring 2014. (AC 3/7/11)
H. MPA, five year review in 2017-2018 (AC 9/10/12)

Ongoing Items:
1. Report by SVPAA to AC each semester to inform the council of any approved exceptions to the Athletic Department’s policy of not scheduling athletic events that conflict with final exams.
2. Report from the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees after each meeting with board members. At the end of each academic year, discuss items for the Conference Committee to put on the agenda for their meetings with members of the board the following year.
Present: Professors: Joe Dennin, David Downie, Bob Epstein, Shannon Harding, Chris Huntley, Ginny Kelly, Wendy Kohli, Alison Kris, Nikki Lee-Wingate, Irene Mulvey, Martin Nguyen, Elizabeth Petrino, Shawn Rafalski, Susan Rakowitz (Secretary of the General Faculty), L. Kraig Steffen, John Thiel.

Administrators: Deans Bruce Berdanier, Robbin Crabtree, Faith-Anne Dohm, Don Gibson, SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald.

Guests: Professors Nancy Dalla valle, Liz Hohl, Phil Lane, Kathy Nantz.

Regrets: Professor Roxana Walker-Canton, Dean Lynn Babington.

0. Selection of recording secretary; election of Chair; election of Executive Secretary

Prof. Rakowitz called the meeting to order at 3:35. Prof. Dennin’s name was pulled out of the ‘hat’ to be recording secretary. Prof. Rafalski was elected Chair and Prof. Mulvey was elected Executive Secretary, both unanimously.

1. Presidential Courtesy.

SVPPA Fitzgerald briefly touched on 4 topics.

1. Enrollment is going well. We currently have 975 freshmen. We are ranked third in the north in our category by US News and fourth in the north on excellent teaching.

2. On ongoing goals, the strategic plan process is moving along; we continue to assess the enrollment process; we will be rearticulating our value proposition in light of the changes in marketing.

3. The search for the new dean of GSEAP is moving long well. We have hired a search firm and they will be meeting with GSEAP this week.

4. He gave a brief presentation on the history of the Mentor issue. The administration is concerned about and responsible for the safety of our data and for following federal law. He admitted the timing was awful, but due to the risk, action needed to be taken.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty.

The new edition of the Faculty Handbook is out. Profs. Mulvey and Rakowitz were appointed by the Council to work with the SVPAA’s office on the new edition. Many thanks to Prof. Mulvey and SVPAA Fitzgerald for their work on the document.

She has been in contact with the Quick Center over a handbook violation concerning tickets. This was triggered by the limiting of free tickets to John Lithgow’s appearance.

Work is being done on reconciling all relevant documents on the issue of modified core for the RN to BS program.
The AC ruled in May that faculty with administrative status are not eligible for the faculty slots on search committees. Recently a faculty member elected to the search for the GSEAP dean was appointed to an administrative position for the spring. The search will not be concluded until early in the spring although the bulk of the work will be done in the fall. The faculty member is willing to continue to serve. No objections were raised.

The Committee on Committees is working to fill the vacancies on committees.

Today there have been more emails about Mentor. With no objections, the new ACEC was charged to study the issue and draft an appropriate motion to the ETC. Note: following the meeting, the ACEC drafted and sent the following motion to the ETC:

MOTION. Following the decision to discontinue the use of the course management software aspect of Mentor, the AC charges ETC to provide a full report to the AC at its November meeting on this matter that includes what led to the decision, how the decision was made, and the appropriateness of the decision.

Prof. Epstein mentioned that on Monday Sept. 16th at 3:30, the consultant for the Provost/SVPAA search will meet with elected members of the AC.

Upon the suggestion of Prof. Rakowitz, the AC agreed to move the May meeting to the last Monday in April.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary

a. Approval of minutes of 4/8/13, 4/29/13, 5/8/13, and 5/28/13,

Prof. Thiel asked that the minutes of 4/8/2013 be revised to include the text referred to but not included in the minutes. For someone not at the meeting, the text is important to understand the issues.

MOTION (Kohli/Mulvey): To approve the minutes of April 8, 2013 with the relevant text inserted.
MOTION PASSES 10 – 0 - 7.

MOTION (Mulvey/Kelly): To approve the minutes of April 29, 2013.
MOTION PASSES 9 - 0 – 8

MOTION (Mulvey/Epstein): To approve the minutes of May 8, 2013.
MOTION PASSES 9 -0 – 7

Prof. Thiel added an 's' to the minutes of 5/28/13 on page 17 of the packet.

MOTION (Mulvey/Petrino): To approve the minutes of May 28, 2013 as corrected.
MOTION PASSES 9 - 0 – 7

MOTION (Rakowitz/Epstein): Reorder the agenda to do 7a next.
MOTION PASSES unanimously

7a. Committee on Conference with the Trustees

Prof. Lane gave a quick review of the June meeting. Two key points:
1. The Trustees discussed what they wanted to know about academics and what resources would be needed to achieve various academic goals. After the salary issues, the discussions were very cordial and good.

2. The faculty is trying to get the Trustees to develop an agenda jointly.

SVPAA Fitzgerald agreed that it was a good year. The Trustees should be engaged in the university but not too deeply involved in the day to day running of the university.

Prof. Mulvey stated that the AAUP has a new statement in the comment stage – *Faculty Communication with Governing Boards: Best Practices* which ends with 3 recommendations.

Prof. Lane said it seemed too long for the Board and asked if there was an executive summary.

Prof. Mulvey. No.

Prof. Kohli asked what other ideas the AC had for the Committee.

SVPAA Fitzgerald said that international education, things like study abroad and international students, were an important item.

Prof. Lane said he needed specific items or the Committee would create them on its own.

SVPAA Fitzgerald said the Committee cannot do that on its own.

Prof. Mulvey said that the Conference Committee as well as the Council has to put ideas on the table at these Council meetings. Deciding on the items for the Committee to take to the Board is a two way street between the Committee and the AC.

Prof. Thiel said it is the responsibility of the Committee to develop an agenda and bring to the AC to get feedback.

Prof. Steffen noted that there were 6 points from last year’s last meeting. He asked if they were still on the table.

Prof. Lane responded that none should leave the table and none were going away.

Prof. Rakowitz mentioned the motion about the strategic plan from last year’s AC.

Prof. Huntley said that any strategic plan should have contingencies built in, for example, discussions about plans for a recession so that we are prepared unlike during the last recession.

Prof. Lane agreed about the need for contingency plans and hopefully the Trustees are aware of this need.

**4a. Subcommittee on the status of part-time faculty.**

Profs. Nantz and Hohl gave a brief report from their committee followed by a fairly lengthy discussion.

The committee surveyed about 300 part time faculty and received 90 responses. The 3 main issues were lack of voice, absence of respect and unstable employment. There was good response from all schools. There is a wide range of situations ranging from people who have full time employment elsewhere to people who are adjuncts working at a number of institutions in order to make a living.
There is significant difference from school to school and department to department (English vs. Mathematics for example). No one seems to have overall concrete data and a question is: is collecting such data the job of the faculty or administration? The committee’s report contains 2 motions which should address the issues of making recommendations on policy, getting information on national trends and collecting data. The first motion addresses the need for a plan involving all constituents to articulate how we are deploying faculty resources.

Prof. Nantz highlighted the need to address the conditions of employment, a compensation schedule and criterion for rewarding non-teaching contributions.

MOTION (Epstein/Steffen): That the AC appoint a subcommittee composed of administrators, tenure-track faculty, non-tenure track faculty, and staff to develop a long-term mission statement for the optimal employment and deployment of Non-Tenure Track faculty at Fairfield. The subcommittee will report back to the Academic Council at the March 2014 meeting.

MOTION TO AMEND (Fitzgerald/Rakowitz) add the phrase ‘empower the ACEC to’ between AC and appoint in line 1.
AMENDMENT PASSES 16 – 0 – 0.

MOTION PASSES 16 - 0 - 0

MOTION (Kohli/Epstein): That the AC appoint a subcommittee composed of administrators, tenure-track faculty, non-tenure track faculty, and staff to consider developing a general purpose for a Faculty Handbook Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty employment, roles, and conditions. The subcommittee shall also provide a membership requirement and specific duties for such a Handbook committee. The subcommittee will report back to the Academic Council at the March 2014 meeting.

MOTION TO AMEND (Kohli/Epstein) add the phrase ‘empower the ACEC to’ between AC and appoint in line 1.
AMENDMENT PASSES 16 – 0 – 0.

Prof. Kelly supports the motions. She is concerned that it sounds like an administrative issue (collecting data) is being put on the faculty. Is an additional administrative component needed?

Prof. Thiel asked how the fact that there is no precedent for electing part time faculty to committees to be handled.

Prof. Mulvey replied that the issue was addressed under number 4 in the section on Structure and Governance. One solution would be to open up governance structures according to AAUP guidelines, a statement she will send to the AC. There were some issues with the motions but she was in favor of them. A committee can ask for data and would give the request some authority. She asked how the subcommittee would be formed.

Prof. Harding asked if there would be 2 separate committees.

Prof. Epstein: Yes.

Prof. Nantz said the different committees would be addressing different issues but would need to fit together.

MOTION PASSES 16 – 0 – 0
4b. Subcommittee on sexual misconduct policies.

Prof. Dallavalle presented the report. She noted that an across the board policy was useful. The current policy reduced the reporting requirements to a minimum. The following language, offered as a possible statement for faculty to include on syllabi, had been vetted by a lawyer:

Fairfield University seeks to provide an environment that is free of bias, discrimination, and harassment. If you have been the victim of sexual harassment, misconduct or assault, we encourage you to report it, knowing that if you report this to a faculty member, she or he must notify Fairfield University’s Title IX coordinator about the basic facts of the incident (you may choose whether you or anyone involved is identified by name). For more information about your options at Fairfield:


Prof. Epstein said there needs to be an increased realization on the part of all faculty of their obligations.

SVPAA Fitzgerald said this policy helps define who we are as a community. We need good information about what is happening. We need to tell students that we are a safe place, and that we do not just make ad hoc decisions.

Prof. Petrino wondered if the policy should also be in the instructional handbook.

Prof. Dallavalle suggested looking at the link at the end of the statement; it is very student oriented.

MOTION(Fitzgerald/Mulvey): that the AC receives the report favorably and requests the SVPAA to communicate the information in the report to the faculty.
MOTION PASSES 14 – 0 – 0.

MOTION TO ADJOURN (Dennin/Thiel)
MOTION PASSES 14 – 0 – 0.

Meeting adjourned at 5:20.

Respectfully submitted,
Joe Dennin
From: <Gibson>, Donald <DGibson@fairfield.edu>
Date: Friday, September 20, 2013 12:13 PM
To: Irene Mulvey <mulvey@fairfield.edu>
Subject: DSB Faculty motion on discontinuation of Mentor

Irene,

The DSB faculty passed this motion at last week’s DSB Full Faculty meeting (Wednesday, 9/11/13, 3:30 to 5 p.m.).

I know there are other motions on this issue; let me know what the Executive Committee decides about its status for the AC agenda.

Best,
Don

Donald E. Gibson, Ph.D.
Dean and Professor
Charles F. Dolan School of Business
Fairfield University

DSB Full Faculty Meeting
Meeting Notes
September 11, 2013

8. New Business
d. Shutdown of Mentor

        Professor Chris Huntley made a motion, seconded by Professor Dawn Massey. Motion: The DSB faculty strongly call for immediate examination by the Education Technology Committee of the events leading up to the shutdown of Mentor that occurred without recourse to faculty or dean input and that the ETC report their findings to the General Faculty as soon as possible.

        Professor Vishnu Vinekar stated that the ETC met with CIO, Paige Francis, and Jay Rozgonyi. The ETC was satisfied with the explanation of the events leading up to the shutdown of Mentor.

        Professor Vinekar proposed an amendment to the motion: The DSB faculty strongly call for immediate examination by the Academic Council of the events leading up to the shutdown of Mentor that occurred without recourse to faculty or dean input and that the Academic Council explore what needs to be done to reinstate all components of Mentor and report their findings to the General Faculty as soon as possible.

        Professor Huntley stated that the motion is not addressing the governance issue.

        Professor Tromley agreed that the Academic Council needs to look at the governance issue.
After some discussion Professor Huntley withdrew his original motion.
Professor Vinekar withdrew his amendment.

Professor Tromley proposed a new motion, seconded by Professor Solomon:

The DSB faculty strongly call for immediate examination by the Academic Council of the events leading up to the shutdown of Mentor that occurred without recourse to faculty or dean input including the potential violation of legitimate faculty governance procedures. We further request that specific conditions be given to Axiom Education about what would be required for the reinstatement of all components of Mentor.

Vote: 15 in favor, 1 Opposed and 2 Abstentions.

From: <Mulvey>, Irene Mulvey <mulvey@fairfield.edu>
Date: Tuesday, October 1, 2013 8:10 PM
To: "Gibson, Donald" <DGibson@fairfield.edu>
Cc: Susan Rakowitz <srakowitz@fairfield.edu>, "Rafalski, Shawn" <srafalski@fairfield.edu>, "Fitzgerald, Paul" <pfitzgerald@fairfield.edu>
Subject: Re: DSB Faculty motion on discontinuation of Mentor

Don,

The ACEC decided to put this excerpt of minutes from the DSB faculty meeting along with your email in the packet under "Correspondence". The ACEC, as you may remember, was charged to draft an appropriate motion on this matter and send it to the Ed Tech Committee. Immediately following the 9/9/13 AC meeting, the Executive Committee drafted the motion below and sent it to the Ed Tech Committee so that they had it before their meeting on 9/11.

MOTION. Following the decision to discontinue the use of the course management software aspect of Mentor, the AC charges ETC to provide a full report to the AC at its November meeting on this matter that includes what led to the decision, how the decision was made, and the appropriateness of the decision.
Memo

To: Academic Council

From: Professor Richard DeWitt, Chair, Department of Philosophy

Date: 9/18/13

Re: Two related matters for the Council

Cc: President Jeffrey von Arx; VP Mark Reed; VP Kevin Lawlor

I am writing primarily concerning two related matters for the Council:

(A) An ongoing violation of the Faculty Handbook by the Fairfield University administration, including a violation of a faculty member’s Due Process rights specified in Appendix I of the Handbook;

and

(B) In light of a recent Council motion referencing “the Grievance Procedure in Appendix I,” to note that Appendix I, rather than being a grievance procedure, instead contains Fairfield’s policies governing Procedures for Due Process. The issue is not semantic: Fairfield University has no grievance procedure or any other policy under which a faculty member can viably pursue a grievance against the administration, including allegations of ethical misconduct on the part of the Fairfield administration, of a violation of the Faculty Handbook, a violation of academic freedom and freedom of expression, or any other type of alleged improper behavior on the part of the administration. I also wish to bring to the Council’s attention the existence of a near-complete draft of an AAUP-compliant grievance procedure for Fairfield University, worked out some years ago. Complete files on this are in my office.

Background Information Concerning (A)

Here is a summary of the situation regarding (A). [1]

(i) The Fairfield University administration initiated proceedings against a Fairfield faculty member under the Appendix I section of Fairfield University’s Faculty Handbook, “Procedures for Due Process.”
(ii) The Faculty Handbook Appendix I Procedures for Due Process provide a member of the faculty certain rights, including the right to present evidence before a Hearing Committee concerning allegations against him or her, and the right to have the matter adjudicated by that Hearing Committee.

(iii) The Fairfield University administration is refusing to follow the Due Process policies required by the Handbook, and the rights a faculty member is assured under those policies, in violation of Fairfield University’s Faculty Handbook.

Regarding (i), please see note [2] below for documentation.

A summary of some of the rights concerning these matters assured by the Faculty Handbook Due Process procedures, as well as the complete text of the Due Process policy from the Faculty Handbook, can be found under note [3] below.

Documentation and other information regarding (iii) can be found under note [4] below.

**Recommendations Regarding (A)**

The informal discussions called for in Step 1 of the Handbook’s Procedures for Due Process have taken place. The next step required by the Due Process provisions of the Handbook is the formation of a Hearing Committee to adjudicate the matter discussed in (A). Thus, at this point the proper body to hear additional information concerning these matters is a Hearing Committee.

Given the documentation found in note [2], there can be no question that the administration initiated proceedings under the Due Process section of the Faculty Handbook. There is equally no question that the administration is now refusing to comply with the procedures mandated by that section of the Faculty Handbook.

Thus, at a minimum I would encourage the Council to take the following step:

- Pass a resolution insisting President von Arx’s administration respect the provisions of the Faculty Handbook, and in particular that the administration proceed in the matters discussed in (A) as required by the Due Process provisions of the Faculty Handbook.

Below closing this section, I would like to note that only a short time ago President von Arx, in response to concerns about governance matters raised during the NEASC accreditation process, pledged to the faculty that he and his administration would respect Fairfield’s governance documents, of which there is none more important than Fairfield’s Faculty Handbook. If the administration’s violation of the Faculty Handbook is allowed to continue, we will be back to where we were, with an administration that feels it need not respect the provisions of the Faculty Handbook and other governance documents. And it will make a mockery of the faculty’s recent efforts to require the administration respect Fairfield’s governance documents and policies. [5]
Background Information Concerning (B)

Unlike every university comparable to Fairfield of which I am aware, Fairfield University has no policy or procedure under which a faculty member may pursue a grievance or other allegation of wrongdoing against the administration. For example, we have no grievance process, or other policy or procedure, by which a faculty member may pursue an allegation against the administration of a violation of the Faculty Handbook, or a violation by the administration of a faculty member’s rights to academic freedom and freedom of expression, of ethical misconduct, or any other type of improper behavior alleged against the administration.

It is important to note in this context that the Appendix I procedures of the Faculty Handbook do not apply to accusations against the administration, only to accusations made against a member of the faculty.

One might, I suppose, try to shoehorn in a complaint against the administration under the Appendix I procedures by directing the accusation against one of the handful of administrators who hold faculty status. But note how such a scenario would play out. [6]

- In such a case, the administration would choose the members of the Hearing Committee that would adjudicate the allegation that was made against the administration. No non-administrator would have any input into the selection of the Hearing Committee.

- The administration would have sole discretion over what evidence it presented against itself before the Hearing Committee. The administration would have every right to present no evidence against itself.

- The faculty member making the complaint would have no right to present any evidence to the Hearing Committee, nor would that faculty member, or any faculty body, or any non-administrator, have any right even to be present at the meetings of the Hearing Committee.

Not for nothing did I say that Fairfield University has no viable policy or procedure by which a member of the faculty may bring a grievance or other allegation of wrongdoing against the administration. And as noted, in this matter we differ from every comparable university of which I am aware.

It is worth noting that the Handbook’s Appendix I Due Process procedures are more reasonable in cases, such as that discussed in (A) above, in which an allegation has been made against a member of the faculty. But in terms of a procedure which would allow a member of the faculty to pursue an allegation against the administration, Fairfield has no policy or procedure.
**Recommendations Regarding (B):**

I would encourage the Council not to attempt to convert the Appendix I section of the *Handbook* into a grievance procedure. As noted, that section is not and appears never to have been intended as a grievance procedure; rather, that appendix specifies a faculty member’s Due Process rights.

Instead, I would encourage the Council to start from the near complete draft of an AAUP-compliant grievance procedure we already have. This was one of the items George Lang and I were working on not long before George died. I have the files in my office.

---

**NOTES**

[1]  *A Note on Timing*

A note on the timing of these matters. Although the administration initiated Step 1 of the Due Process procedures in mid-2012, other factors prevented moving forward with Step 2 of those procedures until the end of 2012. At that point I had family matters that had to take precedence, including the sudden death of my mother-in-law, and then shortly after that and for the majority of 2013 I have spent most of my time in the Pacific Northwest providing end of life care for my mother. It has been a physically and emotionally exhausting year, and I had to set aside almost all else. My mother has now died, and while I have much to catch up on, I can now return to matters that were pending at the start of the year. The subject of this memo is one such matter.

[2]  *Documentation of Initiation of Due Process Procedures*

Below are a few relevant statements from VP Paul Fitzgerald and/or Director of Human Resources Mark Guglielmoni in written communications to me. This correspondence establishes beyond question that the Fairfield administration initiated procedures against a faculty member under the *Faculty Handbook*, Appendix I, Procedures for Due Process.

**In response to your e-mail, please be advised that we are following procedures as outlined in the Fairfield University *Faculty Handbook*. A member of the faculty has made a verbal accusation and complaint against you regarding a violation of his/her professional integrity. According to the provisions of the handbook, the Administration is proceeding as is required by this document, which is to investigate the accusation and complaint by holding an informal discussion with you.**
As stated in the Procedures for Due Process outlined in Appendix I of the Fairfield University Faculty Handbook: “when a University or faculty member has accused a member of the faculty of violating his or her contractual agreement or of violating his or her professional integrity, there shall be an informal discussion among the Administration, the individual involved, and any interested parties acceptable to both the Administration and the individual.” I am seeking to conduct an informal discussion as soon as possible, as mandated by the Faculty Handbook. An attorney is not an acceptable interested party who should attend this informal discussion at this time.

As indicated previously, pursuant to the procedures for due process set forth in Appendix I of the Fairfield University Faculty Handbook, … “when…a faculty member has accused a member of the faculty…of violating his or her professional integrity, there shall be an informal discussion among the Administration, the individual involved, and any interested parties acceptable to both the Administration and the individual.”

In compliance with these policies and procedures [the Faculty Handbook Appendix I procedures], the Fairfield University Administration has scheduled an informal discussion with you for Tuesday, May 29, 2012 at 11am in the office of Mark Guglielmoni, Director of Human Resources. If you do not attend the above scheduled meeting, the Fairfield University Administration will immediately schedule a formal hearing pursuant to Paragraph 2, of Appendix I of the Handbook. In addition, the Fairfield University Administration has determined that an attorney is not an acceptable interested party who should attend this informal discussion.


The complete text of the Faculty Handbook Appendix I, Procedures for Due Process can be found at the end of this memo. In summary, those procedures first require an informal meeting or meetings. The informal stage of the Appendix I procedures was completed by the end of last year.

The next step, under Step 2, is the formation of a Hearing Committee. The Hearing Committee mandated by the Due Process Procedures of the Faculty Handbook is the sort of body at which both sides can present their evidence, and address the claims made by the other side. If, for example, the administration now believes it was mistaken in initiating action against me under the Appendix I procedures, or if for other reasons the administration no longer wishes to pursue such action, the administration may state this to the Hearing Committee and that committee may take it into account.

It is worth noting that the Step 2 procedures envision the possibility of the proceedings becoming informal in nature. It is possible, then, that the matters may be resolved without
the need for full hearings before the Hearing Committee. I have communicated multiple times over the past year that I am open to this possibility.

Also worth noting is that for a brief period there appeared to be a disagreement over whether the Due Process procedures may be invoked in the absence of a complaint submitted in writing. I subsequently communicated to the administration that there was no longer any disagreement on this matter.

[4] The Administration’s Current Refusal to Follow the Procedures Mandated in the Due Process section of the Faculty Handbook

A preliminary point: this is not a he said/she said situation. At the outset of these matters I was well advised to proceed slowly, gather information, document everything and be sure to leave a robust paper trail. I have ample materials documenting what I am saying. I will bring this documentation, including the complete texts of all correspondence excerpted in this memo as well as the complete set of emails, memos, and other relevant correspondence, to the Council meeting should it be needed.

As can be seen in the correspondence in note [2] above, the administration initially pursued these matters rather robustly under the Appendix I, Procedures for Due Process section of the Faculty Handbook. Again, as noted in [1], those procedures had to be put on hold for a time while I managed family matters.

When I communicated to the administration that I could now continue with the procedures begun earlier, the administration’s tune had changed considerably. Instead of robustly pursuing proceedings under the Appendix I section of the Handbook, the administration now appeared to be robustly running away. The administration has attempted several ways to avoid the obligations under the Handbook, the most recent being to claim, with respect to the matters described in (A), that the administration never initiated proceedings against me under the Appendix I, Proceedings for Due Process section of the Handbook. (“The complaint [regarding the matters described in (A)] was not done so under the provisions of Appendix I of the faculty handbook.”) Again, I will bring to the Council meeting the complete text of this and all other correspondence.

I would invite members of the Council to again review the correspondence in note [2]. In light of such correspondence, the administration’s claim that in the matters involving (A) they never initiated procedures under the Appendix I Due Process provisions of the Handbook is obviously false. That the administration is willing to make such a claim illustrates, I think, the lengths they are willing to go in order to avoid respecting the faculty’s rights to due process specified in the Faculty Handbook.

As noted, if the administration is allowed to continue this violation of the Faculty Handbook, it will make a mockery of faculty efforts in recent years to require the administration respect the provisions of Fairfield’s governance documents.
Consideration of These Matters at the Academic Council

At the Council meeting at which these matters are discussed, I anticipate the administration, either directly or indirectly, will try to have the Council meeting held under executive session without me present. Should such a proposal be made, I encourage the Council so soundly reject it. Discussion of these matters under such a scenario would be antithetical to the idea of due process.

Notes on Attempting to Bring a Complaint Against the Administration under the Due Process Procedures in the Handbook

In understanding these bullet points, it is crucial to note that the references to “the faculty member” in clauses 2.a through 2.1 of Appendix I refer to the faculty member against whom the allegation was made, not to the faculty member making the allegation. So in cases of an allegation made against an administrator—presumably this would have to be an administrator with faculty status—in these clauses “the faculty member” refers to the administrator against whom the allegation was made.

So, for example, in clause 2.a the administrator against whom the allegation was made would chose one member of the Hearing Committee, other members of the administration would chose another member, then the accused administrator and other administrators would agree on the third member. Similarly for the other clauses under 2.

In short, if a member of the faculty tried to bring a complaint against an administrator under the Appendix I procedures, the administration alone would choose the Hearing Committee, and the administration alone would present (or not present) evidence against itself.

[Below is Fairfield University Faculty Handbook, Appendix I, Procedures for Due Process. I have omitted the final section of the appendix dealing with procedures involving non-tenured faculty, as it is not relevant in this case.]

APPENDIX I

PROCEDURES FOR DUE PROCESS

1. Informal Procedures
When the University or a faculty member has accused a member of the faculty of violating his or her contractual agreement or of violating his or her professional integrity, there shall be an informal discussion among the Administration, the individual involved and any interested parties acceptable to both the Administration and the individual.
The same procedure *mutatis mutandis* shall apply where an individual considers that actions taken against him or her violate his or her academic freedom.

2. The Hearing - Tenured Faculty
Academic due process provides for summary suspension of a faculty member holding tenure only when serious violation of law or public immoral conduct is admitted, or proved before a competent court. If indictments by a grand jury or informations handed up by district attorneys are to lead to court trials, a faculty member may be suspended with full pay and protection of full rights pending final adjudication. All other charges shall first be heard in formal hearings based upon the preliminary action outlined above in Section “1”.

The hearing should take the following forms:

a. The hearing committee shall consist of three members: one chosen by the Administration, one by the faculty member, and the third by agreement between the two.
b. The faculty member shall have the right to be present and to be accompanied by his or her personal advisor or counsel throughout the hearing.
c. Both the faculty member and the Administration shall have the right to present and examine witnesses and cross-examine witnesses.
d. The Administration shall make available to the faculty member such authority as it may possess to require the presence of witnesses.
e. The principles of confrontation of witnesses and examination of evidence shall apply throughout the hearing.
f. A full record shall be taken at the hearing; it shall be made available in identical form and at the same time to the hearing group, the Administration, and the faculty member. The cost shall be met by the University.
g. The hearing committee shall promptly and forthrightly adjudicate the issues.
h. The full text of the findings and conclusions of the hearing committee shall be made available in identical form and at the same time to the Administration and the faculty member. The cost shall be met by the University.
i. In the absence of a defect in procedure, recommendations shall be made to the Board of Trustees by the ad hoc committee as to possible action in the case.
j. At any time should the basis for an informal hearing appear, the procedure may become informal in nature.
k. The Academic Council shall be informed of only the conclusions and actions taken in the case.
l. But in the event of a finding unfavorable to a faculty member, it is understood that normal legal procedures shall be available.
DATE: October 2, 2013  
TO: Academic Council  
FROM: Mark C. Reed  

Concerning the memorandum dated 9/18/13, sent to the Academic Council by Prof. Dewitt, and copied to Fr. von Arx, Kevin Lawlor, and me, I write to communicate the following:

In response to a communication sent to me by Prof. Dewitt in April 2013, I informed him that there was no pending or on-going investigation into a complaint against him. Additionally, I noted that as had previously been communicated to Prof. Dewitt, no adverse action had been taken against him and that the University had closed its file on the matter.

After further communication from Prof. Dewitt in which he made reference to retaining legal counsel, he was advised to have his counsel contact the University’s legal counsel.
Date: September 2, 2013
To: Academic Council
From: Academic Council Executive Committee
Re: Motion on standing Calendar Review Subcommittee

On March 4, 2013, the Academic Council passed the following motion:
   That the Academic Council form a standing Calendar Review Subcommittee. The
   subcommittee should consist of two members elected each year from among the
   members of the Academic Council. The subcommittee is charged with reviewing all
   Fairfield academic calendars before their publication and making any necessary
   recommendations for changes to the Academic Council and the Senior Vice
   President for Academic Affairs.

The Journal of Record states that,
   The language of motions intended for inclusion in the Journal of Record should not
   be framed as exhortation, or advice, or as an expression of hopeful outcome. If, after
   the Academic Council has approved a motion for inclusion in the Journal of Record,
   the Secretary of the General Faculty determines that the language is not expressed
   appropriately in the form of policy, the Secretary should return the matter to the
   Academic Council for review and possible revision. The Faculty Secretary, in
   consultation with the Executive Committee, may propose a revised text in the form
   of policy for the Council’s consideration.

We therefore suggest the following revision to the Calendar Review Subcommittee motion:
   Each September, the Academic Council will elect a 2-person Calendar Review
   Subcommittee from its elected membership to review all Fairfield academic calendars
   before their publication and make any necessary recommendations for changes to the
   Academic Council and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.
Request: Revision of JoR Language on Midterm Estimates

Submitted by:
Jessica York, Director of Exploratory Academic Advising
David Sapp, Associate VP for Academic Affairs
Membership of the Academic Planning Committee

Supporting Correspondence (2, see attached):

Christine Siegel, Associate VP for Academic Affairs
Robert Russo, University Registrar

Existing Language from JoR, p. 33

First-Year Midterm Estimates:
In order to identify and intervene with students who are having trouble in several courses, it will be required that all faculty teaching first year students notify the Registrar halfway through the fall and spring semester if a student is in danger of receiving a C-, D or an F. The Registrar will notify the student, and notification will also be made to the faculty adviser, the appropriate Dean, and the Dean of first year students.
AC: 11/01/1993
amended AC: 10/03/1994

Proposed New Language for JoR, p. 33

First-Year Midterm Estimates:
In order to identify and intervene with first-year students who are struggling in a course or several courses, it will be required that all faculty submit midterm estimates in the fall and spring semester for their students in danger of receiving a C-, D, or F. The student, along with the faculty advisor and the appropriate Dean or Director, will be notified.

Rationale for Change:
As an academic advising tool, midterm estimates serve as one of the many fundamental and critical processes used to identify first-year students who are struggling. In order to provide them quickly with the resources they need to get back on track, we’d like to assign the entirety of those efforts to one office. Centralizing the process of reporting Midterm Estimates will contribute to our goals of student success and retention. The Office of Exploratory Academic Advising currently sends out Early Alerts and Final Alerts. The Academic Planning Committee hopes that by assigning the Midterm Estimate to the same office, we will be taking the first step in achieving our desired outcomes.

Email Correspondence #1

From: <Siegel>, Christine <csiegel@fairfield.edu>
Date: Wednesday, October 2, 2013 12:08 PM
To: David Sapp <dsapp@fairfield.edu>
Cc: "Russo, Robert" <RCRusso@fairfield.edu>
Subject: Mid-term Estimates
Dear David,

As we have discussed, the University Registrar requests faculty to submit midterm deficiencies for freshman and division I athletes in accordance with guidelines set forth in the Journal of Record. With the advent of the Office of Exploratory Advising and the implementation of the early warning system, this request from the Registrar has become redundant and confusing to both faculty and students. In my position as the academic administrator with oversight of the Registrar’s Office, I support your petition to the Academic Council to revise the Journal of Record regarding midterm deficiencies. Given the current University structure, the responsibility for soliciting information about student performance is best served by the Office of Exploratory Advising.

Sincerely,

Christine Siegel, Ph.D
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Fairfield University

---

**Email Correspondence #2**

**From:** Russo, Robert  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 02, 2013 10:16 AM  
**To:** Siegel, Christine  
**Cc:** Fitzgerald, Paul  
**Subject:** Freshman Deficiencies

Christine- With the poor academic performance early warning system that is overseen by the Exploratory Academic Advising Office, asking faculty to submit midterm deficiencies for freshman and division 1 athletes—now seems to be redundant and an extra burden for the faculty. Also the midterm deficiencies are due by the end of the 6th week of classes to meet the 7th week deadline to withdraw from a course with Dean’s permission. As a result, many faculty say that they haven’t given their mid term exams yet and have nothing to report. I think it is time for the faculty to review this process and permanently replace it with the new efficient early warning system. Thanks…Bob

Robert C. Russo ’72  MA ’76  
University Registrar
From: <Munden>, Ryan <rmunden@fairfield.edu>
Date: Tuesday, April 30, 2013 10:26 AM
To: Susan Rakowitz <srakowitz@fairfield.edu>, "Keenan, Dennis" <DKKeenan@fairfield.edu>, "Epstein, Robert" <REpstein@fairfield.edu>
Subject: Memos to AC from CUC

To the Academic Council,

The Committee on University College respectfully submits the following recommendations, and corresponding three attached memos, which we have endorsed, to the Academic Council for consideration. We were tasked by the AC to make a recommendation regarding the formation of a Center for Continuing Education, which is addressed by Motion 2. We were also tasked by the AC to make a recommendation regarding the future of the Committee on University College, which is addressed by Motion 3. As a committee we also felt we should make a recommendation on a remaining area of University College’s purview, online education, which is addressed in Motion 1. All three motions passed unanimously in the CUC. This concludes our business as a committee, until and unless we receive further instruction from the Academic Council.

Respectfully,
Ryan Munden, Chair 2012-2013
Committee on University College

**MOTION 1:** The Committee on University College endorses the Strategic Vision for Online Education, and recommends its submission to the Academic Council for consideration.
**PASSED Unanimously**

**MOTION 2:** The Committee on University College does NOT recommend the creation of a Center for Continuing education and endorses the Memorandum on Lifelong Learning and Continuous education and recommends its submission to the Academic Council for consideration.
**Passed Unanimously**

**MOTION 3:** The Committee on University College recommends DISSOLUTION of the Committee on University College and endorses the memorandum on Proposed Dissolution of the Committee on University College and recommends its submission to the Academic Council for consideration.
**Passed Unanimously**
MEMORANDUM
FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY

TO: ACADEMIC COUNCIL
FROM: RYAN MUNDEN, COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, 2012-2013 CHAIR
SUBJECT: PROPOSED DISSOLUTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY COLLEGE
DATE: APRIL 5, 2013

With the closing of University College in 2012 its various programs have been redistributed throughout the university. The part-time programs are now housed in the corresponding School for the major the student is pursuing. The Bachelor of Professional Studies degree was adopted by the College of Arts and Sciences. Responsibility for online and summer courses has shifted to the appropriate school. Lifelong learning and continuous/professional education programs have likewise moved to the schools with which they are most closely aligned.

In light of these changes, and the actual closing of University College, the Committee on University College (CUC) hereby respectfully recommends dissolution of the CUC and removal from as a Handbook Committee. We feel that the programs previously housed in University College are now under the purview of individual schools, and are adequately overseen by their own faculty committees or other existing handbook committees. We, therefore, do not feel that the mandate of the CUC as currently outlined in the handbook can be fulfilled any longer.

We recommend to Academic Council that the Committee on Committees be tasked with reviewing this situation and proposing a handbook amendment to the AC to remove the CUC as a handbook committee. If they feel it is appropriate, the Committee on Committees may recommend a new committee with a different mandate to replace it in the handbook, to continue providing opportunities for faculty service.
MEMORANDUM
FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY

TO: ACADEMIC COUNCIL
FROM: RYAN MUNDEN, COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, 2012-2013 CHAIR
ROBBIN CRABTREE, DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES,
ACTING DEAN OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

SUBJECT: LIFELONG LEARNING AND CONTINUOUS EDUCATION
DATE: APRIL 5, 2013

With the closure of University College in 2012 and the various programs, specifically those certificate, lifelong learning, and summer enrichment programs, finding compatible homes within existing schools, the Committee on University College (CUC) feels their oversight responsibilities in relation to these programs is no longer required. School curriculum committees and the Educational Planning Committee might see their charges expand slightly to allow attention to be paid to non-degree and non-credit university business that focuses on academics and/or intellectual engagement.

After careful and comprehensive individual review over the past two years, the programs deemed worthy and fitting of the lifelong learning mission of Fairfield to provide enrichment, education, and exploration for the larger community were re-housed mostly within the College of Arts and Sciences. These specific programs are: Interior Design, Lifelong Learning (formerly Institute of Retired Professionals), Au Pair class auditing, Summer Institute for the Gifted, Manhattan Art Tours, Emergency Medical Technician (EMT) training, and Spiritual Direction Formation. The professional certificate programs, all closely aligned with business professions and/or disciplines in the business school, were re-housed in the Dolan School of Business, where they have cultivated these and developed others. Finally, those programs that could not be moved into existing departmental structures or that did not align well with the University mission and/or were not profitable were terminated. In each case, careful consideration was given to whether these programs were well connected with the University (e.g., with programs or individual faculty champions) and whether they could be financially viable to the University with adjustments.

The Committee on University College continues to express support for further strategic conversations (e.g., with the new Executive Vice President) related to developing a strategic long-range plan to support the vibrancy of lifelong learning programming. We believe some infusion of personnel and budget would be necessary in order to support innovative and aggressive marketing and program development, launch, and recruitment. However, the CUC believes the appropriate faculty body for interface with such strategic conversations would be the Educational Planning Committee, with related consultations with other Committees based on individual programs and situations.
Strategic Vision for Online Education

Spring

Prepared by Aaron Perkus, Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and Acting Director of Distance Education

Context
This report was requested by the Committee on University College for their upcoming April 2013 meeting as part of a series of strategic recommendations.

Background

Fairfield University offered its first online asynchronous courses through University College in the summer of 2003. Over the next several years, this vital aspect of summer enrollment grew naturally to a high of 91 courses in 2008 before gradually declining to the 20 currently being offered for the summer of 2013. The ten-year graph looks like a perfect bell curve:

![Online Students by Term](image)

Reasons for Growth

During the five years of steady growth in summer online offerings and enrollment, University College was aggressively pursuing a strategy to not only increase the total number of courses offered by 20% each year, but also offer a sufficient breadth of subject areas to allow students seeking a degree in professional studies to complete their degree entirely online. Simultaneously,
faculty in the departments of Communication, English and Psychology were exploring adding online sections of courses in the major. Course development and maintenance stipends were awarded to interested full-time faculty who agreed to offer their courses online over the summer and winter terms when any student (fulltime, part-time, visiting) is eligible to enroll.

This initiative had the full support of the Vice President for Academic Affairs who, in a far-reaching decision, determined that offering a pre-existing course online required no additional approvals. University College’s ability to bring an ever increasing array of online courses to market was also facilitated by (1) a full-time director of distance education (2) a robust budget for faculty recruitment and ongoing development (3) full administrative support (4) the goal of offering complete online degree programs and (5) relatively negligible competition. During its peak in the summer of 2008, online gross revenue generated roughly 1.5 million dollars (875 enrollments at $1785 per).

Reasons for Decline

Since its peak in the summer of 2008, online education at Fairfield University has steadily declined in both the number of courses offered and the number of students enrolled. Several factors contributed to the decline:

• Lack of Strategic Vision
  o The growth of online education was never elevated to the level of institutional strategy. According to the annual report by Babson College, *Changing the Course: Ten Years of Tracking Online Education in the United States*, in 2013 70% of all colleges and universities currently view online education as critical to their institution. In contrast, Fairfield University has no clear vision or mandate, there is no mission driven incentive for faculty, departments, programs, or colleges to support this type of initiative much less make it critical.

• Lack of Curricular Growth
Without a clear vision, it became difficult to expand the curricular online offerings. Faculty who wanted to participate were funded to do so, but a saturation point was reached regarding the number of faculty and thus the number and types of courses offered. Without the ability to grow and diversify a menu of courses to meet the demand, we began to experience stagnation.

- Loss of popular courses

  - After the summer of 2008, University College dismissed a popular part-time History instructor because of a rising number of performance concerns. This instructor had offered three fully online History classes over the summer (75 students). His poor performance, along with the department’s skepticism regarding the validity of online education, resulted in a moratorium on all History online courses. Around the same time, another very popular part-time online Sociology professor passed away unexpectedly and without that internal advocacy, that department has also ceased offering online courses.

- Multiple Course Management Systems

  - During the years of growth and decline, Fairfield has gone through a series of changes in technology which has negatively impacted both the faculty and student experience. Over the course of four years, the University shifted from WebCt to Angel (and Moodle) to Blackboard, plus a home grown system that changed from Eidos to Mentor. This disruption caused current online faculty to be forced to completely redesign their courses (without stipends) and learn new interfaces. Student could be enrolled in multiple platforms in the same semester and experience faculty with differing degrees of proficiency in the CMS. In addition, the Vice-Present who oversaw CN&S and the Dean of University College were let go during a phase of deep budgetary cuts.

- Lack of Oversight and Centrality

  - The initial decision to allow online classes to be offered without
additional approval was a double-edged sword. Since these courses were offered by University College, there was no direct departmental oversight of the quality of the courses. Chairs were recruited sometimes to review the online offerings in their area, but this was seen as an add-on to their core responsibilities.

Without a strategic vision tying it all together, this work was seen as happening at the margins of the university. As a result, more and more online sections were only being offered by part-time faculty and were usually not being periodically reviewed.

• Competition
  
  o The growth of online education is well documented. Over the last five years, when Fairfield has seen its numbers decline, the overall picture nationally has been clear and steady growth:

  ![](image)

  As the table shows, while overall growth of enrollment has faltered, the growth of online courses has increased in general, and online courses and programs now represent 32% of the total enrollment.

  • The Closing of University College
    
    o The decision to close University College in May 2010 coincides with
a dramatic and continuous decline in enrollment of part-time students at Fairfield University. The decision to require all part-time students to be accepted based on the same criteria as full-time students, and complete the same core and major curriculum, makes the degree more difficult to obtain. Tuition hikes for part-time and summer students further challenge enrollment.

Recommendations

Fairfield University has an outstanding reputation as an institution of higher education. Moreover, as a Jesuit institution, our mission is to educate the whole person, serve the community, and prepare our graduates to be leaders and full participants in a global and highly technologically driven environment. Online education provides us the opportunity to reach populations otherwise unable to attend Fairfield University due to work and family schedules, lack of mobility, and other factors. Numerous studies continue to show that at its best, online education does as good, or better, than face to face instruction in terms of demonstrating student learning. Students are entering college expecting state of the art technology in the classroom, and our new faculty are coming from graduate programs and other institutions where online education is embraced, supported, and expected. While it would be a mistake to try to recklessly recapture our market share through top down mandates, a long range strategy involving faculty and departmental buy-in through the existing committee structure and administrative incentives could prove very successful.

Below are a series of recommendations that ought to be considered as we work to address the question of online education and the Fairfield strategic plan:

1. Since credibility comes from handbook committee approval, a charge should be made to the UCC to develop a protocol for granting approval for online courses and faculty. This can be similar to the diversity subcommittees wherein elected members review applications against criteria.

2. Criteria for excellence in online education can be gleaned from US News and World Report’s ranking of Online Degree Programs:
a. Instructional faculty with Ph.D. or terminal degree
b. Faculty have at least 2 years online teaching experience
c. School finances online instructor training
d. Online instructor training required to teach
e. Instructor response expected within (hours)
f. Instructor office hours (weekly)
g. Faculty track student login
h. Max class size
i. Career placement assistance
j. Live tutoring
k. Smartphone app
l. Live streaming video

3. In addition, administrative decisions and incentives regarding online education would also impact the culture at Fairfield. For example:
   a. Require all students to take at least one Fairfield online course as part of their graduate requirements
   b. Allow full-time faculty to teach a certain amount of online courses as part of load
   c. Allow full-time faculty to teach online summer courses as part of load (something like a 2/2/2 option)
   d. Fund course redesign stipends for interested faculty
   e. Provide ample technology and media support for online course creation and maintenance.

4. To ensure that the quality of online education is as good, or better than, face to face, recruit award winning faculty to teach, support their work through incentives, and curricular design specialists, and market these courses as high impact.

5. Place this initiative high enough on the strategic food chain to ensure that it is integrated with other activities and initiatives (international, humanitarian, peace and justice, service,

6. MOOCS. The meteoric rise of Massive Open Online Courses might be a fad or might be a game changer. Of particular note is the fact that Georgetown has just been added to EdX’s team of university partners (joining Harvard, MIT, Berkeley and UT Austin). While the initial offerings have tended to be all related to health and technology, there are now courses in philosophy,
literature, poverty, and globalization. The other main player, Coursera, currently boasts of offering 334 courses from 62 universities to 3,181,839 students. Of particular note is the fact that Wesleyan, which offers no online courses for credit, is currently offering through Coursera the following five MOOCs: Passion Driven Statistics, Property and Liability: An Introduction to Law and Economics, The Ancient Greeks, The Language of Hollywood: Storytelling, Sound, and Color, and The Modern and the Postmodern. The combined enrollment in these courses is probably above 100,000.

While there does not currently exist (to my knowledge) a revenue generating strategy for MOOCs (the classes are free and non-credit), it appears that the real question is whether or not we can afford NOT to participate in this phenomenon. The magnitude of high quality branding these courses bring to the institution is tremendous.
Final Report on the Joint Sociology-Anthropology Major and the Anthropology Minor

Submitted by

The Subcommittee on the Joint Sociology-Anthropology Major
(Professors Crawford, Hodgson, and White)

The Subcommittee on the Anthropology Minor
(Professors Crawford, Hodgson, Lacy and Penczer)

8 April 2010
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1.0. Overview
This document outlines the subcommittees’ proposed format for the Anthropology Minor and the Joint Major in Sociology and Anthropology. During a Program Review Meeting on 15 October 2009, the Sociology and Anthropology faculty established two subcommittees to develop a Joint Sociology-Anthropology Major and an Anthropology Minor. The faculty charged each subcommittee with five specific tasks, which together establish a framework for the joint major and anthropology minor:

a.) identify the goals and objectives of the joint major/anthropology minor
b.) identify the course content of the joint major/anthropology minor
c.) structure the assessment process for the joint major/anthropology minor
d.) specify the fit of the minor with the joint major/anthropology minor
e.) specify the fit of joint major/anthropology minor with the mission

2.0. The Sociology-Anthropology Major

2.1. Goals and Objectives of the Joint Sociology-Anthropology Major

During a series of Program Review Meetings (Fall 2009), the faculty of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology established three central program goals to guide the development of the joint major and anthropology minor, and to serve collectively as a central organizing principle for curriculum development and on-going program assessment. In November 2009, the Department of Sociology and Anthropology submitted these goals to the Fairfield University Office of Institutional Research, which will use Department goals and objectives for alumni surveys (to assess the degree to which Sociology and Anthropology courses helped students accomplish said goals and objectives).

The three Sociology and Anthropology program goals (outlined below) serve as the goals for the Joint-Sociology-Anthropology Major.

Goal 1: Quantitative Reasoning
Objective 1: Understand basic statistical analysis
Objective 2: Properly interpret charts and tables

Goal 2: Critically examine society
Objective 1: Become aware of the major social problems faced by societies, our own and others
Objective 2: Analyze a social problem from more than one perspective

Goal 3: Work to improve self, community and world
Objective: Demonstrate three activities of social engagement

2.2. Course Content of the Joint Sociology and Anthropology Major

Based on a review of Sociology and “Sociology & Anthropology” departments, two prevailing curriculum models emerged for joint majors in Sociology and Anthropology. The first model maximizes student choice while the second maximizes “jointness” or balance (e.g. a prescribed major with a fixed balance between sociology and anthropology course work).
A comparison between the joint major programs at Middlebury and Albion illustrates the relative attributes of both models (see table 1). While the major at Albion will complete required coursework in both anthropology and sociology (theory and methods), the Middlebury major has the option of taking either Sociology or Anthropology courses to fulfill theory and method requirements. Both the Middlebury and Albion majors devote 50% of coursework to electives. The Department subcommittee proposes a joint major from the center of the “choice” versus “prescribed balance” continuum. The Fairfield joint major consists of ten courses, including 4 electives. The six required courses are split evenly between Sociology and Anthropology; majors complete an introductory course, a theory course, and a methods course in both Sociology and Anthropology.

The joint major is built from the existing course catalogue, with the exception of an Anthropology methods course to parallel and complement the Department’s Sociology methods course. Lacy is developing this ethnographic methods course to be offered starting spring semester 2011.

Table 2.2.A. Overview of Joint Sociology & Anthropology Programs/Majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximize...</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Example</td>
<td>Albion</td>
<td>Middlebury</td>
<td>Fairfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF COURSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All courses for the minor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUIRED COURSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory Courses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Anthro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Field</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory Courses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc -OR- Anth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods Courses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology Methods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc -OR- Anth Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/Capstone Project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Joint Soc-Anth major will adopt a capstone project or course once the full Department develops the Sociology-Anthropology capstone format. The capstone will include an extensive research component.
Figure 2.2.A. Proposed Joint Sociology-Anthropology Major (10 Courses)

- **Introductory Courses (2)**
  - SO 100: Introduction/General Sociology
  - AY 100: Introduction to Four-Field Anthropology

- **Theory Courses (2)**
  - SO 328: Classical Social Theory (or combined classic/contemp theory course, if created)
  - AY 189: Ethnographic Knowledge and Practice

- **Methods Courses (2)**
  - SO 222: Methods of Research Design
  - AY 222: Ethnographic Research Methods (course in development)

- **Elective Courses (4)**
  - Coursework in Sociology and/or Anthropology

2.3. **Structure of the Assessment Process for the Joint Sociology-Anthropology Major**

The assessment process for the Joint Sociology-Anthropology Major will be based on a system of three tracking surveys: an entry survey when the student declares her Sociology-Anthropology Major, an exit survey for all graduating Sociology-Anthropology Majors, and the alumni survey developed and administered by the University Office of Institutional Research. The entrance and exit surveys for joint majors will be developed and administered by the Sociology and Anthropology Department. Department faculty will develop the entrance and exit surveys based on the three program goals and their corresponding learning objectives described in section 2.1. Declaring majors will complete the survey as part of the paperwork required of students who declare their majors. Graduating majors will complete their survey as part of their paperwork required of graduating department seniors.

2.4. **Fit of the Joint Sociology-Anthropology Major with “The Core”**

In many ways the Sociology-Anthropology major serves as a social science model of what Fairfield’s Core hopes to accomplish across all discipline. The major itself is an integrated learning experience that requires students to look across disciplinary boundaries with the goal of acquiring a broader understanding of the social realm than can be attained by working within the limitations of either discipline. The core has the goal of fostering an individual who can think "clearly, accurately, and dispassionately" and who as a "social being" will "care about others" and who will take their "place in the world" beside them. The Sociology-Anthropology major will equip students with the needed quantitative and ethnographic skills to think "clearly, accurately, and dispassionately" about the workings of their own society, of other societies, and of the World System. An essential component of the major will be to have students begin to think of themselves as Global Citizens responsible for fashioning a more just world.
2.5.  *Fit of Joint Sociology-Anthropology Major with the University Mission*

Fairfield University's mission is to foster "diversity," "social responsibility," and "the creative intellectual potential of students." Additionally the institution seeks to highlight the "similarities," "differences" and "interrelationships" of disciplines. The Sociology-Anthropology major is in great harmony with the University's mission. As a creative fusion of two disciplines this major necessarily underscores the similarities, differences and interrelationships between two social science approaches to understanding human behavior. The goal of this major is to have students celebrate human cultural diversity, recognize that true understanding of the "other" can only come from fully embracing their reality, and then use this understanding to help bring about a better world.

Present: All, but one. Excused: Prof. Terry-Ann Jones who is at a conference in Louisiana.

Report of Joint Major/Anthro Minor by Scott Lacey, dated Feb. 15.
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Introduction
The Department of Sociology & Anthropology Subcommittee on the Joint Sociology-Anthropology Major collaborated with the Subcommittee on the Anthropology Minor to discuss frameworks for a joint major and an anthropology minor. This document outlines the subcommittees’ proposed format for the Anthropology Minor and the Joint Major in Sociology and Anthropology.

The Joint Major: Sociology & Anthropology
Based on a review of Sociology and “Sociology & Anthropology” departments, two prevailing models emerged for joint majors in Sociology and Anthropology. The first model maximizes student choice while the second maximizes “jointness” or balance (e.g. a prescribed major with a fixed balance between sociology and anthropology course work).

A comparison between the joint major programs at Middlebury and Albion illustrates the relative attributes of both models (see table 1). While the major at Albion will complete required coursework in both anthropology and sociology (theory and methods), the Middlebury major has the option of taking either Sociology or Anthropology courses to fulfill theory and method requirements. Both the Middlebury and Albion majors devote 50% of coursework to electives.
The Department subcommittee proposes a joint major from the center of the “choice” versus “prescribed balance” continuum. The Fairfield joint major consists of ten courses, including 4 electives. The six required courses are split evenly between Sociology and Anthropology; majors complete an introductory course, a theory course, and a methods course in both Sociology and Anthropology.

The joint major is built from the existing course catalogue, with the exception of an Anthropology methods course to parallel and complement the Department’s Sociology methods course. Lacy is developing this ethnographic methods course to be offered starting spring semester 2011.

Proposed Joint Sociology-Anthropology Major (10 Courses)

Introductory Courses (2)
- Introduction/General Sociology
- Introduction to Four-Field Anthropology

Theory Courses (2)
- Classical Social Theory (or combined classic/contemp theory course, if Dept develops one)
- Ethnographic Knowledge and Practice

Methods Courses (2)
- Methods of Research Design
- Ethnographic Research Methods (course in development)

Electives in the Department of Sociology & Anthropology (4)

Table 1: Overview of Joint Sociology & Anthropology Programs/Majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Example</th>
<th>Maximize...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All courses for the minor</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NUMBER OF COURSES**

**REQUIRED COURSES**

*Introductory Courses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cultural Anthro</th>
<th>General Sociology</th>
<th>Four-Field</th>
<th>Biological Anthropology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction Courses</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Theory Courses*

|                         | 2               | 1                 | 2          |
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Anthropology 1 1 1
Sociology 1 1 1
Soc -OR- Anth 1

Methods Courses 0 0 2
Sociology Methods 1
Anthropology Methods 1
Soc -OR- Anth Methods 1

Senior/Capstone Project 1 1 1*

*The Joint Soc-Anth major will adopt a capstone project or course once the full Department develops the Sociology-Anthropology capstone format. The capstone will include an extensive research component.

Motion Dr. Hodgson:

Approve the proposal for a Joint Sociology–Anthropology major and submit to Faculty Committees

Vote: Approve - Unanimous

ARTS & SCIENCES CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING
8 May 2012
3:30-5:00 p.m.
BCC 206

Approved by the committee, 18 September 2012

Present: Dean Robbin Crabtree, Anita Fernandez, Johanna Garvey (scribe), Jerelyn Johnson (Chair), Scott Lacy, Doug Peduti, Vin Rosivach, Giovanni Ruffini, Roxana Walker-Canton, Qin Zhang, Tommy Xie

Guests: Shannon Harding, Mark Scalese, David Crawford

Chair called the meeting to order at 3:32.

V. Joint Sociology/Anthropology Major Proposal

David Crawford gave an introduction to the proposal, saying that it had been prepared by the whole department, with debate, in on-going discussion for the past four years. The Sociology
colleagues drove the proposal and the Anthropology colleagues feel included. All resources and courses exist already. The students chart a different path and construct an intellectual identity differently that in the current major. The proposed major is a reorganization of existing assets.

Johnson asked why they cannot have an Anthropology major? Crawford said that it is a matter of resources, and is not viable with only two people to run such a major. There is also a syncretic value to a Sociology/Anthropology major, as a stand-alone entity. It is harder, more quantitative survey-based, as well as taking an international, broader approach. It has advantages over either single major; Anthropology would be a separate entity.

Discussion ensued on whether a student could major/minor in both currently. Crabtree said that a student could major in SO, minor in AY, double-counting one course. Crawford said that up until now, a student could take as many courses as desired in AY for a SO major. They have already had students who did the proposed major without its having a name. The combined major is more structured, so that the students tack back and forth between the two disciplines, wanting to do both.

Rosivach commented that in an interdisciplinary major, students normally take a capstone: had they considered such a course? Crawford said that in the third year of outside review a capstone was suggested and the majority want one in SO. Logistics have not been agreed upon. Yes, they would like one for the new major. Lacy noted that a senior graduating in AY and TH has done a capstone with him.

Xie asked if there is a course that bridges AY and SO? Crawford answered that the sociocultural side of AY dovetails with SO. AY is such a big tent, though, including the more scientific side, but we have no faculty member now in that area.

**MOTION** to endorse the Joint Sociology/Anthropology major (Peduti, Ruffini)

Rosivach wanted to amend the motion to encourage that the curriculum include a capstone. Peduti agreed to the amendment, but Ruffini did not.

**AMENDMENT** to endorse the proposal for a joint major in Sociology/Anthropology with a strong recommendation that the curriculum include a capstone (Peduti/Garvey)

**AMENDMENT passes 8-1-1**

Discussion on amended motion:

Rosivach said they have made a good case. Crabtree said the department has worked through the process methodically for several years, with external reviewers and departmental response. The changes have been long in coming. Ruffini said he would love to see an Anthropology major, and this new major is a good step in that direction. Johnson agreed. Lacy noted that this year,
with an AY minor for only one semester, there have been large numbers of students, which has led to IDMJ in Anthropology. Xie spoke in favor of a capstone.

**MOTION passes 10-0-0.**

Meeting adjourned 4:59.

Respectfully submitted,
Johanna X. K. Garvey

---

**UNDEDGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING**
Minutes of the meeting of October 02, 2012
Approved November 06, 2012

Attending: Professors Mousumi Bose Godbole, Bruce Bradford, Shah Etemad, Anita Fernandez, Johanna Garvey, Alison Kris, Scott Lacy, Larry Miners, Rajasree Rajamma, Shanon Reckinger, Vin Rosivach, Giovanni Ruffini (Chair), Yohuru Williams, Tommy Xie, SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, Deans: Jack Beal, Robbin Crabtree, Don Gibson.

Guests: Dean Perkus, Professors: Doug Lyon, Tim Talty

The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 3:32 pm.

---

8. **Joint Sociology/Anthropology joint major:**

Prof. Lacy offered the rationale behind the joint major. This was followed by a question and answer session where, in response to Profs. Kris, Miners, Rajamma, Rosivach, and Williams, Prof. Lacy explained that the new joint major does not require any new resources; the sociology major is not getting closed, nor will it be cannibalized by the new major; the sociology department has reached out to several outside departments and they are willing to offer the required classes that will fulfill the new major. Prof. Lacy also pointed out that his department is also looking for collaboration with other departments to offer Medical Anthropology and Bioanthropology which can embolden our health sciences offerings.

Hearing no further questions regarding the topic, a motion was made by Prof. Williams and seconded by Prof. Bradford:
Motion: The UCC approve the creation of a joint Sociology / Anthropology major:

Prof. Crabtree spoke in favor of the motion.

The motion passed unanimously with 11 votes in favor; no abstentions.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Rajasree K. Rajamma

Educational Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

November 15, 2012
Present: Lynn Babington, Peter Bayers, Paul Fitzgerald, Sheila Grossman, Olivia Harriott, Evagelia Bilias Lolis, Mark Scalese, Carl Scheraga, Christopher Staecker

Absent: Catherine Giapponi, Susan Franzosa, Qin Zhang

Item 2 Proposal for Sociology/Anthropology Major

Professor Scott Lacy described a brief review of the proposed joint major in sociology and anthropology. The idea came from a 2009 External Review which recommended this joint major from a department that offers a sociology major, sociology minor, and anthropology minor. The six required courses would be split in each area with majors taking an introductory, theory, and methods course in each discipline along with four electives from the two areas. Professor Lacy explained the multiple advantages for students who avail themselves of this major. Professor Harriet reinforced the importance of having a medical anthropology course and the many benefits this would allow for collaboration with other departments in the university. Professor Lacy described that the Anthropology 110 course, which has recently been opened as a core science course, is being taught by an adjunct anthropologist and is very popular. Professor Bayers suggested that the new major would prepare students for graduate programs and be good for preparing students’ careers. Professors Lacy and Scheraga discussed the benefits of Sociology & Anthropology collaborating with various departments in providing courses on cross-cultural communication methods and the need for more graduates with these skills. SVPAA Fitzgerald described the results of an alumni poll and suggested that students majoring in this newly proposed major would most likely obtain a job after graduation, that the major might be a good foundation for pre law, and also that the major serves as a mechanism to fulfill the university and department’s mission. Professor Bilias Lolis agreed it was an excellent idea and
would positively impact the whole university. Professor Lacy suggested high potential growth and would hope a medical anthropologist faculty could be hired in the future. Dean Babington agreed that there would be many collaborations between departments regarding medical anthropology such as with nursing and communication. Professor Scalese suggested collaboration between his department and sociology & anthropology regarding ethnographic filming. Professor Lacy explained that he is trained in video anthropology by the NSF and agreed on this potential collaborative.

Professor Scalese made a motion to approve the proposal for the joint major and Professor Harriet seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheila Grossman