ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, November 4, 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 Oct. 7, 2013 (attached)
   b. Correspondence
   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. Recommendations from the Committee on University College (attachments)
   b. Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees: report from October meeting and preparation for December meeting
   c. Faculty Salary Committee to review Journal of Record language re standard versus further merit (attachment)

• Lists of Attachments, Pending, and Ongoing Items are on page 2
List of Attachments:
For item 3.a. Minutes of AC meeting of 10/97/13 (pages 3-7)
For item 7.a. Email from Chair of University College Committee (page 8); Memo 4/5/13 re Proposed Dissolution of the Committee on University College (page 9); Memo 4/5/13 re Lifelong Learning and Continuous Education (page 10); Strategic Vision for Online Education, Spring 2013, by Associate Dean of CAS and Acting Director of Distance Education (pages 11-18)
For item 7.c. Memo from Faculty Salary Committee to AC dated 10/28/2013 (page 19)

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
Academic Council Meeting

Monday, October 7, 2013,
3:30 - 5:30
CNS 200

DRAFT MINUTES OF MEETING

Present: Professors: Joe Dennin, David Downie, Bob Epstein, James He, Shannon Harding, Chris Huntley, Ginny Kelly, Alison Kris, Nikki Lee-Wingate, Irene Mulvey (Executive Secretary), Martin Nguyen, Elizabeth Petrino, Shawn Rafalski (Chair), Susan Rakowitz (Secretary of the General Faculty), L. Kraig Steffen.

Administrators: Deans Lynn Babington, Bruce Berdanier, Don Gibson, SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald.

Student Representative: Timothy Manning.

Guests: Professors Scott Lacy, David Sapp, Kurt Schlichting, Ms. Jessica York.

Observer: Professor Rick DeWitt.

Regrets: Professors Wendy Kohli, John Thiel, Roxana Walker-Canton; Deans Robbin Crabtree, Faith-Anne Dohm.

Professor Rafalski called the meeting to order at 3:35. Before turning to the agenda, Professor Rafalski welcomed the new student Representative, Timothy Manning and invited committee members to introduce themselves.

1. Presidential Courtesy.

SVPPA Fitzgerald briefly touched on several topics.

The Board of Trustees had approved the Amendments to the Handbook that the General Faculty had approved in June.

The Freshman class currently stands at 963. The current budget had assumed 950. The freshman class includes increases in both students of color and international students. 39% are male, up from the 38% the preceding year. 40% of the current class applied utilizing the test-optional choice. The high school GPA, quality of high schools attended, and strength of high school courses taken, which collectively are better measures for predicting college success than standardized tests, are collectively higher than the preceding class. The discount rate for financial aid for the freshman class is approximately 40%, which SVPAA Fitzgerald characterized as generous but not financially onerous for the University.

Tuition associated with graduate students enrolled for the summer and fall terms of the 2013-2014 academic year is within $50,000 of the $5 million revenue budget associated with these programs. Additional enrollments are expected during the winter intersession and spring terms.
2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty.

Professor Rakowitz, Secretary of the General Faculty, reported that Committee on Committees was working to fill one remaining vacancy.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary

a. Approval of minutes of 9 September 2013.

Prof. James He noted that he should be listed as present. Several members drew attention to non-consequential editorial issues, which required correcting.

   MOTION (Epstein/Steffen): To approve the minutes of 9 September 2013 as corrected.
   MOTION PASSES 15 – 0 – 0.

b. Correspondence

Professor Mulvey, Executive Secretary, noted three items of correspondence in the packet.

4. Council Subcommittee Reports.

Professor Mulvey noted that no sub-committees were ready to report.

5. Petitions for Immediate Hearing.

Professor Rafalski opened the floor to AC members to consider the petition for immediate hearing sent by email 30 minutes before the meeting and distributed to AC members by the petitioner immediately prior to the meeting. No AC member made a motion to entertain the petition for immediate hearing.

Following its consideration of the agenda items below, the AC unanimously agreed to return to this item as it needed to decide how the materials submitted to AC members immediately prior to the meeting should be handled procedurally.

   MOTION (Rakowitz/Steffen): That the material distributed for today's petition for immediate hearing not be included with today's minutes or in correspondence because it includes personnel information.
   MOTION PASSES 15 – 0 – 0.

6. Old Business

There was no old business to consider at this time.

(a) Election of faculty members to the Honorary Degree Committee

Professor Rakowitz reported that three faculty members had been nominated for the three faculty positions on the Honorary Degree. The Academic Council elected Profs. Lane, Massey, and McFadden by acclamation, to serve as the faculty members of the Honorary Degree Committee.

(b) Motion on Subcommittee on Calendar Issues, and election of members

Professor Rakowitz drew the Council’s attention to the relevant information in the packet. Professor Dennin stated that while more concise, there appeared to be little substantive difference between the proposed new language and the proposed old language. Professor Epstein said that as the author of the old proposed language, he supported the new proposed language.

MOTION (Rakowitz/Fitzgerald):
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.
MOTION PASSES 14 – 0 – 1.

Shannon Harding and Nikki Lee-Wingate were elected, by acclamation, to serve as the 2-person Calendar Review Subcommittee for 2013-2014.

(c) Proposed revision to JoR language regarding Midterm Estimates

Professor Rakowitz drew the Council’s attention to the relevant information in the packet.

Director of Exploratory Academic Advising Jessica York and Associate VP for Academic Affairs David Sapp reviewed the background of the proposal and its endorsement by the Academic Planning Committee. Midterm estimates have proven to be an important tool for identifying students that might need assistance. The current language is out-of-date, however, given administrative changes at the University. In addition, shifting responsibility for requesting and receiving the estimates away from the Registrar’s office and to the Office of Exploratory Academic Advising might improve the faculty response rate, which is sometimes less than 20% in a given term.

During the subsequent discussion, Professors Dennin and Huntley emphasized the need to amend the proposal so that it states specifically that the estimates should be submitted to the Office of Exploratory Academic Advising.

Harding and Epstein proposed adding specific reference to first-year students in the second sentence of the proposed language.

In response to a question from Professor Downie, Ms. York stated that if the existing language was removed from the JoR and not replaced, this would not necessarily inhibit the ability of her office to request the information from faculty. Professor Downie stated that this could be an example of an opportunity to avoid micromanaging. Simply removing the outdated language from the JoR would allow the Office of Exploratory Academic Advising to continue its work and eliminate the potential need for the Academic Council to consider additional changes to this language in the future.
In response to a question from SVPAA Fitzgerald, Ms. York explained how her office uses the information in the mid-term estimates to assist students and how these efforts have proven effective both in helping them improve academically during their transition to college and in sustaining the University’s high retention rate.

Professor Kris noted that the timing of the reports could be an issue as it could come too early or too late to identify a potential problem. Professors Epstein and He noted that early grades, and even mid-terms grades should not be the only indicator used by faculty and others to identify students having trouble.

**MOTION (Fitzgerald/Epstein):** To delete the following language on page 33 of the Journal of Record:

“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.”

And to replace it with the following new language:

“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 semesters for their first-year students in danger of receiving a C-, D, or F to the Office of Exploratory Academic Advising. The student, along with the faculty advisor and the appropriate Dean or Director, will be notified.”

**MOTION PASSES 13 – 1 – 0.**

**MOTION (Rakowitz/Steffen):** To reorder the agenda and consider item 7(e)  
**MOTION PASSES 15 – 0 – 0.**

(e) Proposal for a Sociology-Anthropology Major

Professors Lacy and Schlichting outlined the proposal for a possible new major in Sociology and Anthropology, noting it would utilize existing resources to give students more options. The origins of the proposal stemmed in part from the results of the department’s self-study, including specific recommendations by an outside-reviewer.

In response to questions from Professor Dennin, Professors Lacy and Schlichting outlined some of the options that students would have after completing the major, including graduate school and work in fields related to, in general terms, survey research, marketing, international development, and ethnographic research, among others. In the future, the major could also become linked to the health-science initiative through courses in medical anthropology and social epidemiology.
In response to several questions from Professors Harding and Dennin, Professors Lacy and Schlichting stated that current students had not been polled to gauge interest in the major. Their belief that students will enroll in the major was based on: reports from the outside reviewer regarding interviews conducted with students; the number of students who had considered or enrolled in IDMJs similar to the proposed major; conversations with current and former sociology majors, and student enrollment in some of the classes that would comprise the new major, such as Physical Anthropology. They could not provide precise estimates regarding the number of students that would pursue the proposed major in the future. Currently, there are approximately 62 students majoring in sociology, and the department graduates about 20 students each year.

In response to several questions, Professors Lacy and Schlichting clarified that a student majoring in “Sociology and Anthropology” would not be able to double major in Sociology or to minor in Sociology or Anthropology. In response to a question from Professor Steffen, Professor Lacy clarified that references to medical anthropology in parts of the proposal were references to physical anthropology.

Professor Lee-Wingate noted that some students pursuing the new major would benefit from pursuing a minor in marketing as qualitative market research employs some anthropological techniques.

**MOTION (Epstein/Petrino): That the Academic Council Approve the Proposed Major in Sociology and Anthropology.**

SVPAA Fitzgerald spoke in favor of the motion. The new major would provide students more options and the proposal had been reviewed in detail by the relevant committees.

Professor Dennin spoke in qualified favor of the motion, believing the proposal should have included more specific information regarding student demand.

Professor Downie spoke in favor of the motion.

**MOTION PASSES 15 – 0 – 0.**

**MOTION TO ADJOURN (Epstein/Steffen)
MOTION PASSES 15 – 0 – 0.**

Meeting adjourned at 4:45.

Respectfully submitted,
David Downie
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
  - 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

  o 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

  o 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

  o 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

  o 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:

  Total and Online Enrollment in Degree-granting Postsecondary Institutions – Fall 2002 through Fall 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Annual Growth Rate Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Students Taking at Least One Online Course</th>
<th>Online Enrollment Increase over Previous Year</th>
<th>Annual Growth Rate Online Enrollment</th>
<th>Online Enrollment as a Percent of Total Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>16,611,710</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>16,911,481</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1,971,397</td>
<td>368,427</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>17,272,043</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2,329,783</td>
<td>358,386</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>17,487,401</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3,100,020</td>
<td>850,267</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>17,758,872</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3,488,381</td>
<td>308,331</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>18,248,113</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3,938,111</td>
<td>449,730</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>19,102,811</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4,606,353</td>
<td>668,242</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>20,427,711</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5,579,022</td>
<td>972,669</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>21,016,126</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>6,142,280</td>
<td>563,258</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>20,994,113</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>6,714,792</td>
<td>572,512</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
MEMORANDUM
Faculty Salary Committee
Fairfield University

TO: Academic Council
FROM: Faculty Salary Committee
DATE: October 28, 2013
RE: Journal of Record language re standard versus further merit

The guidelines for Faculty Annual Merit Review and Self-Evaluation are in Appendix 12 in the Journal of Record. The section on Distribution of Funds articulates how much of a salary pool that is above the increase in the cost-of-living will be distributed as Standard Merit and how much of that pool goes to Further Merit:

If the increase in the salary pool is at or below the increase in the cost of living (CPI-U), the entire increase in the pool will go to Standard Merit. If the increase in the salary pool is above the increase in the cost of living, then the percent going to Standard Merit will be cost of living plus one quarter of the remainder of the increase in the pool.

Last year, the increase in CPI was 1.7% and the salary pool was 2%. According to the Journal of Record formula, we should have had Standard Merit at 1.775% and Further Merit at 0.225%.

Since, in the previous year, cost-of-living was 3% and salaries were frozen (0% increase), the Faculty Salary Committee and administration agreed to distribute the 2% all as standard merit. The General Faculty approved this override of the Journal of Record when the MOU was approved on May 8, 2013. The FSC would like to propose revising the JoR language to ensure that raises keep pace with the increase in cost-of-living not just over one year, but over many years, and we ask the AC to endorse the FSC working on this matter.