ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, March 3, 2014
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 meetings
   b. Correspondence
      i. Memo of 1/31/14 from Coordinator of Student-Athlete Programs to SVPAA re Fall 2013 conflicts between finals and scheduled athletic contests (Ongoing Item 1; attached)
      ii. Letter (undated) from faculty members re agenda item 6.a (attached)
   c. Oral Reports

4. Council Subcommittee Reports (No reports expected at this meeting.)
   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 on time codes (AC 5/8/13)
   f. Subcommittee on Mission Statement re non-tenure track faculty (AC 9/9/13)
   g. Subcommittee to consider Faculty Handbook committee on non-tenure track faculty (AC 9/9/13)

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

6. Old Business
   a. Report from the Educational Technologies Committee re discontinuation of the course management software aspect of Mentor (see AC 9/9/2013 minutes item 2; attachments)

7. New business
   a. Recommendation from FDEC on adopting the IDEA short form (attachment)
   b. Proposal for a Bachelor of Science Degree program in Bioengineering (materials distributed with packet for 2/3/14 AC meeting; see pages 68-92)
   c. Committee on Conference with the Board - report from December and prepare for March meeting (Ongoing item 2)
   d. Discussion of AC three-year Review of Merit Appeals Policy (due fall 2013; Pending Item F)
   e. Academic Planning Committee proposed revision to JoR re college courses taken in high school (attachment)

* Lists of Attachments, Pending, and Ongoing Items are on page 2
List of Attachments:
For item 3.b.i. Memo dated 1/31/14 re conflicts between exams and athletic contests (page 3)
For item 3.b.ii. Letter (undated) from faculty re agenda item 6.a. (pages 46)
For item 6.a. Report from ETC re Mentor (Report on pages 7-20; Appendices in separately stapled document)
For item 7.a. Recommendation from FDEC with FDEC minutes dated 1/15/2014 (pages 21-25)
For item 7.b. Proposal for a Bachelor of Science degree in Bioengineering – materials are in the packet for the 2/3/2014 AC meeting (see pages 68-92 of AC 2/3/14 packet)
For item 7.e. Memo dated 2/19/14 from Academic Planning Committee (pages 26-28)

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
3. Standing Calendar Review Subcommittee: A subcommittee of two people will be elected by the AC each September from its elected membership. The subcommittee’s charge is 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.
To: Fr. Paul Fitzgerald, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

From: Mary Ann Palazzi, Coordinator of Programs for Student-Athletes

Re: 2013 Fall Semester Conflicts with Finals and Scheduled Athletic Contests

Date: Friday January, 31, 2014

Dear Father Fitzgerald,

Please find below a list of conflicts with final exams and reading days for the Fall 2013 semester. Please contact me at extension 2011 or mpalazzi@fairfield.edu with any questions.

**MEN’S BASKETBALL**- DECEMBER 15, 2013 VS. NORTHEASTERN- HOME-4:00 pm- It was a scheduled contest and was a conflict with a Reading Day.

**WOMEN’S BASKETBALL**- DECEMBER 18, 2013 VS. OKLAHOMA- HOME- 7:00 pm- It was a scheduled contest and was a conflict with a Reading Day.

**FIELD HOCKEY**- NO CONFLICTS

**MEN’S SOCCER**-NO CONFLICTS

**WOMEN’S SOCCER**- NO CONFLICTS

**MEN’S/WOMEN’S TENNIS**- NO CONFLICTS

**MEN’S/ WOMEN’S GOLF**- NO CONFLICTS

**MEN’S/ WOMEN’S SWIMMING**- NO CONFLICTS

**VOLLEYBALL**- NO CONFLICTS

**MEN’S /WOMEN’S ROWING**- NO CONFLICTS

**MEN’S/WOMEN’S CROSS COUNTRY**- NO CONFLICTS
To the President, the Board of Trustees and the Academic Council:

Last August, the Mentor course management system was abruptly shut down by Chief Information Officer Paige Francis, creating enormous disruption for some 500 courses, as well as assessment and accreditation processes in multiple schools and departments. The Academic Council asked the Educational Technology Committee to investigate “what led to the decision, how the decision was made and the appropriateness of the decision.” ETC conducted a five-month long exhaustive investigation. The ETC report is now out, and the implications are unfavorable.

The ETC is clear in its findings: Information Technology Services offered no plausible grounds to justify closing down Mentor in August and has failed to demonstrate any grounds for a permanent shutdown. The ETC recommends that, in the absence of evidence that Mentor has the severe flaws that Francis has alleged, the university should restore Mentor to full functionality.

Last August, Francis claimed it was necessary to shut down the Mentor system abruptly because sensitive student data were at risk. As hundreds of faculty scrambled in the first weeks of class to convert all of their course materials to Blackboard, Francis reiterated that while this was unfortunate, it was necessary because of the security risk posed by the Mentor software. But as the ETC report makes clear, there was no evidence to support the claim of a security crisis.

The administration maintains that it is the prerogative of the CIO to decide what software the university should use and that faculty are not entitled to participate in those decisions. We respectfully note that this is inaccurate. Page one of the faculty handbook provides that it is the role of the general faculty to be concerned with “matters pertaining to the academic life of the University.” While an actual emergency may be grounds for overriding the role of the faculty in academic matters, there is not now, and never was, any emergency.

Many of us have worked closely with Professor Curt Naser, the creator of Mentor. For years he has assisted faculty, department chairs and deans in countless ways. His software and his extraordinary help and dedication have transformed our classes, our assessment efforts, our accreditation reviews, our hiring processes and many other critical functions of our university’s educational mission. As the ETC notes, “The work Prof. Naser did for the university in good faith has been disregarded and his reputation impugned.” That Naser should be treated so shabbily is shameful.

The administration has maintained that it cannot allow the university community to use software that presents a risk to the university. There was never any such risk. There was only the arbitrary decision of the CIO based on groundless accusations, which was defended by inaccurate and misleading claims.

We, the undersigned, ask the Academic Council to join us in endorsing the report of the Educational Technology Committee.

We call upon the university to immediately reinstate the full availability of Mentor to students, faculty and staff.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department/Field</th>
<th>College/Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Colleen Arendt</td>
<td>Religious Studies Department</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Steven Bayne</td>
<td>Religious Studies Department</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jack Beal</td>
<td>Philosophy Department</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dorothea Braginsky</td>
<td>Educational Studies &amp; Teacher Preparation</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Scott Brenner</td>
<td>Department of Visual and Performing Arts</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolan School of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sara Brill</td>
<td>Philosophy Department</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Patricia Calderwood</td>
<td>Educational Studies &amp; Teacher Preparation</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Studies &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Allied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Anne Campbell</td>
<td>Educational Studies &amp; Teacher Preparation</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Studies &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Allied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kevin Cassidy</td>
<td>Department of Communication</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Gerald Cavallo</td>
<td>Department of Communication</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolan School of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ronald Davidson</td>
<td>Department of School Psychology</td>
<td>Graduate School of Education and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>Allied Professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Maureen Dewan</td>
<td>Philosophy Department</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Richard DeWitt</td>
<td>Philosophy Department</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ryan Drake</td>
<td>Philosophy Department</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Philip Eliasoph</td>
<td>Department of Visual and Performing Arts</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Deborah Farber</td>
<td>Educational Studies &amp; Teacher Preparation</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Studies &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Allied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dina Franceschi</td>
<td>Economics Department</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Susan Franzosa</td>
<td>Educational Studies &amp; Teacher Preparation</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Studies &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Allied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Gisela Gil-Egui</td>
<td>Department of Communication</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Joelle Goldfield</td>
<td>Modern Languages &amp; Literatures</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Joy Gordon</td>
<td>Chair, Philosophy</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Rosemarie Gorman</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David Gudelunas</td>
<td>Chair, Department of Communication</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Evangelos Hadjimichael</td>
<td>Physics Department</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Olivia Harriott</td>
<td>Biology Department</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Herr</td>
<td>Marketing Department</td>
<td>Dolan School of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolan School of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Walter Hlawitschka</td>
<td>Chair, Finance Department</td>
<td>Dolan School of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolan School of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dennis Hodgson</td>
<td>Department of Sociology and Anthropology</td>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. Hugh Humphrey
Religious Studies
Department
College of Arts & Sciences

William Kaplan
Educational Studies &
Teacher Preparation
Graduate School of
Education and Allied
Professions

Dr. Wendy Kohli
Educational Studies &
Teacher Preparation
Graduate School of
Education and Allied
Professions

Dr. Alison Kris
School of Nursing

Dr. Philip Lane
Economics Department
College of Arts & Sciences

Dr. Mark LeClair
Economics Department
College of Arts & Sciences

Dr. Nikki Lee-Wingate
Marketing Department
Dolan School of Business

Dr. James Long
Philosophy Department
College of Arts & Sciences

Dr. Douglas Lyon
Computer Engineering
School of Engineering

Prof. Kathi Mettler
Accounting Department
Dolan School of Business

Dr. Todd Osier
Biology Department
College of Arts & Sciences

Dr. Gail Ostrow
English Department
College of Arts & Sciences

Dr. Michael Pagano
Department of
Communication
College of Arts & Sciences

Dr. Gita Rajan
English Department
College of Arts & Sciences

Dr. Doug Peduti, SJ
Philosophy Department
College of Arts & Sciences

Dr. Kris Sealey
Philosophy Department
College of Arts & Sciences

Dr. Michael Serazio
Department of
Communication
College of Arts & Sciences

Dr. Norman Solomon
Management Department
Dolan School of Business

Prof. Debra Strauss
Management Department
Dolan School of Business

Dr. Mukesh Sud
Management Department
Dolan School of Business

Dr. Michael Tucker
Finance Department
MEMORANDUM
Educational Technology Committee
Fairfield University

TO: Academic Council
FROM: Mark Scalese, S.J., Chair, Educational Technology Committee
DATE: January 29, 2014
RE: Report to the Academic Council

Background.
This report from the Educational Technology Committee (ETC) to the Academic Council (AC) is to carry out the charge given to the ETC by the AC at its meeting on September 9, 2013:

MOTION. Following the decision to discontinue the use of the course management software aspect of Mentor, the AC charges the 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.

Timeline/Chronology.
The ETC met 9 times during the fall 2013 semester. During its first meeting on September 11, the committee elected Prof. Mark Scalese chair and voted to fulfill the motion from the AC. The committee drew up an initial schedule: meet with CIO Paige Francis and members of her ITS team on September 25; meet with Prof. Curt Naser the following week, on October 2; discuss what it learned on October 9; and if necessary, have a followup meeting with CIO Francis and/or Prof. Naser on October 16 (Appendix A). For reasons that will be explained below, that timetable did not work out as planned.

On September 13, Prof. Scalese emailed Prof. Naser, inviting him to meet with the ETC on Oct. 2. Prof. Naser confirmed his willingness to meet and that Oct. 2 would be a suitable date.

On September 18, Prof. Scalese emailed the ETC, confirming the timetable of
meetings on 9/25, 10/2, and 10/9, and suggesting some questions the committee could pose to ITS on 9/25 (Appendix B). This email also acknowledged that Larry Miners agreed to serve on the committee during the fall semester in place of Ron Salafia, who had a conflict during with the time slot which the committee had scheduled for its meetings.

Before the September 25 meeting, reading materials were emailed to the committee by Prof. Vishnu Vinekar and AVPAA Christine Siegel. These materials included: 1) a memo on the reasons for the Mentor shutdown compiled by select faculty of the Dolan School of Business (DSB) and Engineering; 2) a response to this memo by Prof. Naser; 3) a Q&A report between the DSB faculty and Prof. Naser; 4) a timeline of IT use at Fairfield University from 1993-2013; 5) a 2010 PowerPoint presentation from VPSA Pellegrino about FERPA basics; 6) selected links on the Fairfield University website related to FERPA compliance. Additional files were forwarded to the committee from Profs. Amalia Rusu and Susan Rakowitz concerning FERPA and SVPAA Fitzgerald’s remarks about Mentor to the general faculty. (See Appendices C-K)

On September 25, the ETC met with CIO Francis and the following members of her ITS team: Russ Battista, Director of Administrative Computing; Jay Rozgonyi, Director of Academic Computing; Bryan Skowera, Director of Network Services; and Curt Swartzlander, Database Administrator. Prof. Joy Gordon also attended the meeting as an observer (Appendix L).

On September 26, Prof. Naser emailed Prof. Scalese an extensive report about the events leading up to the Mentor shutdown (Appendix M). Prof. Scalese forwarded this to the ETC. He also emailed Prof. Naser handouts which CIO Francis had distributed at the Sept. 25 meeting in addition to a summary of his understanding of what ITS presented at that meeting (Appendices N-O).

On October 2, University General Counsel Darin Callahan emailed Prof. Scalese, advising him that Mr. Don Bodnar was the official spokesperson for Axiom Education and as such, should represent that company at the meeting with the ETC (Appendix P). In light of this email, the meeting with Prof. Naser that afternoon was postponed. Subsequent emails between Profs. Naser and Scalese rescheduled the meeting for October 23 and clarified that Prof. Naser would accompany Mr. Bodnar to the October 23 meeting.

On October 10, Atty. Callahan emailed Prof. Scalese again, stating that lawyers from both the university and Axiom Education were discussing the contractual relationship
between the two parties. In light of that, Callahan requested that Axiom representatives be removed from the Oct. 23 meeting agenda (Appendix Q). That day, Prof. Naser emailed Prof. Scalese stating that he still intended to meet with the ETC on Oct. 23.

In light of these developments, Prof. Scalese wrote to the Executive Committee of the AC on October 11 for advice about how to proceed. Prof. Irene Mulvey emailed a reply on October 13 (Appendices R-S). Prof. Scalese forwarded this to the committee, which decided to proceed with the October 23 meeting.

Prior to the October 23 meeting, Prof. Scalese exchanged emails with Mr. Bodnar and Prof. Naser, trying to clarify the capacity in which Prof. Naser would meet with the ETC. Prof. Naser stated that he would attend the meeting as the faculty member who had developed the Mentor system.

On the morning of October 23, Prof. Naser emailed Prof. Scalese that Profs. Chris Huntley and Joy Gordon would assist him in making his presentation to the ETC that afternoon. The following faculty members attended the meeting as observers: Rick DeWitt, Vagos Hadjimichael, Laura Nash, David Schmidt, Norm Solomon, and Michael Tucker. After the meeting, Profs. Naser and Huntley emailed copies of PowerPoint presentations they had made, and Prof. Scalese forwarded these to the committee. (Appendices T-V)

On October 30, the ETC met in Executive Session to discuss the Sept. 25 and Oct. 23 meetings. The committee decided to invite representatives from the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs to its next meeting (Appendix W). Prof. Scalese invited SVPAA Fitzgerald on October 31, who replied that he and AVPAA Siegel would attend.

On November 6, the ETC met with SVPAA Fitzgerald and AVPAA Siegel. Afterwards, the committee went into Executive Session and during its discussion, decided to send follow-up questions via email to CIO Francis and Prof. Naser (Appendix X). Between November 8-13, Prof. Scalese exchanged questions and follow-up emails with them. Prof. Naser sent an additional follow-up email on Dec. 1. (Appendices Y-EE)

On November 13, Profs. Rusu and Scalese visited the office of CIO Francis and reviewed copies of the 2009 and 2013 contracts between the university and Axiom Education. The ETC met again that same day to sift through all it had learned. The committee decided to write to the AC again, asking for clarification about how to
proceed with its mandate. (Appendix FF). The same afternoon, Prof. Scalese received an email from COO Kevin Lawlor in support of CIO Francis and ITS (Appendix GG).

Between **November 15-18**, Prof. Scalese exchanged emails with Profs. Rakowitz and Mulvey. Prof. Mulvey sent a memo to the ETC on November 18, suggesting a possible structure for its report (Appendix HH).

On **November 20**, the ETC discussed Prof. Mulvey’s memo and began compiling a timeline of its activities during the fall semester (Appendix II). Due to time constraints, Profs. Jaclyn Conelius and Scalese completed the timeline on **December 2** and forwarded it to the committee (Appendix JJ).

On **December 4**, the ETC met and discussed the timeline. Then it began discussing and assembling the sequence of events that led to the shutdown of Mentor (Appendix KK). Due to time constraints, Profs. Larry Miners and Scalese met on **December 6** to complete this task. Between **December 6-10**, they crafted individual answers to the first 2 points of the AC motion: what led to the shutdown and how the decision was made. After collating their drafts, they decided to recast the 3 points from the AC as follows: 1) what led to the decision and how it was made, 2) why the decision was made, and 3) the appropriateness of the decision. This new draft was forwarded to the committee on **December 10**.

On **December 11**, the ETC met to discuss the draft and the recasting of the 3 points from the AC. The committee agreed to the new points and spent the duration of the meeting discussing the preliminary draft of the report. The committee decided to post the draft on Google Drive so members could continue to make amendments during the holiday recess (Appendix LL).

Subsequent revisions of the report were completed by various members of the committee by **January 24**, after which it was submitted to the voting members for approval. The final draft was approved on **January 29, 2014**.

**Report on the shutdown of Mentor**
#1 What led to the decision and how it was made.

Fairfield University has had a long relationship with Eidos, and then Mentor. Eidos was created in 2001 by Professor Curt Naser and it evolved from a program for tracking General Faculty committee assignments, to a system that included faculty reporting, applications for the Institutional Review Board (IRB), a Course Management System (CMS), and program assessment. As those capabilities were added to Eidos, Prof. Naser was given access to the necessary data in Banner by then-Academic Vice President Orin Grossman and University Registrar, Robert Russo.

Between 2009 and 2010, a number of changes occurred. At the recommendation of then-Senior Vice President Billy Weitzer and AVP Grossman, Prof. Naser formed Axiom Education with two business partners and began the process of bringing Eidos up to industry standards. This involved designing and building a new system, Mentor, to replace Eidos. At that time (2009), a contract was signed between Axiom Education and Fairfield, granting the university several benefits, including free use of the Mentor CMS, royalty payments to Fairfield University, and joint ownership of Mentor’s intellectual property (IP) between Fairfield University and Prof. Naser. That same year, Orin Grossman stepped down as AVP and Paul Fitzgerald took over as Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. Blackboard purchased Angel (the other CMS in use by Fairfield University at the time), and immediately announced its intention to discontinue it. That occasioned a review of two alternative CMS to replace Angel, Blackboard and Moodle. The review was conducted by the Educational Technology Committee (ETC) and Computing and Network Services (CNS), which concluded by endorsing Blackboard. SVPAA Fitzgerald decided to use both Blackboard and Eidos because the latter CMS was being commercialized and several schools had spent years tailoring Eidos for external accreditation purposes as well as internal assessment needs. Michael Graham-Cornell was also hired as director of CNS.

Prof. Naser says that when Mentor was ready to come on-line in 2011, CNS Director Graham-Cornell did not authorize the same data-feed from Banner that had been granted to Eidos by AVP Grossman (and which continued until a few months ago). He was only allowed to use limited data fields from Eidos to feed the necessary data to the Mentor CMS as well as additional services in Mentor such as IRB, student data and course evaluation reporting. SVPAA Fitzgerald says that this was because there were concerns about the level of access Eidos had to Banner, and he asked CNS Director Graham-Cornell to build safeguards to ensure that Mentor only received the data it needed to function as a CMS, as well as for for IRB, assessment and accreditation. According to SVPAA Fitzgerald, CNS Director Graham-Cornell felt that Prof. Naser may have had a conflict of interest regarding Mentor, as both the faculty member who had developed the system and promoted it among the faculty, and as the CEO of the
After being on campus for several months in the fall of 2012, an outside consultant named Patrick Lepore, hired by VPF/CFO Julie Dolan, advised restructuring CNS and hiring a Chief Information Officer (CIO). Lepore’s report eventually led to the hiring of Paige Francis as CIO in January 2013 and the subsequent restructuring of CNS into Information and Technology Services (ITS). Prof. Naser reports that on January 28, 2013, he met with CIO Francis, Vice President for Student Affairs Tom Pellegrino, and CNS Director Graham-Cornell (who soon thereafter resigned his position and left the university). During this meeting, Prof. Naser discussed the suite of features in Mentor and expressed his desire that CNS take charge of pushing data to Mentor directly from Banner so he could shut down the Eidos system. He also claims that toward the end of this meeting, CIO Francis expressed concern that there were two course management systems at Fairfield and indicated a preference for Blackboard.

During the spring of 2013 a number of structural changes were put into place as CNS was reorganized into ITS. The university made plans to assume the administration of Banner, ending a 20-year relationship with SunGard/Ellucian. Some Ellucian employees were hired by the university. CIO Francis also hired Russ Batista and Kurt Schwatzlander, both of whom she knew from her earlier role as IT Director at Arkansas Community College, to direct network services and administer university databases respectively. According to CIO Francis, the primary areas of focus were security and uniformity of university systems.

CIO Francis contacted Prof. Naser on April 1, proposing that the university renegotiate its contract with Axiom Education to a standard Software as a Service (SaaS) agreement. She says that based on her professional experience, outside auditors look favorably upon uniform, standard software agreements and relationships. The new agreement would rework the relationship between Axiom Education and the university from co-owners of Mentor to that of vendor and customer. The university would relinquish its 50% share in the Mentor IP as well as the royalty payments that Fairfield University would be paid by Axiom. Prof. Naser notes that the new agreement also stopped the royalty payments he had been sharing with the university under the 2009 contract, a decision made unilaterally by the university without providing him consultation from the Office of Technology Management. Nevertheless, Prof. Naser’s partners voted in favor of the proposal and the new contract was signed on July 31. ITS formally took control of Mentor on August 1, after which two meetings were held to begin transferring the administration of Mentor from Axiom Education to ITS.

The first meeting, on August 8, was very brief. CIO Francis says that it was scheduled for 90 minutes but lasted only 10 minutes because one of Prof. Naser’s Axiom
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Education co-workers did not show up and he had nothing to show them. Prof. Naser says that it was preliminary and was really an organizational meeting.

A second meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, August 20. (There is some discrepancy between the various accounts as to why there was a nearly 2-week gap between the two meetings.) CIO Francis and ITS administrators say that they expected this meeting would be a comprehensive boot camp tutorial about how Mentor worked, because under the new license agreement, they were now responsible for running Mentor at Fairfield. According to them, this should have included a user’s manual with documentation about Mentor’s system architecture. Prof. Naser reports that during the meeting he demonstrated an overview of the Mentor system for ITS, and he volunteered the assistance of Axiom Education help staff until they were comfortable and able to support the system on their own. He also answered questions about Mentor’s operation from ITS. During this exchange, ITS says that they became increasingly concerned about Mentor’s security because they perceived a lack of expertise in its software architecture; and every set of questions led to even more concerns. But according to Prof. Naser, no one from ITS voiced any concerns about Mentor’s design or its security during this meeting.

CIO Francis and ITS claim that August 20 was the first time they became concerned about possible FERPA violations and security vulnerabilities in the Mentor system. Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs Christine Siegel says that the next day, CIO Francis asked for an immediate meeting with SVPAA Fitzgerald which was scheduled for August 22. During this meeting, she expressed grave concerns about Mentor’s security. This was the same date on which CIO Francis emailed Prof. Naser about several concerns ITS had identified with the Mentor software. (We are not sure which came first -- the meeting with SVPAA Fitzgerald or the emails with Prof. Naser.) These concerns included the ability for faculty and staff to view or access student information -- such as gender, ID numbers, or class schedules -- which CIO Francis felt violated FERPA guidelines. As a result, CIO Francis asked Prof. Naser to remove these data fields in Mentor so faculty or staff would not see this information and only see a much more restricted “need to know” set of data. She asked that these changes be completed by Friday, August 30.

Prof. Naser notes that it is difficult for the programmers at Axiom Education to make changes to the Mentor system within a short time frame -- in this case, in little more than a week. Nevertheless, they made the changes CIO Francis requested within 18 hours, by Friday afternoon, August 23. Because of the weekend, the changes could not be fully deployed until Monday morning, August 26, and Prof. Naser informed the CIO about that. By his account, the changes were fully implemented by 6:00 a.m. on August 26, five days earlier than the deadline. As will be explained below, the CIO and
ITS did not consider the fixes to be sufficient to allay their concerns. At 5:41 p.m. on August 26, CIO Francis sent Prof. Naser an email. She thanked him for his prompt response to the concerns she raised on August 22, but informed him that Fairfield University would not be using the course management portion of Mentor for the upcoming academic year. The next day, on August 27, she and SVPAA Fitzgerald made the decision public with a joint email announcement.

Everyone in the University administration we spoke to confirms that the decision to shutter the Mentor CMS ultimately resided with CIO Francis, that her job description entitled her to make it, and that she had the requisite qualifications to do so. She says that before reaching that decision, she consulted with her ITS administrative team, with Fairfield University leadership, and with the CIOs of other Jesuit colleges and universities, and that she attempted to vet issues with other institutions using the Mentor CMS. (Prof. Naser tells us that one other institution besides Fairfield uses the CMS portion of Mentor. SVPAA Fitzgerald adds that this is the elementary school where Prof. Naser’s children had attended in the past. We do not know the result of the CIO’s efforts to contact this school.) SVPAA Fitzgerald confirms that CIO Francis did consult with him and that he supported her decision, but even if he had not, as CIO she ultimately answered only to the university president, and most probably he would have acceded to her expertise and experience.

Both SVPAA Fitzgerald and CIO Francis acknowledge that they were well-aware their announcement on August 27 was only one week before the start of classes on September 3, and that they realized it would wreak havoc with the faculty. SVPAA Fitzgerald says that is why he insisted the CIO marshal every ITS resource to help faculty to migrate their courses to Blackboard in time. For her part, CIO Francis says that she made the decision to shutter Mentor even though she knew it would result in a huge workload for her staff, and that this lends credence to the urgency she felt was necessary in making it. Nevertheless, she was willing to push them hard because she wanted to mitigate the impact of the Mentor decision on faculty as much as possible.

#2 Why the decision was made.

During our meetings and subsequent communication with the various players in this situation, two competing narratives have emerged as to why the Mentor CMS was shut down. According to CIO Francis and ITS, the reasons primarily had to do with possible FERPA violations in the display of student data, concerns about role-based user access controls, and concerns about ‘data partitioning’. On the other hand, Prof. Naser asserts that CIO Francis was biased against Mentor and restructured the legal relationship between the university and Axiom Education in order to facilitate the eventual discontinuation of the Mentor CMS and its other services. He also claims that
many of the issues cited by ITS about Mentor were actually true of Eidos, and therefore, the decision to shut down Mentor’s CMS was based on misconceptions.

CIO Francis and ITS say that their initial concerns had to do with possible FERPA violations. As described above, CIO Francis was concerned that Mentor displayed students’ gender, ID numbers, and class schedules beyond the appropriate “need to know” for Fairfield faculty and staff. For example, she mentions that faculty could see current students’ full class schedules and even schedules from past semesters, or that with her limited IRB access she could see lists of student ID numbers. According to her, these constituted FERPA violations.

In turn, the FERPA issues led to greater concerns about role-based user access controls and how university data were ‘partitioned’ within the Mentor software architecture so that they would be secure. When they met with us on September 25, ITS said that role-based data access means that users of Mentor should only be able to see student data based on their roles at the university. For example, professors should only be able to see data about their students; chairs should only be able to see data about students with majors belonging to their departments; deans should only be able to see data about students in their schools, etc. ITS said that the problem with role-based access control in Mentor was that in a scenario when users logged in and the system administrator subsequently cut off their access or changed their user roles, the users could continue to access data in their old roles until they logged out.

Another concern ITS mentioned is that Axiom Education failed to provide a user manual or other documentation of the system architecture or database structure when Prof. Naser met with them on August 20. It is not clear if ITS made that expectation known ahead of time, but they say that providing such documentation is standard practice for commercial software vendors to institutional customers.

Lastly, when ITS staff met with selected faculty from the Dolan School of Business and Engineering in late August, the faculty report mentioned that ITS claimed that Mentor ran on outdated hardware. Later in the discussion, it emerged that Eidos, owned by Fairfield University, was what ran on outdated hardware, while Axiom’s Mentor was hosted on servers run by Amazon Web Services. ITS was not sure if any of these servers were located outside the United States. If that were the case, then Fairfield student data might cross U.S. borders, and ITS alleged that this may violate FERPA guidelines.

For his part, Prof. Naser charges that the preference for Blackboard expressed by CIO Francis at their January 2013 meeting was the motivation for her proposal to renegotiate the contract with Axiom Education in April. He was so concerned that the
new contract would become step #1 in the eventual elimination of the Mentor CMS at Fairfield, that he set the price for it and Mentor’s assessment systems to $0.00. Thus, the university could not claim that it could not afford to pay for two CMS. (ITS points out that while this is true, the new contract also stipulated that Fairfield had to purchase the entire suite of Mentor software services to use the CMS, and that cost about $21,000.)

Prof. Naser disagrees with the CIO’s interpretation of the kind of information allowed under FERPA and under which circumstances. He contends that FERPA allows institutions latitude in determining who has access to student data and the extent of that data, and says that Fairfield has never articulated a policy about that. Furthermore, he notes that in late August when the decision was made, Self-Service Banner displayed some of the same information (such as student ID numbers) that had raised flags about Mentor for ITS, and these systems were not shut down.

Regarding the ITS claim about rudimentary access controls in Mentor that allowed users to go anywhere in Mentor and see almost anything, Prof. Naser demonstrated that was not the case. When he met with us on October 23, he gave Prof. Joy Gordon temporary administrator status within Mentor and showed us the pages she could access. Then while she was still logged in, he switched her status back to faculty. The very next page she tried to click on came up empty because she was no longer entitled to access it. CIO Francis and ITS contend that this fix only affects the user interface, that while certain data may no longer be visible on a given page, they still exist beneath the surface within the Mentor system, and would therefore be vulnerable to access by savvy hackers. They say that that was the extent of the fixes Prof. Naser delivered to ITS on August 26 and why they considered them to be insufficient. However, when Prof. Chris Huntley accompanied Prof. Naser to our meeting on October 23, he showed us that the switches in Mentor that manage role-based access are similar to those in open source content management systems, including those used by the White House, suggesting that this functionality indeed conforms to industry and U.S. government standards.

Prof. Huntley also pointed out that software system security is less a matter of programming architecture than it is a back-and-forth process in which customers discover and report problems to vendors so they can be remedied. When asked about this, CIO Francis and SVPAA Fitzgerald say that it is not the responsibility of customers to point out flaws to software vendors or “do their job for them.” On the other hand, anyone with a smartphone knows that app developers regularly issue updates based on customer feedback. Indeed, if software companies did not respond to user complaints, they would not be in business for very long. Furthermore, members of our committee point out that security auditors look for evidence of this back-and-forth
process between customers and vendors -- in this case, that Fairfield regularly informs Axiom about all security concerns it has about Mentor.

As for documentation about database structure or system architecture, Prof. Naser claims that such information is proprietary and is not required under the new 2013 contract. While the data belongs to the university, the database structure and SQL queries belong to Axiom Education.

Regarding the concerns about the locations of Amazon’s servers, Prof. Naser says they are located in Northern Virginia -- not outside the U.S. -- and that that information was readily available if ITS had asked for it.

Prof. Naser also points out that ITS had confused Eidos with Mentor, and many of their allegations were directed against Eidos. Eidos is owned by Fairfield University, while Mentor is owned by Axiom Education. He notes that when ITS met with DSB / Engineering faculty, they stated that Mentor runs on outdated hardware. However, the hardware and software configuration that they specified was that of the Eidos server which belongs to Fairfield University. Mentor runs on state-of-the-art hardware and software provided by Amazon, which is more advanced than the servers that ITS uses. In addition, CIO Francis stated that Mentor was never designed to be a big system; it was a small system that slowly grew over the years. This is a description of Fairfield University’s Eidos system, which grew as deans and chairs asked for functionality to be added. However, Axiom’s Mentor was designed from the ground up using all the functionality in Eidos as requirements guiding the architecture. ITS also stated that Mentor contains sensitive data, but Prof. Naser says that the data they pointed out used to be part of Eidos, not Mentor.

#3 The appropriateness of the decision.

Was the decision to turn off the Mentor CMS appropriate? After months of looking into this question, we still have not been able to determine all the facts. While we believe that CIO Francis and ITS felt real urgency in turning off Mentor’s access to Banner, we are not sure how warranted that urgency was or whether it was necessary to take action before the start of the fall 2013 semester. Moreover, as of this writing, ITS has not demonstrated to us the need to shutter Mentor permanently.

Based on the chronology we have been able to piece together, ITS had less than a month at best -- and a week at worst -- to “look under the hood” at how Mentor operated. We are willing to take CIO Francis at her word when she says that she had no initial concerns about Mentor and was preoccupied during the first half of 2013 with organizing ITS and preparing to take over the running of Banner from Ellucian. Before
August 1, ITS may not have had an opportunity -- or reason -- to focus on Mentor's inner workings because it was being managed by Axiom Education. It is not clear to us whether the ITS staff began looking at Mentor in earnest on August 1 or only after the meeting on August 20. In any case, we find it plausible that they did not have enough time to allay their concerns about the Mentor CMS before the start of school on September 3, and given that, that they felt the need to turn it off.

However, was that urgency warranted and did it necessitate the immediate shuttering of the Mentor CMS?

Prof. Naser tells us that apart from his email communication with CIO Francis on August 22, ITS has not communicated why it ultimately decided to shutter Mentor's access to Banner, nor has it given Axiom Education the opportunity to make things right. Nothing CIO Francis or SVPAA Fitzgerald has told us contradicts this. Furthermore, as of Dec. 16, SVPAA Fitzgerald informed the university community that faculty data in the Mentor CMS will no longer be available after March 30. After months of looking into this matter, we have received no verifiable evidence to warrant this action. Since the university has signed a contract with Axiom Education that includes use of the Mentor CMS, we do not understand why ITS would not work with Axiom to fully address their security concerns and bring it back on-line.

Prof. Naser tells us that depending on the particular issues, the programmers at Axiom Education could address ITS’ concerns about Mentor within a matter of weeks. CIO Francis and ITS suggest that the flaws in Mentor are so grave -- and Axiom Education’s grasp of them so limited -- that the company is not capable of bringing Mentor up to industry standards anytime soon, regardless of what Prof. Naser says. One difficulty we face in evaluating the appropriateness of their decision, however, is that ITS has not been able to verify its allegations, or has chosen not to. On multiple occasions throughout the fall semester, we asked CIO Francis to show us the security problems ITS identified in Mentor. At first, she demurred through the use of architectural metaphors: how can one show that a bridge is about to fall down or a pipe is about to burst? However, the committee notes that engineers have methods to do such verifications, not only with bridges and pipes, but also with software. The matter of verification became more important after Prof. Naser addressed the claims ITS made about weak role-based management in Mentor. When he met with us on October 23, his demonstration with Prof. Gordon appeared to refute what ITS had told us. When we pressed CIO Francis about this in several emails between November 8-13, she replied by stressing her deep qualifications and experience as well as that of her team. Essentially, she said, “You need to trust us,” but did not show us any proof of her allegations.
Everything CIO Francis and ITS say about Mentor’s security vulnerabilities may indeed be true, and while they speak about them with credibility and conviction, their assertions are not as compelling as something we witnessed with our own eyes. Furthermore, another claim ITS made when they met with us on September 25 turned out to be incorrect. CIO Francis and Director of Administrative Computing Russ Battista told us that one incentive for renegotiating the 2009 contract with Axiom Education was to protect the university from liability because it shared ownership of Mentor. However, Prof. Naser claimed that the first contract specifically indemnified the university from legal claims. On November 13, Profs. Amalia Rusu and Mark Scalese had a chance to view the 2009 contract and confirmed that Prof. Naser was correct.

In addition, we have not been able to see any data in Mentor that are so sensitive that they warrant an immediate and permanent shutdown. If ITS’ allegations of insufficient role-based access are true, then one professor would be able to have access in Mentor to another professor’s class and see the class roster, the student’s assignments, and grades the professor has given to those assignments. Members of the ETC have not had this experience in Mentor, and even if they did, they would not be able to see the other professor’s final course grades in my.Fairfield. On the other hand, access to other professors’ courses has actually occurred in Blackboard. Toward the end of the fall semester, some ETC members suddenly had access in Blackboard to courses other than their own -- apparently caused by the recycling of old Course Registration Numbers (CRNs) by the Registrar.

CIO Francis is a sitting member of our committee (as is another member of her ITS team, Jay Rozgonyi). We highly regard her as a colleague and respect her professional expertise. But in an institution dedicated to the pursuit of truth, where testing and verification are among the ways of ascertaining that truth, asking us to believe something based solely on trust is less than persuasive. Even Ronald Reagan, who did not always have a firm grasp of the truth, was famous for saying, “Trust, but verify.”

At the same time, we wish to signal our respect and support for Prof. Naser. Not only is he a faculty colleague, but he developed Eidos and its subsequent Mentor iteration at the request of senior administration and in response to the needs of deans and faculty. While he was compensated for his efforts with stipends and course releases, his Eidos / Mentor work has been regarded as a genuine service to the university. We accept the importance that CIO Francis places on uniform licensing agreements and relationships with IT companies that do business with the university, as well as her expectation that their products conform to recognized industry standards. However, we are concerned that the work Prof. Naser did for the university in good faith has been disregarded and his reputation impugned now without the possibility of remedy.
We are also concerned that the way the university renegotiated the Mentor IP with Prof. Naser established a bad precedent for future IP deals with other faculty. In addition, we are concerned that the work that deans, chairs and faculty did to tailor Eidos for their unique teaching, research, service and assessment purposes -- and then learned to use in Mentor -- has been for naught.

We recognize that given her job description, CIO Francis has the prerogative to shutter Mentor permanently, and we find it regrettable that apparently she has decided to do so. Shared governance at this university has been a delicate balancing act. *De jure*, the Board of Trustees and the administration have the authority to make decisions at Fairfield without the consent of the faculty. But *de facto*, the work of the faculty with students is the lifeblood of the university, and it is in the best interest of the institution that its professors feel valued and respected by those who make decisions that affect them. For those teachers who use them, course management systems are integral to the functioning of their courses, and professors develop personal attachments to them similar to what people can feel toward their computers or cell phones. Before this academic year, half of the faculty who used a CMS on campus preferred Mentor over Blackboard. As far as we are concerned, it is not a closed case that Mentor should be discontinued forever.

Therefore, we recommend that CIO Francis and ITS: 1) honor Fairfield’s contract with Axiom Education, work with it to fix any remaining concerns in Mentor, and restore it to full functionality; or 2) demonstrate the severity of Mentor’s alleged flaws in a transparent and convincing manner that justifies turning it off permanently.

Respectfully submitted,
The Educational Technology Committee

Voting members:
Jaclyn Conelius, Amalia Rusu, Ron Salafia, Mark Scalese, SJ (chair), Stephanie Storms, Vishnu Vinekar, and Tommy Xie
FDEC’s Recommendation for Adopting the IDEA Short Form
1/15/2014

Recommendation
The Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee recommends:

That the IDEA short form be adopted as an option for end-of-semester student course evaluations, and that the following defaults be used in the event that a faculty member does not specifically choose either the “short” or “long” form during the online IDEA evaluation registration process.

- Tenured, full Professors will default to the short form
- Junior faculty (Instructors, Assistants & Associates) will default to the long form
- Adjuncts will default to the short form

Rationale
The rationale for this recommendation is two-fold: (1) Adoption of the short form will provide faculty with the option of selecting an evaluation instrument that may be more appropriate than the long form for particular faculty or particular courses; (2) Adoption of the short form should reduce the amount of time students spend completing end-of-semester evaluations, thus reducing student evaluation fatigue.

(1) Provision of an evaluation instrument better suited for the evaluation needs/goals of particular faculty and/or particular courses: The IDEA long form provides both summative and formative student evaluation data to guide pedagogical improvement and professional growth. But, the formative component may not be necessary or appropriate to administer for all courses. In particular, the long form may not be necessary for instructors with a long record of teaching excellence, or for long-running “tried and true” courses that have not undergone significant changes in the current semester. Additionally, the long form is not appropriate in course contexts where the teaching methods contained in the long form diagnostic instrument do not fit as well (e.g., clinical classes, practicums, labs).

(2) Reduction of student evaluation fatigue: The Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs has expressed a concern with student evaluation fatigue resulting from students having to complete a large number of lengthy evaluation forms at the end of the semester. The primary concern here is that such evaluation fatigue may result in students not taking the evaluations seriously and thus in providing data that may not be useful or informative for evaluative purposes. Adoption of the short form should allow for a reduction
in the time students spend completing evaluations, thus reducing evaluation fatigue.

If this recommendation is accepted, the IDEA Evaluation Registration Website will be modified to include the option of “short” vs. “long” form. Options for online vs. paper and FUSA opt-in vs. opt-out will remain intact. Individual faculty members will always have the option of choosing either the “short” or the “long” form. Because the long form will always be an option for instructors, instructors will always have the ability to choose the long form to gather formative student feedback on a new course, new teaching method, or other significant change in a course, or to provide periodic formative feedback to complement more regularly-gathered summative feedback. Where possible, faculty members may wish to consult with their Department Chairs/Deans to determine which evaluation form is most appropriate in their unique situation.
Excerpted Minutes from FDEC Meetings where Amendment was Discussed

11/18/13 Meeting

**Members present:** Mike Andreychik, Deborah Edelman, Cinthia Gannett, Valeria Martinez, Eileen O’Shea, David Winn

**Guests:** Suzanna Klaf, Tracy Immero, Bill Taylor (SoE)

**Regrets:** Christine Siegel

---

**Suzanna:** Has attended two Conferences with IDEA recently and presented highlights of her discussions with IDEA representatives about the differences between the short and long forms.

*Functions Differ:* Long form is both formative and summative.

Short form is exclusively summative and may be more appropriate for some classes where long form objectives don’t necessarily fit (e.g., labs)

Suzanna also noted that whatever decisions are made about the short vs. long form, it is critical going forward for faculty need to be in conversation about how/why we use the IDEA Forms, when the short vs. long form may be appropriate, etc.

**Tracy:** The SVPAA’s Office has noticed a problem with students not taking the evaluation process seriously. The shorter form may help with this by alleviating some of the “evaluation fatigue” that can stem from having to complete lots of forms at the end of the semester.

**Mike:** But what do we mean when we say students aren’t providing “good” evaluation data? How do we know what a “good” student evaluation is? It’s hard to know whether or not a short form will solve whatever problem we’re seeing if we’re not sure of exactly what the problem is.

**Mike and Others:** FUSA leaders seem to care about these data, so it’s a problem for FUSA as well if students don’t take the process seriously.

What about a much more sustained and substantive discussion at New Student Orientation? Continued in FYE?

Does IDEA have any literature on encouraging student engagement with the evaluation process? Can they create resources?

**David:** More senior faculty seemed to like the older forms better, but younger faculty seem to like the fact that they are customizeable.

**Suzanna and Others** There are larger issues here about the broader culture surrounding evaluation.

**Bill:** School of Engineering had two sets of forms, which was very confusing.
Mike: These are all important issues, but for the purposes of this specific proposal, we need to deal first with the issue of whether or not we feel that faculty should be provided with the option of using the short form.

Many: The short form certainly seems appropriate in certain cases, so it seems sensible to at least offer it as an option.

Mike: We also need to deal with the issue of defaults. If we adopt the short form, what will be the default options? Which faculty will default to short and which to long?

Many: For untenured faculty – they need more formative data.

For full professors?

For adjuncts? Short form?

Mike: Although the proposal from the SVPAA’s office asks for adjunct and full professors to default to the short form I’d be in favor of having everyone default to the long form. Everyone still has the option of selecting the short form, and I worry about sending a message that some people need formative feedback whereas others don’t.

Since we know lots of faculty don’t select options at all, I’d be more worried about people who want the long form information not getting it because they failed to select that option than about people who don’t want the long form getting too much information because they didn’t select the right option.

Tracy: But remember that everyone will still have the option of defaulting to the long form with the current proposal.

Many: Can you adjust the criteria for who defaults to which form when? For example, adjuncts will default to the short form, but not when they’re teaching a new class that, presumably, they’d want formative feedback about.

Tracy: Yes, but it is time consuming and might be tricky in some cases.

Carol Ann: I’m not sure that I agree with the idea of full professors and adjuncts defaulting to the short form either. Can’t we adopt the short form, but make the default the long form for everyone?

Many: What is opt in? Opt out? How might we use these options for the form selection, online vs. paper selection, FUSA questions?

Tracy and Others: Most faculty also default—so they may not be taking the process seriously.

Suzanna, Carol Ann, and Others: Faculty also need a clearer sense of the whole system.

David: Faculty strategize: gaming the system. Some faculty stay in the classroom, pass the forms out and sit with students as they complete the forms.

System is wrong: often students are just chatting and just typing stuff in. Students talk about the teacher and the course together, while they are taking the evaluations.

Sometimes students who are negative can persuade others, just by their utterances to dwell more on negative aspects.
Many: Can any of these problems be addressed by completing the forms online? What other strategies can we consider?

Mike and Others: Do students really do a better job on the evaluations if they’re shorter?

Eileen and Others: Do we really use the evaluation data to rehire faculty (adjuncts) or not?

Many: Many students feel that their comments are not useful. It is up to the individual faculty member to make it clear how functional these responses are.

Cinthia: What about the electronic “like” “not like” culture? Do students use these evaluations simply to make summary judgments?

Many: There is a serious issue of ownership surrounding these data. Because individual faculty own their data, programs and departments can’t access any of the real data without permission? This really needs to be revisited across the institution.

David: Could we do an experiment where we assign some sections of classes to complete the short form and some the long form and compare the data?

Tracy: From a logistics standpoint that would be very difficult.

Mike: That sounds like a study that would require IRB approval, especially since you’re taking away the option of providing feedback to students who might otherwise want to do so.

David: Could faculty try out both forms or modes for themselves if they have multiple sections of the same course? Would you really get commensurate data?

Many: If you introduce short forms will everyone make effective use of them? Will they just use because they are short?

Mike: These are all important issues that we will revisit, but should we move forward on this particular proposal?

Valeria and Others: Let’s move forward.

Mike: It sounds like we have two versions of this proposal to vote on. In both cases, we are voting to accept adoption of the short form. In the first case we are voting to accept the default schedule as written by the SVPAA’s office. In the second case, we are voting to accept a default schedule where all faculty default to the long form. Do I have that correctly?

All: Yes.

Mike: We are now voting on the SVPAA’s language: Adoption of the short form with a default system where untenured and tenured associate professors default to the long form and full professors and adjuncts default to the long form.

Vote: 5 in favor/2 opposed. Option 1 passes. FDEC recommends adoption of the short form with the default schedule proposed by the SVPAA’s office.
To: Academic Council
From: Academic Planning Committee
Date: February 19, 2014
Subject: Proposed Change to Journal of Record on Policy Regarding Courses Taken for College Credit While in High School

The Academic Planning Committee requests that the Academic Council consider the following change to the Journal of Record.

Existing Language (Journal of Record, pp. 36-37):

College Courses in High School:
For students who pursue college courses in their high school, upon receipt of an official college transcript, the course work will be evaluated by the appropriate dean in consultation with the appropriate curriculum area. That dean will determine the appropriateness of the transfer credit for the student’s program and decide whether it has met Fairfield’s curriculum standards. Only courses in which the student received a grade of "C" or higher will be considered. Approved courses with a grade of "C" or higher will be awarded transfer credit. The grades will not be transferred.

AC: 11/02/1992

Proposed Revision (using strikeout/underline):

College Courses in High School:
For students who pursue college courses while in their high school, upon receipt of an official college transcript, the course work will be evaluated by the appropriate dean/director in consultation with the appropriate curriculum area, provided the following criteria are met:

• The course(s) must have been completed in a college environment and must have been taught by a college professor
• The course(s)/credits were not used to satisfy high school graduation requirements
• A final grade of “C” or better was earned.

That dean/director will determine the appropriateness of the transfer credit for the student’s program and decide whether it has met Fairfield’s curriculum standards. Only courses in which the student received a grade of "C" or higher will be considered. Up to 15 credits of approved coursework will be awarded transfer credit. The grades will not be transferred.

Proposed Revision:

College Courses in High School:
For students who pursue college courses while in high school, upon receipt of an official college transcript, the course work will be evaluated by the appropriate dean/director in consultation with the appropriate curriculum area, provided the following criteria are met:

• The course(s) must have been completed in a college environment and must have been taught by a college professor
• The course(s)/credits were not used to satisfy high school graduation requirements
• A final grade of “C” or better was earned.

That dean/director will determine the appropriateness of the transfer credit for the student’s program and decide whether it has met Fairfield’s curriculum standards. A maximum of 15 credits of approved coursework will be awarded transfer credit. The grades will not be transferred.

Rationale for Change:

As part of a comprehensive review of AP Credit and College Credit for courses completed while in high school, a sub-committee of the Academic Planning Committee reviewed and analyzed data on the students who submitted College Courses (CCs) completed through high school partnership/co-op programs for evaluation and the number of courses accepted for the classes of 2014-17 (see Table 1).

Over the past four years, the number of incoming first-year students who submitted CCs increased 69%, while the number of individual courses submitted increased 24%. Additionally, the number of courses accepted for transfer credit increased 52% with the Class of 2016 and 35% with the Class of 2017. The vast majority of courses are taught in the student’s high school by a high school teacher while following the college/university-approved syllabus. The data illustrate the following:
  • There is a consistent increase in the number of students submitting CCs for evaluation.
  • Individual students are each submitting more than one CC for evaluation.
  • There is a general increase in the number CCs being accepted for credit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Year</th>
<th># Students</th>
<th>Individual College Courses Submitted for Evaluation</th>
<th>Courses Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class of 2014</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 2015</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 2016</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class of 2017</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Snapshot of Data by Class Year

The results of a review of 20 peer institutions indicate that our current practice is somewhat consistent with our peer institutions; however, a few issues need to be addressed. First, our peer institutions award credit for college courses completed through high school partnership programs. However, our current policy outlined in the Journal of Record does not specify a limit to the number of credits that can be approved. Second, it appears that our peer institutions award college credit for courses taken while in high school with certain restrictions. Common restrictions include that the courses must be offered through an accredited college or university, that the courses are taught by college professors not by high school teachers, and that the credits associated with the college courses were not also used to fulfill high-school graduation
requirements. Our current policy outlined in the *Journal of Record* does not include all of these restrictions.

The Academic Planning Committee recommends a change to Fairfield University’s policy on college credit for courses taken while in high school in order to limit the number of these credits that can be approved and to increase the restrictions on the type of credits that can be submitted for consideration. These two changes, if accepted, would place our policy at Fairfield University in line with policies at our peer institutions including Boston College, Fordham, Loyola Maryland, Providence, and Villanova.