ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, April 28, 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
      i. Minutes of Meeting on April 7, 2014 (attached)
   b. Correspondence
   c. Oral Reports
      i. Dates for summer AC (emergency) meetings: May 21 and July 31

4. Council Subcommittee Reports - (Reports from (d) and (g) 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) - attachments
   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 NTT faculty (AC 9/9/13)

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

6. Old Business
   a. JoR language for Council-approved default options for IDEA evaluations (attachment)
   b. Response from Academic Planning Committee to AC action taken 4/7/14 on credit for courses taken in high school (attachment)

7. New business
   a. Revisions to the Spring 2015 calendar from AC Calendar Review Committee (attachment)
   b. Program Review of the MA in Communication (materials distributed with the 4/7/2014 AC packet)
   c. Dissolution of the 3-2 program in Engineering (attachments)
   d. Proposal for a B.A. in Environmental Studies (separately stapled)
   e. Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees - report on March meeting, prepare for June
   f. Discussion of AC three-year Review of Merit Appeals Policy (due fall 2013; Pending Item F)
   g. Re-evaluation of offering both paper and online options for IDEA forms and re-evaluation of continued use of “yellow sheet” qualitative evaluations (Pending Items C and D)
   h. Journal of Record language from Faculty Salary Committee re standard merit (material to follow)
• Lists of Attachments, Pending, and Ongoing Items are on page 2

List of Attachments:
For item 3.a. Draft minutes of 4/7/2014 AC meeting (pages 3-9)
For item 4.d. Report from AC Subcommittee on maternity leave policy (pages 10-11) Additional material from the AC Executive Committee (page 12)
For item 4.g. Report from AC Subcommittee to consider a Faculty Handbook committee on contingent faculty (material will be sent by email if available before the meeting)
For item 6.a. Memo from ACEC with language suitable for JoR re IDEA defaults (page 13)
For item 6.b. Memo from Academic Planning Committee dated 4/23/2014 RE Proposed change to JoR on policy regarding courses taken for credit in high school (pages 14-16)
For item 7.a. Proposed revisions to the spring 2015 academic calendar for the AC Calendar Review SC (pages 17-18)
For item 7.b. Documents related to the Five year review of M.A. in Communication are in the 4/7/204
AC packet: Five Year Review (pages 45-52); Budget Info (page 53); Excerpts from minutes of meetings – Communication Department 12/6/2013, A&S Curriculum Committee 12/10/2013, EPC 2/20/2014 (pages 54-56)
For item 7.c. SOE Curriculum Committee Meeting 4/3/2014 minutes (page 19); Excerpt of UCC minutes 4/1/2014 (pages 19-20); EPC minutes 4/17/2014 (page 20-22)
For item 7.d. Materials are separately stapled
For item 7.h. Memo from Faculty Salary Committee re standard merit will be sent by email

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, once one or more have been adjudicated, 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.
Academic Council Meeting
Monday, April 7, 2014
CNS 200

Members Present: Professors Joe Dennin, David Downie, Donald Greenberg, Shannon Harding, James He, Chris Huntley, Ginny Kelly, Alison Kris, Nikki Lee Wingate, Irene Mulvey (Executive Secretary), Elizabeth Petrino, Shawn Rafalski (Chair), Susan Rakowitz (Secretary of the General Faculty), L. Kraig Steffen, Stephanie Storms, John Thiel, Jo Yarrington

Administrators: Deans Lynn Babington, Bruce Berdanier, Robbin Crabtree, Don Gibson

Regrets: SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, S.J.

Invited Presenters: Shah Etemad, Bill Taylor, David Sapp, Heather Petraglia

1. Presidential Courtesy
None

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty
Professor Rakowitz provided an update on the search for the new SVPAA. It is anticipated that finalist interviews will be shorter this semester. She noted that she reiterated that it is important for candidates to meet with AC.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary

Professor Mulvey presented the minutes from February 10, 2014

   **MOTION to approve as corrected (Mulvey/Steffen)**
   **MOTION PASSED 13 -1-1**

Professor Mulvey presented the minutes from March 3, 2014

   **MOTION to approve the minutes as corrected (Mulvey/He)**
   **MOTION PASSED 12- 0-1**

Prof. Mulvey presented the communication from Faculty Secretary to EVP Lawlor and the response to the Faculty Secretary from the President. Prof. Mulvey presented the correspondence from Prof. Michael Tucker. She noted that the Council could choose to move Prof. Tucker's memo on to the agenda. The Chair then asked for questions or motions. There were none.

4. Council Subcommittee Reports
Prof. Mulvey suggested that we move directly to item 7 on the agenda, new business, as there are several items pending. Moved without objection.

7. New Business
7a. Prof. Rakowitz reported on the slate of candidates presented for the Committee on Committees, which must be approved by the AC per the Faculty Handbook.

   MOTION (Greenberg/ Dennin)
   Approve the slate of candidates submitted by the Committee on Committees
   MOTION PASSED: 14-0-0

7b. Presentation for a Bachelor of Science Degree program in Bioengineering.

The case for the program was presented by Professors Etemad and Taylor.

Professor Harding asked why the program does not include an Introduction to Bioengineering course. Professor Etemad responded that there is an introductory course that includes all aspects of engineering, including bioengineering. Dean Berdanier also mentioned that some aspects of bioengineering are currently covered in courses under other titles.

Professor Harding asked if there are plans to develop an Introduction to Bioengineering course. Professor Etemad noted that there will be some additional courses that will be added to the curriculum with a focus specifically on Bioengineering. In the Fundamentals of Engineering course, introductory topics of Bioengineering are covered.

Professor Steffen noted that this program will not be resource neutral. It will require additional resources in the Chemistry department. Professor Steffen asked what resources will be required for this coming fall. He also noted that he may not have the resources to be able to support the program. In addition, he feels that he may not have the physical space to deliver lab experiences to these students. Professor Etemad noted that he does not believe that it will be a large program initially. Professor Taylor noted that they have budgeted 1/5 of their budget to go towards expanded chemistry space. Professor Steffen stated that he also felt that their existing resources are already stretched too thin. One possible solution would be to have Saturday labs, however he believes he currently does not have the resources to deliver a Saturday lab safely. There needs to be a staff person in addition to the faculty member teaching the lab. Professor Taylor noted that it is also in the budget to have instructor support for the chemistry lab.

Professor Dennin asked to clarify the student numbers, “Is it 10 total, or 10 per year?” Professor Taylor noted that it is 10 per class, so 40 total. Professor Dennin asked if these are new students or transfers within the program. It was noted that these are not necessarily “new” students per se – but students who are already here on campus who choose Bioengineering as opposed to some other major. Dean Crabtree noted that the College of Arts and Sciences has a declining proportion of total students upon admission, but there is stability among graduates. There is a shift in the proportion of students from CAS to the professional schools. Dean Crabtree noted that the mix of students will change, but the total numbers will not.

Professor Huntley asked if the program might represent a shift among current engineering students, or will the School of Engineering see a net increase in students? Professor Thiel asked how the Deans of other programs might respond to the needs of more students. Dean Babington noted that all of the Deans from all of the programs are completely committed to providing the support needed to help provide the resources needed to support new programs. Dean Berdanier noted that they are working on troubleshooting the space needs. Dean Babington noted that that
if the administration chooses to shift the admissions to, for example, admit 100 students instead of 60, they are aware that the resources need to be in place to support that decision. Dean Crabtree noted that there is a reluctance to invest in personnel at this time. She noted that there is a possibility of a Saturday lab. Professor Yarrington noted that VPA is very interested in digital imaging. She noted that there is a possibility for future discussion. Professor Dennin asked if the students were asked about how they felt about the possibility of Saturday labs. He has trouble believing that students would want to sign up for such labs, and asked if there may be implications for student retention. Professor Dennin also noted that with the loss of Dean Beal, the School of Engineering faculty is down to one faculty member in some areas of engineering. He asked if there are plans to hire new faculty. Professor Etemad noted that there will be an increase of two faculty members, and there are plans within the next two years to add some additional faculty as well as plans for the addition of adjunct faculty.

Professor Greenberg stated that it would be irresponsible for us to approve a program without a guarantee of administrative resources.

Professor Dennin asked on what evidence it was believed that there would be 10 students interested in this program. It was asked whether there has been any survey of the potential students to determine the interest of the students in this program. Professor Etemad noted that during open houses, potential students frequently ask about the possibility of such a program. Professor Taylor also noted that nationally, there is growth in interest in Bioengineering, as well as an increase in Bioengineering majors.

**MOTION (Thiel/Yarrington)**

*Approve the Proposal for a Bachelor of Science Degree program in Bioengineering*

Professor Harding spoke against the motion. She reiterated her concern about the courses offered in the program. She noted that there are no current courses titled as Bioengineering courses and highlighted that this is in contrast to several of our competitor universities.

Professor Dennin spoke against the motion. He felt that there has not been enough research or evidence of interest in such a program. He wanted some evidence in how other competitor programs are doing. Are they growing or shrinking? He noted that although he has faith in the Dean’s promises of resources, he feels that there needs to be a greater assurance of resources to be directed towards the program from higher up in the administration.

Professor Yarrington asked if there is a reason that this needs to be done this year.

Professor Steffen noted that there is some real value in the program. Although he appreciates the nods of support provided by the deans, he would like greater evidence of budgetary support from the administration. He feels conflicted. What happens if we approve the program and the resources do not materialize?

Professor Petrino noted that this represents an opportunity to move more women into engineering.
Professor Huntley noted that there is a lot of potential in this program. He feels that it fits well within the mission of the University. He shared his feelings about the concern over resources, especially since there is some ambiguity in the numbers.

Dean Berdanier acknowledged that there are a lot of issues which have been brought up. He stated that this is the way that undergraduate Bioengineering programs are often written. He noted that as students begin to specialize in a particular aspect of engineering during their junior and senior year, they will have the opportunity to take more specialized Biomedical Bioengineering courses. Professor Berdanier indicated that there is broad interest in this program at open houses. He noted that he is aware of the need for additional chemistry lab space, however he stated that he is committed to solving the issues surrounding the chemistry lab. He also noted that there has not been a rush to institutionalize this program, as it has been under development for several years now.

Professor Downie spoke in favor of the motion.

Professor Greenberg asked if it is possible to amend the motion to include a statement about the inclusion of resources.

**MOTION (Greenberg/Steffen)**
To amend the Proposal for a Bachelor of Science Degree program in Bioengineering to include a statement that the administration will provide sufficient resources required to support the program.

Professor Downie spoke against the motion to amend citing the fact that there is no way to adjudicate such an amendment.

**MOTION FAILED 5-9-1**

**MOTION (Thiel/Yarrington)**
To approve the Bachelor of Science Degree program in Bioengineering  
**MOTION PASSED 9-5-1**

Professor Mulvey suggested that we can move to the next item, but allow Professor Andreychik to speak when he arrives, even if we are in the middle of discussion. He teaches until 4:40, and as a result, it has been difficult for him to attend.

**Item 7c**
Academic Planning Committee proposed revision to JOR regarding college courses taken in high school.

Professor Sapp proposed a change to the current language in the journal of record. Ms. Petraglia noted that the trend seen from the academic planning committee was toward increasing numbers of students, as well as a higher number of total courses requested for college credit. Our current policy is not clear in the number of credits we will accept, nor in the type of courses that we will...
accept. They consulted with the admissions department and they verbalized agreement with the policy we are reviewing.

Professor Downie asked about courses taken online. Ms. Petraglia noted that there has not yet been a request for consideration for an online course. Professor Sapp stated that this is, however, addressed by bullet 1 on their report.

Professor Dennin stated that he took exception to the fact that courses considered for college credit are required to be taught by college professors. He feels that high school teachers may be well qualified to teach these courses. He also noted that we use high school teachers here at Fairfield.

Professor He asked for clarification about the final wording about the number of credits accepted. Professor Sapp responded that the current policy does not specify a total number. They would like there to be a 15 credit maximum.

Professor Dennin asked if the 15 credits would include AP courses. Professor Sapp responded that schools tend to choose either the college credit route or the AP route and not both. He does not expect this to be an issue.

**MOTION (Mulvey/Harding)**

To approve the Academic Planning Committee’s proposed revision to the Journal of Record as stated:

- 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.

Professor Dennin spoke against the motion. He expressed concern about the language requiring a college professor.

Professor Kelly spoke against the motion. She felt that if we have high school teachers teaching college courses here on campus, then it is not consistent to reject courses taught by high school teachers outside the University.
Professor Kelly also expressed concern about the “C or better” requirement. She wondered if we should set the bar higher. Professor Rakowitz noted that “C or better” is the standard for transfer credit.

Professor Mulvey spoke in favor of the motion. She noted that this is better than what we have currently in place.

**MOTION TO AMEND (Thiel/Downie)**

*Strike: “and must have been taught by a college professor”*  
*Replace with: “And must have been taught by someone who possesses the credentials and skills of a college professor”*

Professor Greenberg noted that this is impossible to adjudicate.

Professor Thiel noted that we commonly make this judgment when an adjunct is hired.

Professor Mulvey felt that this should go back to the Academic Planning Committee.

Professor He asked for clarification about what the final language of the motion will be.

**MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION (Greenberg/Mulvey)**  
**MOTION FAILED 2-8-5**

**MOTION (Mulvey/Greenberg)**  
Send the document back to the Academic Planning Committee for further revision  
**MOTION PASSED 13-0-1**

7d. Recommendation from FDEC for Adopting the IDEA short form.

Professor Andreychick presented the report from the FDEC. The report recommends that tenured full professors and adjuncts default to the IDEA short form. Everyone else defaults to long form.

Professor He asked what the differences were between the short and the long form.  
Professor Andreychick noted that the long forms provide formative evaluations allow for additional feedback to junior faculty. This would include items like the provision of feedback to students.

**MOTION (Kelly/ Steffen)**  
Tenured full professors and adjuncts will default to the IDEA short form.  
Instructors, Assistant Professors and Associate Professors will default to the long form.
Professor Harding spoke in favor of the motion. She noted that when she was on the evaluation committee this was always the intention of the IDEA form.

Professor He spoke in favor of the motion, noting that there can be issues of burnout and evaluation fatigue.

Professor Dennin also spoke in favor of the motion.

Professor Mulvey clarified that anyone can use the short form. It may default to one or the other but professors can still choose which form they prefer.

**MOTION PASSED 13-0-1**

7e. Proposal of the transfer of the administration of the computer science program from CAS to SOE

**MOTION (Greenberg/Dennin)**
Administration of the CS program will transfer from the CAS to the SOE.

Professor Mulvey felt that it is odd that the students in the school of engineering will be taking the CAS core. Professor Steffen clarified that the current students would, in fact, be grandfathered in.

**MOTION PASSED: 11-0-1**

Professor Mulvey moves kudos to Chair Rafalski for getting us through the full agenda so expediently.

**MOTION to adjourn (Dennin/Downie)**
MOTION PASSED unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 4:49 PM

Respectfully submitted,
Alison Kris
The AC appointed subcommittee on Maternity Leave Policy came up with a two recommendations that we feel might clarify the current policy with regard to responsibilities in duties and reporting, as well as a third recommendation for AC consideration.

Recommendations

1. include the word ‘service’ along with teaching in the description of what faculty are afforded (duties to be relieved of) during maternity leave, so there isn't any confusion as to what they are and aren't supposed to be doing on campus while 'on' maternity leave. The idea is that the research trajectory of a full time faculty is likely to continue to progress naturally over this time and in most cases can't really be controlled by anyone but the faculty member themselves, but we can, at a minimum, relieve a new mother of classroom and meeting/service obligations during the leave.

We recommend the AC entry of 04/27/1992 in the 2013 JOR on Faculty Maternity Policy that reads:

"Faculty members whose maternity disability leave occurs at a time during the semester that would interfere significantly with their teaching (normally considered to be a period of absence of three or more weeks) shall be released by the appropriate Dean from teaching responsibilities for the semester. During that time, full pay and benefits will be continued. Faculty will be expected to work on projects and to fulfill other responsibilities congruent with their role at the expiration of their maternity leave."

be changed to read:

"Faculty members whose maternity disability leave occurs at a time during the semester that would interfere significantly with their teaching (normally considered to be a period of absence of three or more weeks) shall be released by the appropriate Dean from teaching **and service** responsibilities for the semester. During that time, full pay and benefits will be continued. Faculty will be expected to work on projects and to fulfill other responsibilities congruent with their role at the expiration of their maternity leave."

Also the wording in the 13-14 BPO that reads:

"Fairfield University complies with all Federal and Connecticut State laws relating to pregnancy and leaves of absence for childbirth and adoption. In lieu of unpaid time off for pregnancy and childbirth outlined in the Family and Medical Leave Acts (FMLA), a faculty member may elect to take one semester of paid maternity leave from teaching responsibilities.

The specific semester of teaching release must be determined in consultation with the faculty member’s department chair and dean. In accordance with the Pregnancy Disability Leave Act, the normal recovery period following vaginal childbirth is presumed to be six weeks; following a caesarean section the normal recovery period is presumed to be eight weeks. Outside of the recovery period, faculty on maternity leave will be expected to fulfill their other academic responsibilities, again as determined in consultation with the faculty member’s chair and dean.”

be changed to read:

"Fairfield University complies with all Federal and Connecticut State laws relating to pregnancy and leaves of absence for childbirth and adoption. In lieu of unpaid time off for pregnancy and childbirth outlined in the Family and Medical Leave Acts (FMLA), a faculty member may elect to take one semester of paid maternity leave from teaching **and service** responsibilities.

The specific semester of teaching **and service** release must be determined in consultation with the faculty member’s department chair and dean. In accordance with the Pregnancy Disability Leave Act, the normal recovery period following vaginal childbirth is presumed to be six weeks; following a caesarean
section the normal recovery period is presumed to be eight weeks. Outside of the recovery period, faculty on maternity leave will be expected to fulfill their other academic responsibilities, again as determined in consultation with the faculty member’s chair and dean."

2. include wording on when a faculty member is to notify the appropriate administrator (SVPAA) as to whether or not they want to stop their tenure clock on account of their leave. Suggested wording for insertion in the 11th edition of the Faculty Handbook, 2013:

"3. Tenure
…
c. Other Matters
(1) The normal maximum probationary period shall be …
(2) Time spent on leave from Fairfield University will not …
(3) A pre-tenure faculty member who has been approved for a maternity leave may request, after having returned after the end of the leave, that her tenure clock be stopped for that academic year. This request shall be made in writing within six weeks of the start of the subsequent academic term, to the SVPAA, with a copy sent to the faculty member’s department chair and dean."
(4) A candidate may be required to spend up to …"

3. consider extending this benefit to fathers in the form of a paternity leave. This would likely include additional minor changes to all three documents; changing the reference in the JOR to “Faculty Maternity/Paternity Policy” and so forth, and the BPO. Further, it would require changing the suggested added language in the Faculty Handbook on tenure above to include ‘paternity leave’ references. The committee acknowledges that the BPO “Dependent Care” leave options of reduced load (with make-up teaching) or reduced pay are offered for fathers of infants or young children, but we find this policy to be gender biased and not equal to that which is afforded new mothers.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Behre
Ryan Drake
Paul Fitzgerald, SVPAA
Dina Franceschi, Chair
MEMORANDUM
Academic Council Executive Committee
Fairfield University

TO: Academic Council
FROM: AC Executive Committee
DATE: April 22, 2014
RE: Further considerations on Maternity Leave language

The report from the AC Subcommittee on Maternity Leave policy was in the packet for the 4/7/2014 meeting but not taken up at that meeting. Following that meeting, Prof. Thiel suggested alternative language for one of the Subcommittee’s recommendations and the AC Executive Committee considered the alternative language along with all the recommendations in the report. Our suggestions, beyond what is already in the report, are as follows:

(I) Everything in the 4/27/1992 JoR entry is repeated in the Faculty Handbook. The AC Executive Committee recommends deleting the redundant entry in the JoR.

(II) The AC Executive Committee, with thanks to Prof. Thiel, suggests the following language for the Faculty Handbook:

c. Other Matters
(1) The normal maximum probationary period shall be...
(2) Time spent on leave from Fairfield University will not ...
(3) **Upon return from an approved maternity leave, an untenured faculty member may choose that the time of her probationary period toward tenure not include the academic year in which the maternity leave was taken.** This declaration will be made in writing to the SVPAA by the 15th of October subsequent to a spring maternity leave or the 1st of March subsequent to a fall maternity leave. The faculty member will send copies of this letter to her department chair and Dean.
(4) A candidate may be required to spend up to …”
MEMORANDUM
Academic Council Executive Committee
Fairfield University

TO: Academic Council
FROM: AC Executive Committee
DATE: April 22, 2014
RE: JoR language for Council-approved IDEA defaults

At a meeting on April 7, 2014, the Council discussed default options for IDEA teaching evaluations brought forward by the Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee and approved the FDEC recommendations. The AC Executive Committee drafted language appropriate for the Journal of Record (shown below) to explain the recommendations. The language needs to be approved by the Council. The revised language is shown in bold and underlined; no text is being deleted.

Student Evaluation of Teaching:
Every faculty member in every class shall administer the IDEA teaching evaluation form. All faculty have the option of using the long form or the short form. For individuals who do not specify which form they wish to use in a class, tenured Full Professors and part-time faculty will default to the short form and all other faculty members will default to the long form.

The On Campus Coordinator for IDEA (OCC) shall be a non-faculty employee appointed by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs who reports to the SVPAA. The OCC is responsible for coordinating the administration of the IDEA teaching evaluations, for receiving all data from IDEA, for overseeing the storage of the data and for distribution of Diagnostic Reports to individual faculty members. The OCC is the only person authorized to receive data from IDEA. Individual teaching evaluation data belong to the individual faculty member. The OCC will have access to the data but may not release individual faculty data to anyone except the individual faculty member without the faculty member’s written permission. Aggregate data can be made available to faculty and administrators provided that data for individual faculty members cannot be identified. Each fall, the Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee shall appoint the FDEC chair and an elected FDEC member from a different school to be liaisons to the OCC for that year.

GF: 03/17/1981
AC: 5/25/2010
AC 5/2/2011
AC 4/28/2014
To: Academic Council
From: Academic Planning Committee
Date: April 23, 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 reconsider the following change to the Journal of Record. If the proposed policy is rejected, Academic Planning requests that the Academic Council approve the existing policy with a specified 15 credit maximum.

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. A maximum of 15 credits of approved coursework will be awarded transfer credit.

Approved courses with a grade of "C" or higher will be awarded transfer credit. The grades will not be transferred.
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.

The Academic Planning Committee requests that the Academic Council consider the following information addressing the concerns raised at the April 7th, 2014 meeting:

- Academic Planning, specifically the Office of Academic Support and Retention, will implement the policy the Academic Council approves. In order to do this effectively and efficiently during the months of July/August, when guidance counselors and Fairfield University department chairs are not readily available for consultation, we respectfully request a clearly articulated policy that allows for a decision to be made based on the submitted documentation including the University transcript and the HS Profile (outlining graduation requirements). The documentation does not include the credentials/training/certification of the teachers.

- Transcripts from 46 different colleges/universities were submitted for review by members of the Class of 2017 representing community colleges, state universities, and 4 year private institutions.
  - 115 students submitted transcripts
    - 20 students submitted UCONN transcripts
    - 19 students submitted Syracuse transcripts
    - 6 students submitted LIU transcripts
    - 70 additional transcripts

- While UCONN, LIU and Syracuse are the more commonly seen HS Partnership Programs, there are no stated criteria for training and/or certification programs. There is inconsistency and ambiguity across the various high school programs and even across the disciplines within the same program.
• The proposed policy prose ‘in a college environment and must have been taught by a college professor’ addresses the concern of online course requests that may arise in future years and is consistent with several institutions.

  o Peer institutions requiring courses be ‘taught by a college professor’ include but are not limited to Fordham, Boston College, Loyola Maryland, Providence, Villanova, Babson, and Trinity.

• While Fairfield University departments hire high school teachers as adjuncts, these teachers are vetted by the department, mentored by Fairfield University faculty, and follow Fairfield University syllabi.

• The trend that we are seeing with Fairfield University’s current policy is an increase in first year students (having only completed coursework in their high schools) coming to Fairfield University with core requirements completed, e.g., 2 semesters of social science, 2 semesters of mathematics including calculus, 2 semesters of intermediate language, HI10 and/or HI 200 level. The trend also illustrates an increase in the disciplines being submitted for evaluation including upper division courses at Fairfield, e.g., entrepreneurship, marketing, criminology.
Dear Shannon, Christine and Bob,

Can we agree to the calendar which now has us opening on January 20, restores Holy Thursday as an undergraduate class day, restores President’s day as a holiday and restores the administrative Monday for the day after President’s day?

The other option would be to not allow Turbos on Monday and eliminate the administrative Monday for the day after President’s day.

The attached calendar reflects these changes but does not include the Administrative Monday.

I prefer the second option.

Both of these are with the understanding that very early in September, if not sooner we will address the calendar for 2015-2016.

Mary Frances Malone
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

From: <Harding>, Shannon Harding <sharding@fairfield.edu>
Date: Tuesday, April 15, 2014 9:36 PM
Subject: Re: spring 2015 calendar Very Time Sensitive Please Read

Dear Mary Frances,

If I read the attached calendar right, it's missing both Holy Thursday and including the Administrative Monday.

I like the first option (no Holy Thursday; Adding President's Day with the Administrative Monday) better. This means:

12 Mondays
13 Tuesdays
14 Wednesdays
14 Thursdays
12 Fridays

That's fairly close. The MTh courses meet 26 times; TF 25. It's hard to extend the classes to Friday (elections for GF meetings; and that would push exams to Mother's Day!). The other calendar has only 11 Monday class meeting times. This could be a problem for science labs and turbos. The graduate
calendar (with the Adminstrative Monday; otherwise unchanged) has

13 Mondays (no Easter Monday)
13 Tuesdays
14 Wednesdays
13 Thursdays
12 Fridays

Faculty could always have the option to cancel the Administrative Tuesday if it was an issue?

Shannon

Dear Executive Members of the Academic Council,

There have been a couple of modifications to the Academic calendar for Spring 2015. This was in response to complaints from parents about returning to school mid-week (before MLK Day).

I responded quickly because it was time sensitive. Please review. The suggested changes include:

- Starting after MLK Day (on a Tuesday). This allows for a full month of winter break.
- Ending on a Thursday (which will allow for GF elections on Friday: the first reading day)
- Three reading days: Friday, Sunday, and Wednesday
- Class on Holy Thursday (as we have done this semester)
- No classes on President’s Day; and an Academic Monday on the Tuesday following that day.

The class meeting times are a bit short (26 classes for MTh; 25 for TF), but beyond that, things look okay.

Please let us know ASAP if you have any concerns.

Best,
Shannon
TO: Bruce Berdanier, SOE Dean  
FROM: Bill Taylor, Associate Dean  
DATE: 3 April 2014  
RE: Results of the School of Engineering Undergraduate Curriculum meeting on Tuesday, March 25th at 10:00 AM in the SOE Conference Room (BNW167A).

The meeting was called by Associate Dean Taylor who was unable to attend the meeting due to a sudden illness. Others who were unable to attend expressed their wishes by email. The results are tabulated herein:

Resolution #1
Should the School of Engineering discontinue the 3/2 BA programs?  
Yes: 3  No: 3  Abstain: 1 – three members recommended keeping the program with Columbia

Resolution #2
Should the School of Engineering discontinue the Automated manufacturing Engineering BS program?  
Yes: 6  No: 0  Abstain: 1

Respectfully submitted,  
Bill Taylor  
Associate Dean

______________________________

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Minutes  
Meeting of April 1, 2014  
(School of Engineering Items only)

Present:  
Kathy Nantz (Chair), Margaret McClure, John Miecznikowski, Johana Garvey, Bruce Bradford, Ahmed Ebrahim, Anita Fernandez, Aaron Perkus, Vincent Rosivach, Shah Etemad, Shannon, Reckinger, Chris Staecker, Douglas Peduti, Rajsaree Rajamma, Sally Gerard, Sarah Woods (student proxy for Hope Agresta), Glenn Sauer (recording secretary), Bruce Berdanier (invited guest), Steve Sawin (invited guest).

5. Elimination of 3-2 Engineering Options.

a. Dean Berdanier stated that this program is listed in the catalog and goes back many years, pre-dating our School of Engineering. The idea was that students could begin at Fairfield and receive an accredited engineering degree from another university as well as a Bachelor of Arts from Fairfield. There were 4 participating undergraduate programs. This program is no longer beneficial to students. For example, UConn only says they will use their customary procedure in evaluating Fairfield students. Students could do this without the 3-2 plan. RPI has not updated the program in 20 years. The only benefit to Fairfield students is that RPI will transfer credit back to
Fairfield so they can also receive a Fairfield BA. Columbia has a detailed agreement with many liberal arts schools and is the only one that has been recently updated and still functioning. 8 current students are in the 3-2 program; 3 have applied to Columbia in the fall. They will either be accepted or transfer into another engineering program at Fairfield or transfer to another university; 1 freshmen student is transferring out of the 3-2 program at Fairfield into Mechanical Engineering; 3 students will be applying to Columbia next spring leaving 1 active student in the 3-2 program. Dean Berdanier is proposing to allow all current students to finish but not admit any more. He concluded that these programs may have made sense 30 years ago before Fairfield had an engineering program, but not anymore.

b. MOTION: The UCC approves the elimination of the 3-2 program starting with the incoming fall class (Class of 2018). Moved by Prof. Reckinger, seconded by Prof. Sauer. Prof. Reckinger added that there are currently 8 in the program with one transferring out but there could be more that are currently undecided. She is in favor of this motion since having this program in the catalog is very confusing to incoming students and Fairfield now has its own accredited programs. Assoc. Dean Perkus questioned whether this was within UCC purview since these seem to be articulation agreements that should be entirely up to the School of Engineering. Prof. Rosivach stated this is a specific program with specific requirements so it is under UCC purview. Prof. Etemad spoke in favor of the motion saying that it will help the School of Engineering retain some good students, there is already low enrollment in the 3-2 program, and the administration of the program is complicated. In addition, if a Fairfield student is not accepted into the destination school it becomes very problematic. Prof. Staecker spoke in favor of the motion stating that he does not want to see a situation where a student who wanted to go to Columbia but couldn’t get in, could come to Fairfield to gain “back door” entry to Columbia. Dean Berdanier added that Fairfield is now in a position where we could work with liberal arts schools and community colleges for students to complete engineering degrees at Fairfield. The motion PASSED unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Glenn Sauer

Educational Planning Committee Minutes
Draft Minutes

April 17, 2014, 3:30-5:00pm
CNS 8
Present: Peter Bayers, Angela Biselli, SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, Cinthia Gannett, Cathy Giapponi, Olivia Harriott, Evagelia Bilias Lolis, Nancy Manister, Mark Scalese, Qin Zhang

Regrets: Dean Lynn Babington, Dean Robbin Crabtree

II. Consideration of the School of Engineering's Proposed Dissolution of the 3/2 Program

Dean Berdanier provided an overview of the 3/2 program. The program started in the 1970’s before we had an engineering program at Fairfield. It is a five year program in which students spend the first three years at Fairfield University and finish two more years at one of the four participating universities (Columbia, UCONN, RPI, and Stevens). Upon completion of the program, students receive a BA from Fairfield University and BS in engineering from the other university. Since we now have an accredited engineering program at Fairfield, Dean Berdanier believes that the 3/2 program is no longer beneficial to the students or the University. Rather than earning two bachelor degrees, students can earn a bachelor and master degree in the same five year period. Many engineering jobs now require a MS degree in engineering. Of the four participating universities, Columbia is the only program to which our students are applying. UCONN does not recognize the program and does not accept our students. There are currently three students in the program who have applied to enter Columbia in the fall 2014, and three students who are planning to apply to enter Columbia in the fall 2015. After this, there will be no more students in the program.

Prof. Bayers noted that, although the UCC approved the proposal unanimously, the School of Engineering Curriculum Committee voted 3-3. He asked whether there was a tie-breaker. Dean Berdanier responded that he broke the tie, adding that three professors voted to maintain the program because they like the Columbia program.

Prof. Bayers asked about the ideal timetable. Dean Berdanier replied that he’d like to see a decision made prior to the publication of the next catalog. If not, he will honor a commitment to students who enter under the current 3/2 program as it would appear in the fall 2014 catalog.

Prof. Scalese asked whether the move to a paperless catalog would impact this deadline. Can we change it later? SVPAA Fitzgerald responded that the catalog would be saved in PDF and would not go through substantive changes more than once a year. He noted that the academic programs and academic requirements contained in the catalog should be honored.

Prof. Bayers was curious as to whether there is a governance rule regarding the tie-breaking vote. Dean Berdanier said that there is no rule that he is aware with respect to SOE voting. He remarked that he does not believe there was strong opposition from the faculty because the program is not good for the students or the university.

Prof. Giapponi thanked Dean Berdanier for his presentation and he left the meeting.

SVPAA Fitzgerald moved to phase out the 3/2 bachelor's program in the School of Engineering. Prof. Scalese seconded. Prof. Giapponi made a friendly amendment to the motion. The amended
motion is: to phase out the 3/2 bachelor's program in School of Engineering beginning with the Class of 2018.

SVPAA Fitzgerald spoke in favor of the motion. The 3/2 program makes us look bad because students come to Fairfield’s Engineering School then go to another University’s Engineering program. The 3/2 program made sense before we had our own engineering program at Fairfield. Five years ago we decided to keep our engineering program and it has grown. We hired more faculty and offer the five year masters degree. Last year we had 42 international applications, but there were over 400 applications this year.

Prof. Bayers said that he wanted to understand EPC’s role in laying out how to break a tie. He felt a little uncomfortable, although it makes sense, that a dean broke a tie. He wondered whether it should be a concern for us, especially given the importance of faculty voice. Prof. Giapponi agreed with the concern and responded that she was not aware of any precedent for this type of situation and would look into it. SVPAA Fitzgerald commented that EPC could vote on the 3/2 program as an educational program decision.

Prof. Harriott asked whether all engineering programs offer a BS. SVPAA Fitzgerald replied yes.

Prof. Gannett stated that with the routing procedure, the issue had gone to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) and the UCC unanimously approved a motion to eliminate the 3/2 program beginning with the incoming class of 2018. So the EPC would be backtracking to the School of Engineering decision, second guessing the UCC’s decision. She also noted that there was School of Engineering faculty in the UCC meeting who spoke in favor of the decision.

Prof. Giapponi noted that more complete minutes from the SOE would have helped in our discussion.

SVPAA Fitzgerald remarked that the 3-3 vote was neither for it nor against it. The UCC has voted for it and Dean Berdanier supports it. He emphasized the small number of students; it is such a marginal program.

Prof. Bayers said that his concerns are about the process not the elimination of the 3/2 program. He spoke in favor of the motion. Based on Dean Berdanier’s presentation, the 3/2 bachelors’ program does not make sense. But in the future SOE should provide more detailed minutes.

Prof. Giapponi indicated that if there are no governance procedures to deal with a tie vote in a School, the development of such procedures would eliminate this confusion. Prof. Scalese added that we should make sure that detailed minutes are sent to Academic Council after we approve it.

The motion was approved unanimously. Respectfully Submitted: Qin Zhang