ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, April 7, 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 February 10, 2014 (attached)
      ii. Minutes of Meeting on March 3, 2014 (attached)
   b. Correspondence
      i. Memo Faculty Secretary to EVP Lawlor dated 3/16/2014 re GF response to the discontinuation of the Mentor course management system (attached)
      ii. Memo President to Faculty Secretary dated 3/18/2014 re response to the discontinuation of the Mentor course management system (attached)
      iii. Memo Prof. Tucker to Academic Council dated 3/29/2014 re Mentor shutdown (attached)
   c. Oral Reports

4. Council Subcommittee Reports - (Report from (d) 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) - attachment
   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

7. New business
   a. Approval of ballot for election of Committee on Committee (info will be handed out at meeting)
   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. Academic Planning Committee proposed revision to JoR re college courses taken in high school (attachment)
   d. Recommendation from FDEC on adopting the IDEA short form (attachment)
   e. Proposal to transfer administration of Computer Science program from CAS to SOE (attachments)
      Note: UCC approved the proposal at its meeting on 4/1/2014 but minutes are not yet available.
   f. Program Review of the MA in Communication (attachments)
   g. Discussion of AC three-year Review of Merit Appeals Policy (due fall 2013; Pending Item F)

* Lists of Attachments, Pending, and Ongoing Items are on page 2

List of Attachments:
For item 3.a.i. Minutes of meeting on 2/10/2014 (pages 3-8)
For item 3.a.ii. Minutes of meeting on 3/3/2014 (pages 9-17)
For item 3.b.i. Memo GFS to EVP dated 3/16/2014 (pages 18-19)
For item 3.b.ii. Memo President to GFS dated 3/18/2014 (page 20)
For item 3.b.iii. Memo Prof. Tucker to AC dated 3/29/2014 (page 21)
For item 4.d. Report from AS Subcommittee on maternity leave policy (pages 22-23)
For item 7.c. Proposal for JoR revision from Academic Planning Committee (pages 24-25)
For item 7.d. Recommendation for FDEC re IDEA short form (pages 26-29)
For item 7.e. Documents related to transfer of CS program from CAS to SOE: Proposal (page 30); Questions for EPC answered by SOE Dean (pages 31-34); Implementation plan (page 35); Excerpt of EPC minutes 2/20/2014 (pages 36-37); EPC minutes of prior years submitted by SOE Dean (pages 37-44)
Note: UCC approved the proposal at its meeting on 4/1/2014 but minutes are not yet available.

For item 7.f. Documents related to the Five year review of M.A. in Communication: 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)

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 11/1/11)
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.
Chair Rafalski called the meeting to order at 3:35 PM.

1. Presidential Courtesy
SVPAA Fitzgerald reported on the applicant pool for the next year. There were almost 10,000 applicants so far, with a good mix among schools. He also reported on progress made in attracting international students. There were 64 new international graduate students arriving this January, and fully 14% of the graduate student population now is made up of international students, up from 5% five years ago.

The post graduation report for 2013 is now available. With 75% of all new graduates reporting, 98% report that they are fully employed in good jobs or in graduate school. SVPAA has asked that Fairfield University prepare a similar post-commencement outcomes report for graduate students.

Finally, SVPAA Fitzgerald commented on the recent class cancellations due to weather conditions. The SVPAA’s office was not consulted prior to the announcements.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty
Prof. Rakowitz reported that the SVPAA search has been restarted, with semifinalist interviews penciled in for late March.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
Prof. Mulvey presented the minutes from December 2, December 9, December 12, January 15, and January 27 for approval.

   "MOTION to approve all as corrected (Mulvey/Petrino)"
   "MOTION PASSED 16-0-0."

Prof. Mulvey also reported that the AC’s nomination of Prof. Yohuru Williams to the Strategic Planning Steering Committee was accepted by President Von Arx.
4e. Report from the Subcommittee to Review Hiring Practices

Prof. Paul Lakeland summarized the subcommittee recommendations, which included four primary changes to the current hiring policy:

- Separate faculty and staff hiring policies. There should be a separate document covering staff hires.
- Make a clearer distinction between Jesuits hired through targeted “enhancement” searches (that do not factor into departmental faculty line allocations) and Jesuit hires made through the normal hiring process.
- Change the language regarding dean’s participation in search process so that it better reflects current practice.
- A reordering of the events in the standardized search plan so that authorization precedes search plan.

Prof. Thiel expressed concerns about the policy allowing the outside members of the search committees to vote. While it was right that they be consulted, the actual vote should come from members of the department making the hire.

SVPAA Fitzgerald said that this was not a change from the current policy. He argued that the voting rules were an internal matter for the search committees to work out for themselves.

Prof. Dennin noted that there appeared to be redundant paragraphs in the policy. SVPAA indicated that they were not that way in the original report. Prof. Mulvey suggested that the document be corrected as requested and apologized if she had inadvertently introduced changes in the difficult process of getting a “track-changes” document into the packet. She also suggested taking out the language about the Clery report from advertisements. SVPAA noted that the Clery language was required to be posted in a public location but agreed that it did not belong in advertisements.

Prof. Harding noted that a staff member was mentioned by name instead of by title in the draft policy. SVPAA Fitzgerald agreed that that should be corrected.

Prof. Thiel reiterated his concerns about outside members voting on hiring decisions. He noted that people serve in this capacity not because they expect a vote but because they want to serve. Prof. Greenberg countered that the distinction is immaterial: speaking for or against a candidate may have just as much effect as a vote. Prof. Thiel then noted that the actual vote is a concrete process.

Prof. Mulvey referred to the section about “courtesy” appointments, objecting to the concept of a “courtesy” appointment since it is not in our Handbook or in any other document. Dean Babington noted that her school had a special appointment where the hire was paid for by another corporation, which should then have a say in the hiring process. SVPAA Fitzgerald then recounted several examples of courtesy hires, including several administrators with teaching responsibilities. Prof. Mulvey remarked that each of the administrators in question was given full faculty status through a process in the Faculty Handbook and that calling anything a “courtesy” appointment is dismissive of regular appointments and argued that the relevant sentence be removed.

**MOTION (Thiel/Dennin)**

Strike the language about voting rights for outside members: Outside members should participate extensively in the selection process, including the final deliberations on the candidate.
James He spoke in favor of the motion, suggesting that it gives the committee more flexibility to work with outside members.

**MOTION PASSED 16-0-0.**

**MOTION (Mulvey/He)**
Amend the document to strike the language on courtesy appointments.
**MOTION PASSED 15-0-0.**

Prof. Nguyen inquired about the need for the section on Jesuit hires. SVPAA responded that the candidate has to submit to the same hiring process as any other faculty candidate. Prof. Dennin said that the list of prospective Jesuit candidates comes from an outside process anyway, so there is no need to cover this case explicitly in the policy.

**MOTION (Mulvey/Greenberg)**
Strike the section about Jesuit hires.

SVPAA Fitzgerald spoke against the motion, saying that the current wording reflects existing practice.

Prof. Dennin spoke in favor, saying that the policy should instead be more descriptive of what we actually do, which is to treat the Jesuit like any other hire. Prof. Kelly agreed with Prof. Dennin. Prof. Lee-Wingate suggested that perhaps it could be covered separately in a special section.

**MOTION PASSED 13-0-3.**

**MOTION (Dennin/Mulvey)**
Remove the redundant second bullet (from page 30 of the agenda packet).
**MOTION PASSED 16-0-0.**

**MOTION (Rakowitz/Steffen)**
Remove the Clery language from advertisements.
**MOTION PASSED 16-0-0.**

**MOTION (Fitzgerald/Kelly)**
Add in the following: Jesuits may be recruited through a noncompetitive search that otherwise follows standard hiring practices.

Prof. Greenberg spoke against the motion. It would have no effect since the Jesuits can hire whomever they like.

Prof. He also spoke against. The change seems stronger than the original language.

Prof. Kris spoke in favor, saying that the fact the search is noncompetitive was relevant.

Prof. Thiel suggested amending the motion to read “targeted search” instead of “noncompetitive search.”
MOTION TO AMEND (Steffen/Thiel)
Replace “targeted” with “noncompetitive”.

Prof. Rakowitz asked if this wasn’t about “enhancement” positions, which is the term that Prof. Lakeland used when discussing the report.

Dean Crabtree argued that every faculty line was an enhancement: why include a line that has no budgetary force?

SVPAA Fitzgerald said he might take that into account when discussing search with departments.

MOTION TO AMEND PASSED.
MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED 13-2-1.

Prof. Thiel questioned the requirement (on page 29 of the packet) that a written questionnaire or rubric be used to assess potential teaching effectiveness. Prof. Greenberg said that it forced departments to consider student opinion. Dean Crabtree agreed, saying that with actual data there was less possibility of the chair skewing the discussion with anecdotal comments.

MOTION (Dennin/Kris)
Accept the document as amended.
MOTION PASSED 16-0-0.

5. Petition for Immediate Hearing

MOTION (Huntley/Kris)
Given the need for timely consideration of the ETC report by Academic Council, I submit a Petition for Immediate Hearing to place the ETC Report as the next item to be discussed on the current Academic Council agenda (Monday, Feb 10).

Prof. Rakowitz asked if the petition mattered given the shutdown date of Mentor. Can the shutdown date be delayed if the AC were to recommend that at its March meeting? SVPAA Fitzgerald responded that nothing can happen until the date in March.

Prof. Kelly spoke in favor of the motion.

Prof. Greenberg spoke against, saying he did not see the urgency. Prof. Kris responded that it affected the functioning of the Institutional Review Board, which had spent several years working with Curt Naser and Axiom Education to get the system up and running. She did not want to have to repeat the process with another system.

Prof. Lee-Wingate spoke in favor, saying that she wanted to make sure she could retrieve all her files before the shutdown.

Prof. Thiel spoke against the motion, saying that delaying the discussion of the ETC report two weeks would not make any difference.
Prof. He spoke in favor. He said that while we can get assessment data from the system, it would take time to get it into the right format. Having the summer to work this out would seem more prudent.

Prof. Greenberg said that he did believe that the administration would shut down the system if people still needed the data.

Prof. Steffen agreed with Prof. Thiel that we did not need to invoke an immediate hearing. He also asked if the Academic Council could get a formal statement on the shutdown date. SVPAA Fitzgerald responded that the decision is made by the CIO. However, he would defend the faculty’s access to data. Further, an IRB solution was in progress but was not yet completed.

Prof. Dennin asked if the ETC report could be the first agenda item at the next meeting. That way we’d be sure it gets discussed.

Prof. Huntley asked whether waiting until the March meeting would prevent the issue from getting on the agenda of the March 14 General Faculty Meeting. Prof. Rakowitz replied that there should be plenty of time for that.

Prof. Thiel called the question, with a second from Prof. Rakowitz.

MOTION FAILED 7-9-0.

Chair Rafalski confirmed that the ETC report would be on the agenda for the March 3 meeting.

7b. Proposal for Five-year BS/MS program in Mechanical Engineering

Prof. Shah Etemad and Professor Bill Taylor presented the proposed program. They argued that i) an MS degree is becoming required for employment; ii) our competition is also offering a 5-year MS; and that iii) mechanical engineering enrollments are strong enough to support the program. They then discussed the curriculum changes that would be required to implement the program.

Prof. Rakowitz asked what the difference was between a 5-year program and the (non-accelerated) 6-year BS/MS sequence. Prof. Etemad answered that the 5-year program would require 2 fewer courses. Prof. Mulvey asked if that meant that the overlapping courses would apply to both degrees. Prof. Etemad said that they would.

Prof. Steffen asked whether we had the resources for the new program. Prof. Etemad said that the plan was resource neutral, with any additional resources contingent on program growth.

Prof. Storms asked about housing and funding for the fifth year students. Prof. Etemad said that the number of students could initially be fewer than 10 and the program would still be viable.

Prof. Harding asked about what happens if the enrollments are more than 10. Is the SoE planning to cap enrollments? Prof. Etemad said that most of the students were already here as part-time masters students and that the program would just allow them to graduate sooner.

Prof. Harding then asked if current students had been surveyed regarding their interest in the program.
Prof. Etemad replied that 18 of 19 graduating seniors approved of the program. Dean Berdanier said that 5-year programs tend to grow to about 30% of graduating seniors, meaning that we could expect about 7 students per year at current undergraduate cohort sizes.

Prof. Dennin asked how many students qualify by GPA for the proposed program. Prof. Etemad said that of the 19-20 current juniors, about 30% meet the required 3.2 GPA requirement.

Prof. Dennin also expressed concern about faculty without PhD degrees teaching graduate courses. Dean Berdanier replied that he would add a full-time faculty line and that, further, masters students complete the same coursework as PhDs in engineering.

Prof. Dennin noted that there was no mention of the size of competing programs at other schools. Prof. Etemad responded that the changes were more for curriculum requirements than for adding to the student pool.

Prof. Dennin asked about schools without a similar 5-year masters program. Are they not still competitors? Prof. Etemad said that graduates of these schools represent our market for growing the master program. However, they are not competitors because they do not offer a competing program.

SVPAA Fitzgerald remarked that this program would add a few more students to otherwise empty seats. There would be no net effect on the number of classes or required FTEs. It would also give international students more opportunities. The result would be more revenue without any additional cost. The effect would be similar to undergraduates in CAS moving on to the masters program at GSEAP.

Prof. Steffen asked about the 3/2 program with other universities. Dean Berdanier said that that program still exists and that it generally involves students who want to study an engineering discipline that we do not offer.

**MOTION (Kris/He)**  
Move to accept the program.  
**MOTION PASSED 9-0-3.**

The meeting adjourned at 5:15pm.
Academic Council Meeting  
Monday, March 3, 2014  
CNS 200  

MINUTES OF MEETING  

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; SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, SJ  

Guest: Mark Scalese, SJ  

Observers: Professors Steve Bayne, Rick DeWitt Joy Gordon, Phil Lane, Dawn Massey, Curt Naser  

Chair Rafalski called the meeting to order at 3:32 PM.  

1. Presidential Courtesy  

SVPA Fitzgerald reported that he would be proposing a new committee (University Assessment Committee). He will include a rationale and detailed description, including the need and proposed composition, as a correspondence item on the next AC agenda.  

Professor Thiel asked for clarification on who is proposing the committee and SVPAA Fitzgerald responded that it is he and Associate VP for Academic Affairs, Christine Siegel.  

SVPA Fitzgerald announced that Dean Berdanier has been communicating with Professor Mulvey (Executive Secretary of the AC) regarding moving the Computer Science program from the department of Mathematics and Computer Science to the Software Engineering department in the School of Engineering, specifically under Software Engineering. SVPA Fitzgerald reported that this move is time-sensitive and requested that the AC take this up sooner rather than later.  

Professor Rakowitz questioned why the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) had not vetted this change.  

Professor Downie asked what the temporal urgency related to.  

SVPA Fitzgerald reported that this was primarily related to issues of advising.  

Professor Mulvey pointed out that this item was not on the current agenda and that the conversation appeared to be out of order.  

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty  

Professor Rakowitz reported that the search for a new SVPA is proceeding, but there were no new developments to report.
3. **Report from the Executive Secretary**

Professor Mulvey reported that there were no draft minutes to review from our previous meeting and had nothing else to report.

4. **Council Subcommittee Reports**

None.

5. **Petition for Immediate Hearing**

   **MOTION** (Fitzgerald/Dennin): *Add a discussion of moving the Computer Science program to the School of Engineering to the current AC agenda.*

Professor Downie suggested that we wait until next month to discuss this item, given the full agenda we were considering at this meeting.

   **MOTION FAILED:** 2-11-3

6. **Old Business**

   **Report from the Education Technology Committee (ETC):** Presented by Professor Mark Scalese

Chair Rafalski acknowledged on behalf of the executive committee the work of the ETC since September. He also requested that the body acknowledge and respect the expertise of our colleagues and engage in cordial discussion. Chair Rafalski recognized that we had guests at the meeting and reminded the council that speaking privileges must be granted in order for these individuals to participate in discussions. He requested that the body hold off on a motion to grant such privileges until the report was given and the council had an opportunity to deliberate.

Professor Scalese reported that the submitted report was thorough and included interviews with representatives from all involved parties. He stated that he felt that the report spoke for itself.

Ultimately the ETC concluded that CIO Paige Francis did not adequately make a case for shutting down Mentor, and this impacted the manner in which the report was written. The ETC was unable to ascertain the precise nature of “the security issues”; they were only told that they existed. Professor Scalese reported that numerous opportunities were provided to all constituencies to submit evidence of concerns. The ETC concluded that there was not sufficient evidence of justification to shut down mentor.

Professor Greenberg asked, in reference to a recommendation in the report, “to whom should this decision be justified?” He suggested that it was justified to the SVPAA by the CIO. Professor Greenberg suggested that the role of the AC is to assess the process and/or procedural issues, not to evaluate the substance of such a decision.

Professor Scalese reiterated the charge provided to the ETC by the AC. This included reporting on (1) what led to the decision, (2) how the decision was made and (3) the appropriateness of the decision (to shut down Mentor).

Professor Kris asked if the ETC was ultimately recommending that Mentor be turned back on.
Professor Scalese responded no. The ETC concluded that the university should work with Axiom to investigate potential issues with the reinstatement of Mentor that may need to be remedied.

Professor Kris asked if this had been done.

Professor Scalese said no.

Dean Babington asked if the ETC was recommending that both Blackboard and Mentor be available for use by the university community.

Professor Scalese said yes.

Professor Thiel suggested that the final report was fair. However, he questioned the notion presented within the report that Professor Naser’s reputation had been “impugned” in this process. Professor Thiel’s interpretation was that Professor Naser’s work was criticized. He suggested that, as scholars, we are all subject to criticism. He stated that CIO Francis judged that there were programmatic issues with Mentor, and that this was not meant to impugn Professor Naser personally.

Professor Scalese responded by stating that the ETC felt empathy for Professor Naser and wanted to show their support of his work.

Professor Thiel acknowledged that he understood this sentiment but felt that making the accusation that Professor Naser’s reputation had been impugned was excessive.

Professor Dennin asked if the ETC was recommending that both of these programs (Mentor and Blackboard) be available. In his reading of the report he concluded that the ETC was suggesting that either we reinstate Mentor or we need to conclude that the issues associated with it are insurmountable.

Professor Scalese felt that this was an accurate conclusion to draw.

Professor Mulvey suggested that the group was discussing issues not covered within the ETC report (e.g., Blackboard). The fundamental finding by the ETC was the recommendation that evidence be provided for the permanent shut down of Mentor, or Mentor should be reinstated.

Professor Kris stated that it seemed that the ETC provided CIO Francis with the opportunity to provide evidence supporting her allegations, and she did not comply with this request.

Professor Storms stated that this was the case. Solid evidence was not provided.

Professor Greenberg recognized that CIO Francis has the prerogative to make these determinations (to shut down information systems). While we might find her decision regrettable, he asserted that the report's conclusions were incompatible with the text of the report.

Professor He disagreed, stating that the ETC was charged with three tasks that included an assessment of the final decision.

Professor Huntley acknowledged the weekly ETC meetings for several months, as well as the writing of the extensive report and asked if there was any expectation that this issue might go back to the ETC.
Professor Scalese said no.

Professor Mulvey acknowledged the ETC’s work on a very difficult issue. She asked if the ETC had been contacted by CIO Francis prior to the decision to shut down Mentor.

Professor Scalese stated that the ETC reached out to CIO Francis earlier in the summer and was told that there were no plans for changing anything.

Professor Storms reported that there was “some talk” earlier in the summer about imminent changes. However, the ETC had no prior specific knowledge of the decision to shut down Mentor.

Professor Rakowitz asked for clarification. She wanted to confirm that the ETC was not making any suggestions regarding whether Mentor should be retained in the long term. They were simply investigating the emergent nature and reasoning for shutting down Mentor in the manner in which it was done. Professor Scalese confirmed.

Professor Downie asked if there were any other issues raised, such as, was the institution concerned with having multiple systems available or were there legal issues raised? When CIO Francis announced the security flaw, did she express legal concerns regarding turning it back on?

Professor Lee-Wingate asked for clarification, wanting to confirm her understanding that the original agreement between the university and Axiom included free access to Mentor for Fairfield University as well as a share in royalties for the university. The subsequent agreement did not include free access for Fairfield University or shared royalties, and in fact the university agreed to pay for the use of Mentor.

Professor Scalese acknowledged this change in the agreement between Axiom and the university and stated that his understanding was that this was an agreement negotiated between the vendor and a school.

Professor Steffen asked for clarification of the AC’s role. He acknowledged that there were no individuals present who could represent CIO Francis’ stance on the issues discussed.

Chair Rafalski stated that the AC was free to do anything with the information.

MOTION (Huntley/He) (3-part):

A. That presentation of the ETC report, by the ETC, be put as a priority item on the agenda of the 3/14/14 GF meeting.

B. In light of the ETC Report, the Academic Council calls for the administration to immediately and fully reinstate Mentor.

C. The Academic Council instructs the Conference Committee with the Board of Trustees to immediately forward the ETC Report, and the recent faculty letter with signatures, to the entire Board of Trustees.

Professor Rafalski excused Professor Scalese and thanked him for his report.

MOTION (Mulvey/Downie) to divide the motion on the table into 3 motions.
MOTION PASSES: 16-0-0

Motion A:
MOTION (Huntley/HE) that the presentation of the ETC report, by the ETC, be put as a priority item on the agenda of the 3/14/14/GF meeting.

Discussion of MOTION A:

Professor Rakowitz stated that she felt it made sense to present the ETC report to the General Faculty.

Professor Mulvey concurred and added that she would suggest that the AC’s conclusions be presented to the general faculty as well.

MOTION (Fitzgerald/Dennin) to postpone consideration of this motion (A) until we discuss motions B and C.
MOTION PASSED.

MOTION (B) (Huntley/He): In light of the ETC Report, the Academic Council calls for the administration to immediately and fully reinstate Mentor.

Discussion of MOTION B:

Professor Greenberg spoke against this motion. While he is sympathetic that individuals would like to continue to use Mentor, there is an appropriate body (CIO Francis who garnered support from SVPAA Fitzgerald) that maintains the authority to make the decisions made. He further stated that he feels that the AC should concern itself with assessing the process, not evaluating the specific issues raised. He stated that it appeared that the CIO acted in good faith, and that she has the right to make the decisions she made – and in fact she consulted with other administrators prior to making her decision. Professor Greenberg stated that he does not believe that the issue itself is within the purview of the council.

Professor Huntley stated “even individuals with authority make mistakes, and that they need to be held accountable.” He felt that we were not questioning anyone’s role. However, he argued that it is the role of the AC to “complain” when something happens that might negatively impact the faculty. He is uncomfortable with the notion of agreeing to every decision made by every person in authority.

SVPAA suggested that the ETC did not in fact state that CIO Francis made a “bad decision”. He further explained that while he was consulted on this decision, he did not play a part in its final disposition. CIO Francis reports to Kevin Lawler, not to SVPAA Fitzgerald. SVPAA Fitzgerald felt that his role was to garner assurances that the academic unit of the university would not be negatively impacted by any decision reached.

Professor He stated that it seemed that the decision to shut down Mentor was made very quickly. In addition, he reiterated that the ETC had been assured that such a decision would not be made until they were consulted. His primary concern was regarding the negative consequences of the shutdown, particularly that many faculty members were negatively affected.

Professor Thiel agreed with Professor He that there were procedural issues associated with the shutdown of Mentor. However, the motion on the table was concerned with substance, not procedure. He felt that
if we vote in favor of the motion on the table, we are essentially concluding that CIO Francis lacked sufficient competence to make the decision she made. Professor Thiel felt that while we might be able to conclude that she didn’t explain her reasoning well, concluding that she is unable to make a proper decision is extreme.

Professor Downie spoke against the motion as it currently stands, as the consequences of supporting such a motion could result in the conclusion that CIO Francis was not competent to do her job. He suggested that we continue to discuss the process, prior to addressing the substance of the decision.

Professor Greenberg stated that we do not currently have a procedure regarding what we should do when a “bad decision” is made.

Professor Kris suggested that we are not suggesting that CIO Francis is incompetent. She was a new employee, unfamiliar with our model of shared governance. Reinstating Mentor might allow her to retrace her steps and reevaluate her decision. It would give her the opportunity to process the decision through proper channels. Faculty members should have input. She spoke in favor of the motion.

Professor Dennin spoke against the motion stating that we have a committee that spent a semester on the development of a thorough report. We should be supporting their recommendations. He suggested that the AC propose that either evidence is presented supporting the shutdown of Mentor or the system is reinstated.

Professor Lee-Wingate agreed that the AC should concern itself with the procedure followed in the shutdown of Mentor. She stated that the process did not include notification to the ETC or the AC and should, therefore, not be supported by the AC. However, she felt that the main issue is that there is data stored on Mentor that is vital to many faculty members and this data will soon be deleted.

SVPAA Fitzgerald spoke against the motion for reasons that had been previously voiced. He reiterated that he did speak in favor of the faculty, but that a decision had to be made very quickly.

Professor Huntley suggested that, at a minimum, the AC support a delay in the deletion of data on the Mentor system. He stated that we had very recently received an email stating that all data will be deleted shortly and suggested that we provide some assurance that this will not occur while this issue is in discussion.

Professor Greenberg wondered if there might be a legal issue to consider. He suggested that the AC is not in a position to make the judgment that we are not in legal jeopardy.

SVPAA Fitzgerald said that he wanted to make sure that any data is protected. He will support a request to not delete data.

Professor Yarrington expressed 2 concerns. First is to acknowledge that she is in agreement that the AC should make assurances that no data will disappear. The second is that she is unsure regarding the suggestion that there might be a security breach associated with Mentor. While she wants to believe Professor Naser, there were no opposing voices present to clarify this issue.

Professor Huntley, speaking in favor of the motion, reminded the AC that Mentor was in fact inspected nightly for security issues. MacAfee reviewed the system every night and never discovered a security breach. He stated that we do not need to trust Dr. Naser regarding this particular issue, as a third party
has been assuring privacy. Additionally, he pointed out that we have continued to use Mentor for our campus-wide IRB process. He suggested that we put the security issue to rest.

Professor Lee-Wingate added that we also have very competent experts on the ETC committee and suggested that we trust these colleagues. The report did not substantiate any security breaches associated with Mentor.

**MOTION (Greenberg) to call the question.**
**MOTION FAILS: 6-10-0**

**MOTION (Kris/He) to postpose the current motion until we vote on giving speaking privileges to the guests in attendance.**
**MOTION PASSES: 11-5-0**

**MOTION (Kris/He) to allow the guests speaking privileges.**

Professor Rakowitz spoke against the motion suggesting that it might be unfair to allow this subset of individuals to speak when we do not have any representatives to argue the opposing view.

Professor Thiel suggested that we allow the guests speaking privileges, but limit the time allocated to speakers.

Professor Mulvey voiced her concern that there were no representatives present who could speak for CIO Francis.

Professor He spoke in favor of the motion, as these colleagues came to the meeting with the intent of speaking. He supported setting time limits, but felt that we should respect our colleagues who attended by allowing them to voice their concerns.

**MOTION (Thiel) to call the question.**
**MOTION PASSES: 11-3-3**

**MOTION (Kris/He) to allow the guests speaking privileges.**
**MOTION PASSES: 11-3-2**

Professor Naser explained that if a scholar were to submit an article and was accused of plagiarism, they would expect this claim to be substantiated. The issue under discussion began with CIO Francis making a public charge that there was a security breach associated with Mentor. Professor Naser took this as a very serious allegation. CIO Francis was then asked to provide evidence that this claim was in fact true. According to the ETC report, she did not supply this evidence and simply stated, “this is my job, and this is my judgment”. She was given numerous opportunities to provide evidence of her claim to the ETC and failed to do so. Professor Naser suggested that this was grossly irresponsible and that she failed in her duties.

Professor Gordon stated that, having attended the ETC meetings where these issues were discussed with the parties involved, the CIO did not provide evidence of her claims related to security breaches associated with Mentor. However, Professor Naser did provide evidence that security breaches did not exist within the Mentor system. She stated that CIO Francis made the claim that when she logs onto the IRB page, she can “see everything”. Dr. Naser then demonstrated that this was not accurate. CIO Francis
also suggested that it was possible that the Mentor servers could be located in a foreign country, which puts the data on those servers at risk. However, she never asked Professor Naser where the servers were located, and in fact they were in Virginia. Professor Gordon then asked Professor Storms if she was interpreting the ETC report correctly.

Professor Storms reported that everything that the ETC discovered in its investigation was in the report and that Professor Gordon’s interpretations were correct.

Professor Massey spoke specifically to the issues that were related to the partitioning of data on the Mentor system. She stated that, in her administrative role, she needs access to certain student data. She had been using Mentor to access this data up until November of 2013, when she was no longer able to use Mentor and began accessing this data using Banner. Dr. Massey reported that when she used Mentor to access data, she received only those class rosters associated with the accounting classes for which she had oversight. When she asked for the same data from the Banner system, she was assigned a Dean’s CRN, allowing her to now view ALL rosters across campus. In addition, when she was using Mentor to access the data she needed to perform her administrative duties, she received only the data necessary. Now, using Banner, she receives data on every student in DSB, including data that she should perhaps not have access to. She therefore expressed her confusion regarding the issue of role-based access. She felt that this is an issue more clearly present in her use of the Banner system.

Professor Naser pointed out that this was in fact true and that a different standard seemed to be applied to different data management systems. He questioned why this was the case.

MOTION (Huntley/Thiel) to call the question.  
MOTION PASSES: 12-2-2

MOTION B (Huntley/He) Fails: 7-9-1

MOTION (Mulvey/Dennin) to postpone motion C until later in the meeting.  
MOTION PASSES: 14-2-0

MOTION (Huntley/Dennin): The AC’s position is that all data in Mentor should be retained until the issues raised in the ETC report are resolved.

Professor Kris noted the IRB is using Mentor and wants to continue using Mentor.

SVPAA Fitzgerald expressed concern with the vagueness of the time element, saying that people may not agree on whether or not the issues raised in the report have been resolved.

MOTION PASSES: 13-0-3

MOTION (Greenberg/Downie) that before any major technology decision affecting academics is made by the administration, the Educational Technologies Committee should be consulted and given time to review the decision and receive faculty input. The only exception to this policy would be if delay of the decision would place the university at increased legal exposure.  
MOTION PASSES: 16-0-0
MOTION (Dennin/Petrino): The AC accepts the report of the ETC.

Prof. Mulvey spoke against the motion, saying she did not know what it meant. The implications of this motion passing are not clear.

MOTION TO AMEND (He/Downie): Replace the word accept with endorse.
MOTION to amend PASSES: 10-6-0

MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED: The AC endorses the report of the ETC.

DISCUSSION OF THE AMENDED MOTION:

Professor Greenberg spoke against the motion, saying the AC did not endorse the report, and it would give the General Faculty the wrong impression if this motion were to pass.

Professor Mulvey spoke against the motion, saying again that she did not know what the implications of passing this motion would be. In particular, as Professor Greenberg stated at the beginning of the meeting, the ETC report does not specify to whom the CIO should demonstrate flaws in Mentor. She suggested that the first recommendation in the ETC report would be inconsistent with something already passed by the Council.

Professor Downie (and others) pointed out that the recommendation in the report is very different than what the AC passed.

MOTION FAILED: 7-8-1

MOTION (Huntley/Downie) to take Motion C off the table.
MOTION FAILED: 2-14-0

MOTION (Greenberg/Dennin) to adjourn.
MOTION PASSED: 9-3-1

Meeting adjourned at 5:25 PM

Respectfully submitted,
Ginny Kelly
Date: March 16, 2014
To: Kevin Lawlor, Executive Vice President
From: Susan Rakowitz, Secretary of the General Faculty
Re: General Faculty response to the discontinuation of the Mentor course management system
cc: Paige Francis, Chief Information Officer

As Secretary of the General Faculty, charged by the Faculty Handbook to be the official correspondent for the General Faculty in communications with the administration, I am writing to inform you of two motions passed by the General Faculty at its meeting on March 14, 2014. This memo begins with some background and ends with the two motions I am bringing to your attention as the Vice President for ITS.

Educational Technologies Committee (ETC)

Following the sudden shutdown of the Mentor course management system shortly before the start of the Fall 2013 semester, the Academic Council, at its first meeting on September 9, charged the ETC:

   to provide a full report to the Academic Council 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.

The ETC conducted a thorough investigation. Their report with corrections and appendices can be found with the March 3 materials at: http://faculty.fairfield.edu/gfs/AC/2013-2014/ac13-14.html It concluded with the following recommendation:

   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.

Academic Council (AC)

At its March 3, 2014 meeting, the AC, the executive arm of the General Faculty, took up the ETC report.

The following motion was rejected by the AC: "In light of the ETC Report, the Academic Council calls for the administration to immediately and fully reinstate Mentor."

The AC then passed two motions:

1. The AC’s position is that all data in Mentor should be retained until the issues raised in the ETC report are resolved.
2. that before any major technology decision affecting academics is made by the administration, the Educational Technologies Committee should be consulted and given time to review the decision and receive faculty input. The only exception to this policy would be if delay of the decision would place the university at increased legal exposure.

In response to the first motion, CIO Francis responded that, "While we will be unable to keep access to Mentor indefinitely, we will ensure that all data housed within is retained, stored, secure and retrievable."

Finally, the AC rejected a motion to "endorse the report of the ETC". But the AC determined that the report and the AC's response should be forwarded to the General Faculty.

**General Faculty (GF)**

After brief presentations from the ETC and AC, the GF passed the following motions:

1. In light of the ETC's recommendation the CIO Francis either "demonstrate the severity of Mentor's alleged flaws in a transparent and convincing manner" or else "honor Fairfield’s contract with Axiom Education, work with it to fix any remaining concerns in Mentor, and restore it to full functionality," and in light of the continued failure of CIO Francis to make any such demonstration, and in light of her recent statements that she will not make such a demonstration, we call upon the administration to immediately restore Mentor to full functionality.

2. that before any major technology decision affecting academics is made by the administration, including the termination of Mentor, the Educational Technologies Committee should be consulted and given time to review the decision and receive faculty input. The only exception to this policy would be if delay of the decision would place the university at increased legal exposure.

I thank you for your attention to this matter and look forward to your response. Please contact me if you have any questions.
Office of the President

To: Sue Rakowitz

From: Jeffrey von Arx, S.J.

Subject: General Faculty response to the discontinuation of the Mentor course management system

Date: March 18, 2014

Thank you for forwarding to Kevin Lawlor the communication from the General Faculty and the supporting detail from the Academic Council and the Educational Technologies Committee. After reviewing the relevant documents and issues, I have decided to accept the recommendations of the Academic Council regarding consultation and to provide sufficient time for an orderly transfer of relevant data from the Mentor application. I also want to use this opportunity to underscore several important points:

1) The administration will continue its practice of consulting with the ETC whenever possible prior to making a major decision about technological support for teaching and research.

2) The ITS department will provide reasonable time for the orderly transfer of data from the Mentor application to its new home.

3) The CIO, Paige Francis, and her staff exercised their fiduciary obligations to protect the University and its data from risks. In her professional judgment, the circumstances were outside the normal course and demanded quick action, and I support her and her decision to take this action.

4) The University going forward will no longer be a customer of Axiom Education or any of its applications.

5) All parties are reminded that it is the long standing policy of the institution that all employees, staff and faculty avoid even the appearance of conflict between personal and professional interests. These policies safeguard the institution and are important standards for us all.

I appreciate the hard work of the AC and the ETC on this issue.
MEMORANDUM
Fairfield University

TO: Academic Council

FROM: Michael Tucker

DATE: March 29, 2014

RE: Mentor Shutdown

I would like to thank my colleagues on the Academic Council and the Educational Technologies Committee for their diligence in investigating the shutdown of the course management aspect of Mentor following the declaration of an “emergency” by the administration in August 2013.

As you know, the General Faculty took up this matter at its last meeting on March 14 and overwhelmingly passed a motion calling for the immediate restoration of Mentor to full functionality. This motion was sent to the Executive Vice President by our General Faculty Secretary and the President responded to our actions in a memo of March 18; these memos were distributed to the General Faculty by the Faculty Secretary on March 19.

While I appreciate the President’s confirmation that (1) the Educational Technologies Committee will be consulted (with time to review and receive faculty input) before a major technology decision affecting academics is made by the administration and (2) there will be an orderly transfer of data from Mentor to a new home in a reasonable time, his decision to go against the wishes of an overwhelming majority of the faculty is extremely disappointing. Moreover, there are aspects of the situation unaddressed in the President’s response and I think it is extremely important that the faculty issue a strong statement on these matters. I am asking the Academic Council to take up the following two motions at its next meeting. I am available to attend the meeting on April 7 to discuss this matter with the Council if that would be helpful.

**MOTION.** The Academic Council instructs the Educational Technologies Committee to oversee an orderly transfer and replacement of all Mentor functions by ITS.

**MOTION.** Since the declaration of an “emergency” that resulted in the precipitous shutdown of Mentor in August 2013 has not been demonstrated to any faculty body, the AC condemns ITS for its lack of consultation with faculty, deans and faculty committees, and for the absence of transparency in reaching this decision.
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
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 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.
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11/18/13 Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Members present:</strong> Mike Andreychik, Deborah Edelman, Cinthia Gannett, Valeria Martinez, Eileen O’Shea, David Winn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guests:</strong> Suzanna Klaf, Tracy Immerso, Bill Taylor (SoE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regrets:</strong> Christine Siegel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.
Proposal to SVPAA for Computer Science (CS) and Software Engineering (SW)

Proposal: The School of Engineering (SOE) proposes the move of administration of Computer Science program from the Math and Computer Science Department in the College of Arts and Sciences to the Software Engineering Department in the School of Engineering. Subsequently the name of the Math and Computer Science Department would be changed to the Math Department and the name of the Software Engineering Department would be changed to the Computer Science and Software Engineering Department.

Rationale: The School of Engineering and the College of Arts and Sciences have explored the possibility through the work of the Joint Computing Curriculum Task Force at Fairfield University (September 2012 report) over a multiple year period. The 2012 report presented guidelines for shared courses which were not implemented. The Software Engineering and Computer Science undergraduate programs both have low enrollment and offer duplicate courses. The Software Engineering program has strict curriculum requirements to maintain national accreditation. The Software Engineering MS program is one of the strongest in the SOE with approximately 45 students.

The combining of the two undergraduate programs in the SOE will eliminate duplicate low enrollment courses and support the successful continuation of both programs. The CS students will continue to take the same program technical content and same liberal arts core courses that they do currently. The SW students also will continue with the current coursework in their nationally accredited undergraduate program. CAS students will be more likely to be able to obtain a minor in engineering due to the administration of the CS program in the SOE. Initially, there will be no change to the current curricular programs other than the renumbering/cross listing of some of the CS and SW courses to eliminate duplications. The proposed administrative change would provide the opportunity for the SOE to offer service courses to CAS students completing either a major or a minor in CS. Additionally, the SOE will work with the Math department to develop mutually agreed upon course outcomes for the designated course that meets the requirement for all math majors to take one CS course. This administrative change will lead to increased collaboration and integration between the Math department and the CS/SW department.

Going forward, SOE will continue to evaluate whether any further program changes are beneficial to the two programs. These decisions would be made in consultation with the faculty and through all proper Fairfield University review committee channels and would be based on enrollment trends in the CS and SW undergraduate programs. Possible scenarios could include the CS undergraduate degree with both accredited and unaccredited versions (much like chemistry undergraduate degrees are typically delivered). If this scenario were to come to fruition, CS could become the undergraduate degree and SW would be the MS degree.
January 15, 2014

From: Dean Bruce Berdanier

To: Educational Planning Committee

Regarding: The Transfer of the Computer Science Program from the College of Arts and Sciences to the School of Engineering: EPC Charge to the Dean of the School of Engineering

The EPC approved a motion to endorse the transfer of the Computer Science program from the Math Department in the College of Arts and Sciences to the Software Engineering Department in the School of Engineering pending a formal plan for implementation. We ask that the plan be submitted in time for the February meeting of the EPC (February 20, 2014).

The following are specific issues that the EPC would like to see addressed in the plan:

Introduction:
Some of the details requested in this questionnaire are too detailed for the current scope of planning to administer the CS program in SOE for the efficient offering of the CS and SW degree programs. The answers below are all presented as including modifying words such as “planned”, “initially” or “currently.” We will make a good faith effort to offer the courses here below described, though we reserve the right to alter our course offerings based upon student need and interest. As we have discussed at several meetings throughout this year, cross-listed courses for CS and SW will be offered. CS and SW will both be administered in SOE. CS students will follow the CAS core, and SW students will follow the SOE core. The CS program is unaccredited by ABET but approved by NEASC and the State of Connecticut, and the SW program is accredited by ABET, Inc. as well as by NEASC and the State.

1. Issues to be resolved prior to Fall 2014 Registration:
   a. Determine what CS courses will be offered in Fall 2014 and Spring 2015. There are advising concerns that need to be addressed in the short and long term, but advising students this spring for the 2014/2015 academic year is a priority. Shall this spring advising be done in the CAS or in the SOE? The normal CS courses will be offered in the 2014/2015 academic year and spring advising will be conducted in SOE. This question is asked several times in different forms throughout the questionnaire. SOE is open to current students being advised by current CAS advisers (as described below) if desired by those students and advisers. This is a small number of students and would create up to a three year transition. We are prepared, however, to take on the advising of all CS students immediately.
   b. Determine what MA/CS courses the SOE needs and expects the Math Department to offer in the Fall 2014 and the Spring 2015. Yes, this needs to be done and will be done during the Spring semester 2014 as is normally done by program administrators. This question is also addressed in more detail in different locations throughout the questionnaire.
c. Will there be changes to the catalog for Class of 2018? Since class of 2018 will operate entirely under the SOE CS major, it would be ideal for the catalog to accurately reflect changes in the program. Catalog copy needs to be in before a final decision will likely be made, but Steve Sawin is willing to work with the SOE to the extent that the SVPAA, the two academic deans and the EPC and other governing bodies are comfortable to adjust the catalog in anticipation of the most likely scenario. Yes, the CS program will be administered through the SOE, and this should be properly reflected in the catalog for the undergraduate class of 2018. The CS degree program will be delineated within the SOE, including such items as: the cross listed CS/SW courses in the curricular plan, current CS/SW department professors, etc. The final decisions shall be complete before final catalog copy is due.

d. Related to a. above, who will advise current CS majors (College of Arts and Sciences students) grandfathered into the program? If the SOE faculty take over the advising of current (and future) CS majors (and offer supplemental advising to minors), when will that occur? All new and incoming CS majors and minors will be advised in the SOE beginning with the 2014 spring advising. If some current CS student feels that he/she needs to stay advised by an advisor in the Math department for whatever reason, and if the current advisor is willing to provide this service, this advising arrangement can be accommodated as a secondary advisor; that MA advisor should be in regular communication with the chair of CS/SW (primary advisor) and the Dean of the SOE. This process would represent a fairly small group of students, and in all cases, the SOE will complete degree evaluations and coordinate any questions with a Math department advisor over the next three years.

2. Program Curriculum Issues:
   a. Short-Term: For CS majors/minors in classes of 2015/16/17 (and 2018 assuming no major catalog changes), what adjustments to their requirements does SOE expect to make, and what is a rough schedule of these changes to offerings? No changes are anticipated. CS/SW courses will be cross-listed as described above.
   b. In the long-term, will the program have two tracks (one for CAS majors and one for SOE majors)? If so, how will the courses and catalog descriptions for the CS, SW and CE students in classes of 2018, 2019, and 2020 be different? What courses does the SOE expect to offer? If there are two tracks, will the SOE attempt to get the CS track ABET accredited? All CS majors will be in the SOE. The CS degree program will be the same program it is now, following the CAS core. There is no plan for two tracks. CE is not part of this discussion; it is a different program from CS and SW. There will be a CS program and an SW program administered in one department. SOE will consider in the future and with proper input and evaluation through the Fairfield University governance process whether there should be one undergrad program with two tracks instead of two undergrad programs. Future curricular and pedagogical developments will occur through normal academic review and planning
processes. A list of cross-listed CS/SW courses that will be offered by SOE will be developed early in the Spring 2014, well in time for advising and registration.

c. Which courses currently listed as MA/CS (141, 151, 231, 342, 377 or a similar version thereof) does SOE plan to offer? Which of these does SOE need Math to continue to offer in service to them and which courses do they expect to eliminate and no longer offer? Two courses offered by the Math Department, the introduction to programming and the data structure course, had no exact overlap with SOE courses. How will this be addressed? This question’s course listing in parentheses does not directly correspond to the current BSCS major courses. The following major courses chart shows a scenario with Math Department teaching MA231.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Major Course</th>
<th>Proposed Major Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS141 and CS151</td>
<td>EG31 and SW131 *1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS231</td>
<td>MA 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS232</td>
<td>CS/SW232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW201</td>
<td>SW201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS342</td>
<td>CS/SW342 *2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS343</td>
<td>CS343/SW399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR245/245L</td>
<td>CR245/245L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:
1. A new course with similar content and purpose as CS141 will be developed and offered in SOE by Spring 2015 for any interested student at Fairfield in a non CS major.
2. Several options exist for developing and offering CS342 depending on future needs, resources, and faculty interests.

d. Will the SOE serve other schools by tailoring courses to meet the needs of non-SOE majors? Specifically, is it prepared to offer a one semester terminal programming course (either as part of their majors sequence or separate from it) suitable for non-majors in other disciplines who want to learn basic programming skills (science, math and business students, e.g.), subject to sufficient student interest? There is some concern that the preferred software language used by CAS students is different from that used by SOE students. How will this issue be addressed? The SOE does want to offer a course suitable for non-majors. CS141 is suggested in above table, and others are possible. Software languages are tools, and many “can be” and “are” learned during a professional’s life. Students will have the opportunity to learn, and to learn how to apply, different languages.
e. Related to 1 d. above, will the SOE work to maintain enough flexibility in the CS major to make it feasible for students to double major in Math and CS? This is a common double major at most institutions, and it has been very popular with CS majors in the past. Students who are Math majors have been a steady source of second majors for the CS program. **The CS program is not being changed. Double MA/CS majors will remain feasible and will be encouraged.**

f. Will the SOE maintain and enhance opportunities for non-Engineering students to minor in CS or otherwise pursue computational and information technological literacy at a sub-major level? In particular, will SOE offer courses accessible to students without a standard engineering background? **SOE will encourage students to minor in CS. Course prerequisites will not change.**

g. Overall, in the long-term, what will the program look like (CS/SW and CE)? **CE is a different program in a separate department and is not part of this discussion. I cannot speculate on the future of CE/CS/SW, but the arbitrary lines of technical specialization are certainly changing as technology changes. If the recent past is a guide, I would expect continued change in the interplay between these disciplines in the future.**

3. Additional Advising Issues:

   a. If there are two tracks (one for CAS majors and one for SOE majors), who will advise the CAS majors? **SOE advisors will advise all CS majors and minors; Math department faculty who so choose will be welcome as secondary advisors for CS students, especially those who wish to minor or major in Mathematics as well.**
Implementation Plan and Schedule for Re-Assignment of Computer Science Program to SOE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Completed By:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present proposal to AC</td>
<td>February 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine courses to be taught Fa2014</td>
<td>February 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertise for new CS faculty member for SOE to be hired for Fa2014</td>
<td>February 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop list of cross-listed CS/SW courses which will be taken by both computer science and software engineering majors</td>
<td>February 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer advising responsibilities for CS students to Dr. Amalia Rusu to advise for Fa2014</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer CS program to SOE</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rename Software Engineering Department as Computer Science and Software Engineering Department</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign professors for Fa2014 teaching assignments (Yoo, Rusu, Spoerri, New Faculty). Spoerri could be assigned in consultation with Math Department.</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EPC Meeting February 20, 2014
Draft

Present: Cathy Giapponi (Chair), Angela Biselli, Olivia Harriott, Qin Zhang, Paul Fitzgerald, Lynn Babington, Nancy Manister, Mark Scalese, Evelyn Bilias Lolis, Robbin Crabtree.

Regrets: Peter Bayers, Cinthia Gannett

Agenda Item 2: Review of plan to move Computer Science to School of Engineering.
Guest: Bruce Berdanier, School of Engineering.

The discussion started with a brief review of the proposal to move Computer Science (CS) from the Mathematics Department to the School of Engineering (SOE).

SVPAA Fitzgerald noted that as Computer Science faculty left and the number of students graduating from this program diminished to about 3 per year, reallocation of resources became a consideration. Currently, there are 17-18 CS students. He also noted there are about the same number of undergraduate software engineering students, but a much larger number of graduate software engineering students.

Dean Crabtree noted that Math Department’s objection to this move was mostly philosophical.

Dean Berdanier was invited to provide an overview of the plan for transitioning Computer Science into the School of Engineering and address the questions forwarded to him by the EPC after the December meeting of the Committee.

Dean Berdanier provided a summary of the plan as well as his responses to EPC’s questions concerning specific aspects of the transition. He indicated that the same core classes would be offered in order to diminish disruption, and then they would be cross-listed (Software Engineering and Computer Science courses).

Dean Berdanier indicated that he is engaged in ongoing discussions with Professors Weiss and Sawin of the Math Department. Discussions have been productive, with plans created to determine how courses will be shared and students advised. For example, Professor Sawin will advise dual CS and MA major students.

Professor Giapponi asked if the CS students will earn a degree from Engineering or Arts and Sciences. Dean Berdanier indicated that the degrees are granted by the university. Students will continue in the track/program they are currently in and graduate from their respective programs as they always have. For example, students in Computer Science will fulfill the CAS core requirements, while Engineering students will follow the SOE core. Each will adhere to the specific school requirements for Modern Languages and Visual and Performing Arts.

Dean Berdanier indicated that he plans to hire a new computer scientist for the fall 2015.

The Dean noted that the program may be revised in the future.

SVPAA Fitzgerald noted that there is a nationwide trend toward the phase out of undergraduate Software Engineering degrees.
One of the members of the committee asked if CS courses will remain in Math Department. Dean Berdanier indicated that he and Professors Weiss, Sawin and Rusu had discussed this topic. For example we currently plan that Math 377 course will remain as a math department delivered course. Also, we have discussed two other courses designed for sophomores, MA 141 and MA 151, and plan that Ma 151 will continue to be offered in the Math Department while SOE will offer a course for non-majors that will be equal to MA 141 in the near future as discussed in the implementation plan submitted. We will continue to work on these courses together as we proceed through the next academic year.

Dean Crabtree indicated that some members of the faculty have computer science skills that were not previously noted.

Professor Biselli suggested that in the future CS needs to consider computational physics students.

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

The members of the Committee discussed the plan for transitioning the CS program into the SOE.

One concern raised by members of the Committee was the difference between CAS and SOE with regard to the Modern Language requirement. This could result in confusion. The point was made that advising will be critical and the differences between the two programs must be made clear in the advisement process.

SVPAA Fitzgerald indicated that Computer Science is not required to be accredited by ABET at this time.

The Committee was pleased with Dean Berdanier’s indication that the collaboration between the Math Department and the SOE was going well.

Dean Babington noted the importance of cross-school collaboration and indicated that Nursing plans on offering courses, such as Public Health, that can be taken by non-nursing majors.

Dean Babington made a motion to approve the plan for moving the Computer Science program to the School of Engineering. Mark Scalese seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted By Nancy Manister

EPC minutes of prior years that may be of relevance were sent to the AC by the SOE Dean and are included here. AC Executive Secretary.

Fairfield University
Educational Planning Committee
Draft Minutes
January 31, 2008

Committee members in attendance: Peter Bayers, Mike Cavanaugh, Rao Dukkipati, Susan Franzosa (ex-officio), Orin Grossman (ex-officio), Wendy Kohli, Sallyanne Ryan, Carl Scheraga (chair), Joyce Shea, Emily Smith, Edna Wilson (ex-officio).
Invited Guests: Matthew Coleman, Chair of Mathematics Department; Adam King, Director of Computer Science Program in Mathematics Department; Vagos Hadjimichael, Dean of the School of Engineering.

1. The meeting was called to order at 3:35pm.

3. Focus of January 31, 2008 meeting on the Residency of the Computer Science Program

Carl Scheraga explained to the EPC members that the EPC is not to adjudicate the decision regarding the Computer Science Program; rather we are to provide a recommendation to the AVP after reviewing all documents and listening to the positions of the interested parties. The invited guests were here to answer any questions the EPC may have. In particular, they were invited to address the current state of the Computer Science major and visions for growing the program.

Matt Coleman and Adam King from the Math Department offered their rationale for wanting the Computer Science Program to remain in the Mathematics Department and in the College of Arts and Sciences.

- With regard to the issue of the number of majors in Computer Science, they argued that this small number was not out of line with other small majors at Fairfield and that it was very in line with the size of the faculty serving the program. Furthermore, Adam pointed to several systemic issues that affect the size of the program, including the fact that Computer Science is the only major where students can’t take a computer science course in the Core. Core courses are used as a successful recruitment strategy for departments and majors. Other systemic factors affecting the size of major include gender and the fact that Fairfield isn’t a large science school. According to Adam, the crisis in CS enrollment is a national crisis, not limited to Fairfield and pointed to MIT with a recent 50% decrease in enrollment in their majors.

- With regard to a vision for going forward, Adam insisted that it was best to keep Computer Science within a liberal arts context and located in the Mathematics Department, offering a theoretically rich orientation to the field. As a new science of information and information processing, Computer Science is a foundational science, in the vanguard of new thinking about processes and change, and situated perfectly to work with other science departments in the College of Arts and Sciences.

- As to a plan for increasing the number of majors and reaching more students, the first response is to allow a Computer Science to meet one of the Core Math requirements. By targeting a potential group of students from those who take the second half of calculus, they may be able to get new majors from this targeted group. A second approach is related to the department’s request for a new faculty member specifically identified for Computer Science. A third strategy, already begun, is the institutionalization of the UNIX platform that will allow collaboration with other sciences.

Matt and Adam were thanked for their input and Vagos Hadjimichael, Dean of the School of Engineering was invited in to offer his rationale for wanting the Computer Science Program to be housed within the School of Engineering.

- The primary rationale for the move is that there would be a natural synergy between computer science and three other programs in the SOE: Electrical Engineering, Computer Engineering and Software Development. The addition of Computer Science would provide a seamless transition between the programs and better serve the students in the SOE.

- Furthermore, this synergy would allow the SOE and the university to better leverage its resources. Currently, with the small number of majors in Computer Science, the Math Department can’t run all of the courses necessary, which impacts Engineering students who are in programs needing these courses. By housing the Computer Science Program in the SOE, courses could be given on a more regular basis, serving the students across campus more effectively.

- In response to a query from the committee about the potential for a joint approach, as opposed to an either/or, binary approach that seems to have dominated the recent discussions, Dean Hadjimichael insisted
that moving Computer Science to Engineering would not mean the elimination of it; it would remain a distinct program, located with other ‘siblings’ to create a richer environment with more resources. Since 2002, he has argued that there must be some change in the situation of Computer Science in order to satisfy the needs (not wishes) of the engineering students and faculty. By bringing the Computer Science program into the SOE, it would complete their offerings in Information Technologies, and still serve students in the College of Arts and Sciences. He elaborated on the potential for collaboration with the CAS by pointing to work in Bio-informatics and nanotechnology.

- With regard to growing the Computer Science Program, Dean Hadjimichael said that the move to the SOE would offer a new vision for the program and in turn, enhance the recruitment of students. He also pointed to the alliance with community colleges that would provide a natural outreach and marketing focus.

When Vagos Hadjimichael left, the EPC committee spent some time discussing our options.

- Some members of the committee were searching for a way to recommend a truly collaborative solution to the situation. Others were doubtful of the success for collaboration, given the history. A consensus emerged, recommending that we offer one last chance for a truly collaborative program that could incorporate the differing conceptual and curricular approaches to computer science in order to serve our students better. We agreed that this ‘pilot project’ build on the expertise and experience of faculty in Math, Computer Science and Engineering.

- By promoting a model for inter-school partnerships, we as the EPC could be demonstrating to the university community that it is possible to go “beyond turf” and serve our students (and faculty) better in the process.

Fairfield University
Educational Planning Committee
Draft Minutes
April 17, 2008

Committee Members in Attendance: Peter Bayers, Susan Franzosa (ex-officio), Orin Grossman (ex-officio), Wendy Kohli, Sallyanne Ryan, Carl Scheraga (chair), Joyce Shea, Marie-Agnes Sourseau, Emily Smith, and Edna Wilson (ex-officio).

Professor Scheraga called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm.

1. AVP Grossman reported on significant progress made on the proposal for a joint program in Computer Science between the Department of Mathematics and the School of Engineering. Representatives from both Math and Engineering have been able to develop initial plans for a program which will offer two tracks for Computer Science majors, one in Math and one in Engineering. AVP Grossman stated that he was looking to add one more faculty line so that there would be a total of two dedicated lines per track of the program. The most difficult area to date had been the desire of the Engineering School faculty to develop a Computer Science program that would be in compliance with ABET accreditation standards; this was not an issue for the Mathematics Department. In response to a question from Prof. Scheraga, AVP Grossman indicated that a committee representing both interested parties would be responsible for reviewing core courses in the Computer Science program in an ongoing manner. In addition, a proposal had already been brought forward and received approval by the UCC for CS 141 (Introduction to Computer Science and Programming I) to be recognized as a Core course for the University.

AVP Grossman noted that a positive attitude by all participants had helped greatly in moving the proposal forward, and he thanked Prof. Scheraga and members of the EPC for their assistance in the effort. He expected the committee to continue meeting over the summer, and that a final report would likely be presented to the EPC by October 2008. He recognized the hard work of committee members, particularly Prof. Doug Lyons from Engineering and Prof. Adam King and Prof. Matt Coleman from Mathematics. He
expressed his hope that committee members, and the University, would be able to be clear about what the Computer Science program is, and will be, to potential students as they move forward. On behalf of the EPC, Prof. Scheraga commended the committee on the progress they have made on a difficult issue, and he thanked AVP Grossman for facilitating the dialogue.

Fairfield University
Educational Planning Committee
Draft Minutes
September 18, 2008

Committee Members in Attendance: Peter Bayers, Susan Franzosa, Cathy Giapponi, Wendy Kohli, Shelley Phelan, Sallyanne Ryan, Carl Scheraga (chair, re-elected), Joyce Shea, Emily Smith, Jo Yarrington.

Invited Guests: Dina Franceschi (Economics; Advisory Board, Program on the Environment) and David Downie (Director, Program on the Environment).

1. Professor Scheraga called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m.

2. New Business: Professor Scheraga announced that representatives of the Math Department and the School of Engineering would be addressing the EPC at its next meeting. They will report on the status of their efforts to sustain/grow the Computer Science Program. Professor Scheraga offered to distribute all pertinent documents from the EPC’s past deliberations on this issue to the membership. Dean Franzosa asked for clarification on the EPC’s role in this matter. Professor Scheraga explained that the EPC aims to determine whether or not the two parties are making satisfactory progress, emphasizing that the Academic Vice President (Orin Grossman) first sought the EPC’s advice on this matter last year. He reminded the members that their role is advisory; ultimately, all decisions regarding the future residency of the Computer Science Program are made by the AVP. Professor Yarrington announced that she is serving on the search committee for the next AVP, and she welcomed the opportunity to discuss such practices with the AVP candidates, that is, the role of the EPC in shared governance and its ability to provide feedback to the Academic Vice President.

Fairfield University
Educational Planning Committee
Draft Minutes
October 16, 2008

Committee Members in Attendance: Peter Bayers, Susan Franzosa (ex-officio), Cathy Giapponi, Orin Grossman (ex-officio), Wendy Kohli, Shelley Phelan, Carl Scheraga (chair), Joyce Shea, Emily Smith, and Jo Yarrington.

Professor Scheraga called the meeting to order at 3:39 pm.

2. Prior to AVP Grossman’s report on the status of the Computer Science (CS) Program, Prof. Scheraga addressed a question that had been raised about CS appearing under the School of Engineering (SOE) in the
University catalogue. He clarified that the catalogue entry only indicated that a CS Program was being developed at the SOE. AVP Grossman then reported that representatives of the Department of Mathematics and the SOE had met several times to discuss joint development of the CS Program. Students in the program will take core courses with teaching responsibilities shared between the Math Department and the SOE; additional courses will be offered to students pursuing either the theoretical track developed through the Math Department or the practice-based track being developed through the SOE. Having one CS Program with the two tracks will provide students with additional choices down the road.

There is one faculty line already designated for the CS Program through the Math Department, and a search is underway to fill that position. The SOE is continuing to develop the structure of the program that will be offered through them and will be looking for ways to support the necessary resources (e.g. new faculty). AVP Grossman stated that the conceptual approach to the problem has been good, and that the resource approach is still being worked on.

Prof. Yarrington commented on the compelling amount of work that had been done by the Math Department in presenting their case for continuing the program, and asked if there was a need for additional labs under the joint approach. AVP Grossman responded that he didn’t believe so.

Prof. Scheraga commented on the context within which the collaborative efforts between the Math Department and the SOE had begun, including an awareness of the lack of students who had been choosing CS as a major in the past. He stated that the desire of the EPC was to focus on the needs of the students.

Prof. Scheraga inquired as to how meetings between the Math Department and the SOE had been going. AVP Grossman stated that he had attended several joint meetings, that both sides have continued to work together, and that they both recognize their joint interest in helping CS to survive.

Prof. Bayers asked if the EPC has any other role at this point; AVP Grossman said that there would be nothing more at present until the Program was fully developed.

Prof. Phelan asked how much overlap there would be with Software Engineering in terms of curriculum; AVP Grossman stated that there would be some overlap, but that it was unclear for now how many unique courses would be needed.

Prof. Scheraga asked how the efforts would now proceed; AVP Grossman indicated that budgetary issues regarding new faculty lines would need to be addressed, then the revised Program would need to go through the University’s formal approval process. Prof. Scheraga discussed a potential timeline for approval, especially important if the intent is to start the revised Program in Fall of 2009.

Prof. Scheraga thanked AVP Grossman for his report, and his work, on the CS Program.

Education Planning Committee Meeting
Fairfield University
Draft Minutes
October 20, 2011

Present:
Professors Steven Bachelor, Peter Bayers, Dean Don Gibson, Professors Cathy Giapponi, Sheila Grossman, Olivia Harriott, Michael Pagano, Carl Scheraga (Chair), Chris Staehler

Regrets: Barbara Welles-Nystrom; Dean Suzanne Campbell,

Visiting: Doug Lyon (Guest); Matt Coleman (Guest);
2. Assessment discussion of computer science major housed in the department of Mathematics – charge to the SVAA

Professor Scheraga presented the background for the assessment.

Prof. Scheraga explained that in 2007, the EPC brought the School of Engineering and the Department of Mathematics together to discuss the future of Computer Science at Fairfield University. The Computer Science Program had been (and still is) housed in the Department of Mathematics, but the then Dean of Engineering suggested that the program be moved to the School of Engineering. However, there was disagreement between the Department of Mathematics and the School of Engineering as to where the program should be housed. As a result, the EPC asked the School of Engineering and the Department of Mathematics to offer rationales for housing Computer Science in Engineering or the Department of Mathematics. EPC heard the arguments in the fall of 2007. In short, this was an epistemological debate about the definition of Computer Science: is Computer Science theoretically based (housed in Dept. of Mathematics) or practically based (housed in SOE). At that point, the EPC—in consultation with AVP Orin Grossman—asked that the School of Engineering and the Department of Mathematics work together to develop a solution to the debate. The EPC asked that a common core for Computer Science be developed between the School of Engineering and the Dept. of Mathematics, and then students themselves could decide which “track” in the discipline they would like to follow: the track in the SOE; or the track in the Department of Mathematics. Professor Scheraga presented the following document that was created for the SOE and the Department of Mathematics to guide their discussions.

EPC Proposal for Joint Program in Computer Science

The Department of Mathematics and the School of Engineering will come together and submit a proposal for a major in computer science reflecting joint participation by both parties. This proposal will be submitted in such a timely fashion so that it may be considered by the Educational Planning Committee at its meeting of April 17, 2008. This process will reflect:

1. There will be joint planning sessions which involve the chairman of the Department of Mathematics, the Director of the Computer Science Program (currently housed in mathematics), and the dean of the School of Engineering.

2. These planning sessions will be moderated by the Academic Vice President to insure effort of good faith by all parties.

3. The proposal will integrate courses from the Department of Mathematics and the School of Engineering with the intent of providing students majoring in computer science a holistic understanding of the field with the necessary depth of knowledge to insure them a range of viable options for further study and career paths.

4. This program will be in place for implementation in the fall of 2008. The proposal will provide a schedule of courses indicating a coherent sequence with a regularized timeline (on an ongoing basis) and a clear schedule of assigned instructors, to the extent possible. Thus, a student beginning this program will have a complete map of his/her four years of study.

5. The proposal will also indicate, with content and pedagogical detail, a course in this major that will be submitted for consideration for inclusion in the University Core Curriculum.

6. If the above proposal is not presented to the Educational Planning Committee by April 17, 2008, the disposition of the issue of the future of computer science as a discipline and department/school of residency will be left to the decision of the Academic Vice President.
Following the overview of this document, Prof. Scheraga asked Prof. Coleman and Prof. Lyon to comment on their progress in regard to the EPC’s request.

Prof. Coleman explained that the common core does not now exist. Prof. Lyon explained that while Prof. King and Prof. Lyon were able to construct what they thought was a viable core, other committee members from Engineering did not agree with the solution. Prof. Lyon was not able to continue to work on the committee because he was on sabbatical. In the end, the committee was never able to resolve EPC’s request. Professor Scheraga then asked Prof. Coleman and Prof. Lyon for an explanation of documents before the EPC to explain the current status of the program. Prof. Lyon explained that there is still too much overlap between courses. For instance, as it stands, Prof. Lyon argued that still today the same core course—notably Introduction to Computer Science—is still offered by Engineering and Computer Science, and that this courses could, and should, be offered jointly as one course. Professor Lyon did, however, feel there has been some progress on the respective computer science tracks, in that there are no joint electives between the programs. Prof. Scheraga noted that what seems to have happened is that the common core was not resolved. The process has gotten bogged down in questions about electives.

Prof. Lyon commented that we are dancing around the question of what constitutes a professional program. He believes that the primary goal of a professional program is to ensure that a graduate can practice in a specific profession. He noted that this may not be the goal from a Computer Science perspective housed in the Department of Mathematics.

The point, as Professor Scheraga indicated, is that there is an awareness of different ways to define Computer Science. The point in creating the tracks was that students choose a computer science track based on how they want to define themselves epistemologically—as Engineers or Mathematicians. Prof. Coleman noted that the core is still problematic, particularly CS 141 and 142.

Prof. Scheraga asked how many Computer Science majors there are in both schools. Prof. Coleman offered a handout that illustrated that there were relatively few per year. Prof. Lyon pointed out that he believes that the fundamentals of Computer Science make it a different discipline than computer engineering, and he argued that if the computer science program was housed in the SOE it would not fundamentally change its epistemology.

Prof. Harriet asked how moving Computer Science to the School of Engineering would affect accreditation. Prof. Lyon pointed out that the program would not have to go through ABET (Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology).

Prof. Giapponi asked if there was a downside to keeping the Computer Science Program in the School of A & S.

Prof. Staecker pointed out that in his 3rd year at Fairfield, he has never heard about this conflict.

Prof. Grossman asked how to increase numbers.

Prof. Coleman responded that he believes an adjustment in the schedule of classes would help to recruit students.

Prof. Staecker asked whether or not anything can still be done to create these two tracks.

Prof. Lyon remarked that he still finds that there can be more efficiencies, less overlap between courses, and that he believes there needs to be more synergy between SOE and Department of Mathematics.

Prof. Coleman responded that the Dept. of Mathematics is concerned about the amount of Computer Science majors.

Prof. Scheraga then thanked Prof. Coleman and Prof. Lyon for their input.
After Prof. Colman and Prof. Lyon’s departure, Prof. Giopanni asked whether or not there is any information on the number of Engineering Majors with Computer Science Minors. Prof. Scheraga explained that the EPC does not have this information.

Prof. Bachelor asked Prof. Scheraga if, at this point, there is anything specific being asked of EPC in regard to the status of Computer Science.

Prof. Scheraga explained that the SVPAA is concerned about the viability of the Computer Science program. Prof. Scheraga explained that he would like SVPAA Fitzgerald to review the information provided to the EPC by Prof. Coleman and Prof. Lyon and report back to the EPC.

Prof. Staecker pointed out that some Computer Science courses are filled.

In response Prof. Scheraga explained that the SVPAA Fitzgerald is particularly concerned about the lack of Computer Science majors and minors.

Prof. Harriet remarked that SOE and the Department of Math could follow the model of biology and chemistry majors who take classes together. Both majors get credit for certain core classes.

Prof. Scheraga responded that he was hoping to see that the SOE and the Dept. of Mathematics could work together.

Prof. Bayers commented that he would like to fully understand Paul’s perspective on Computer Science at Fairfield.

Prof. Scheraga commented that he plans to ask SVPAA Fitzgerald to come back to EPC with his view and recommendation.

Prof. Harriet commented that she would like data on alumni and their career paths in Computer Science.

Prof. Giapponi remarked that it is important that EPC understands how enrollments in computer science classes serve other disciplines.

Prof. Scheraga remarked that he will ask Ann Stehney for enrollment numbers.

Prof. Grossman and Prof. Gibson pointed out that Computer Scientists are gainfully employed. Prof. Gibson also pointed out the enrollments for majors in Information Systems are low, but that the major is still valuable.

Prof. Scheraga commented that Prof. Giapponi’s point is well taken. Computer science has to be understood in its broader context serving non-majors as well as majors and minors.

Prof. Staecker pointed out that the Department of Math surveyed its alumni regarding their employment status and felt that perhaps specific alumni information can be gathered regarding Computer Science.

The discussion closed, and Prof. Scheraga again pointed out that he will now talk to SVPAA Fitzgerald to talk about his perspective.

<>
M.A. in Communication Program

Five-year Review:

1. There have been no substantive changes to our program since it first enrolled students in January 2009, except for the addition of new course offerings that were approved by the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee and changes in our tenure-track faculty.

   Specifically, the new, approved courses are:
   a. CO 431 Media Law and Institutions
   b. CO 498 Communication Practicum
   c. CO 530 Media Theory and Criticism
   d. CO 537 New Media Studies
   e. CO 541 International Communication
   f. CO 547 Healthcare Organizational Communication
   g. CO 559 Topics in Communication Research
   h. CO 598 Independent Study

   New Communication faculty since January 2009:
   a. Dr. Colleen Arendt, Assistant Professor
   b. Dr. Michael Serazio, Assistant Professor

   Communication faculty who are no longer teaching in the Program:
   a. Dr. James Keenan, Professor (retired)
   b. Dr. James Shanahan, Professor (at Boston University)

2. As of fall 2013, there have been 117 applications to our Program. Of those 108 (92%) were accepted and 9 (8%) were rejected. Of the 108 accepted, 83 (77%) enrolled in our Program. To date, the Program has a retention rate of 81%. However, it should be noted that 6 (38%) of the 19 students who did not complete the Program were 5th year athletes who came here, or stayed after graduation, to do one more year of sports and then did not return to finish their graduate degrees. This is a problem that we have discussed with the Office of Graduate Admissions and the Athletic Department and we continue to try and assess our applicants who are athletes to determine their commitment to earning an M.A. in Communication degree.

   During the past 5 years we have graduated 32 students with an M.A. degree. Currently, we have 35 students matriculating in our Program—9 (26%) of them are newly enrolled in the 2013-2014 AY. We anticipate that as many as 10 (29%) of our current 35 students will graduate in spring 2014.

   In addition, during the first 5 years of our program, 40 of our graduate students have enrolled in graduate courses in other programs (DSB, Math, and American Studies). At the same time, six students from other Fairfield University graduate programs (MPA and Engineering) have enrolled in one or more courses in our Program.
3. The primary objectives of this program were detailed in the 2007 M.A. in Communication Program proposal. Specifically, they were “to provide quality graduate education in the Jesuit tradition to constituencies who are seeking to pursue graduate study in communication.”

In addition, broad objectives of the proposed program included:

“To foster the intellectual interests of the students and their appreciation for life-long learning;

To support the professional goals and aspirations of students;

To prepare students for leadership positions;

To enhance students’ decision-making and problem-solving abilities within various communication contexts;

To develop knowledge and skills for analysis of communication behavior within various communication contexts;

To increase students’ sense of ethical action and appreciation for diversity;

To promote a greater understanding of, and ability to perform within, the global community.

Secondary objectives included enhancing Fairfield University’s ability to generate new revenues, meet the needs for graduate study in the surrounding community, and help the University remain competitive within the rapidly changing educational environment and for the diverse student populations in the surrounding area.

These Program objectives have been divided into two distinct areas in order to reflect the desired learning outcomes of the students, the needs of the various constituencies, and the aims of Fairfield University.

The student goals were developed by the Communication Department faculty based on an understanding of the competencies Communication graduates should demonstrate and the environments in which graduates will be demonstrating these proficiencies.

**Student Goals:**

- Improve scholarly research skills and understanding of communication theory, research, and application
- Enhance ability to interact with confidence and trust
- Develop the analytical and communication skills necessary for ethical and effective leadership
• Develop, embrace, and practice principles of reflective learning
• Recognize the value of graduate educational opportunities as a way to accomplish professional goals and personal growth
• Become a member of a community of learners
• Demonstrate the values of encouraging and promoting diversity in all communication contexts”

Based on students performances in classes and in their theses and projects, as well as alumni’s anecdotal and survey data (see Table in #4 below), the faculty believe the Program objectives, as well as the student and University goals, are being met and demonstrated. In terms of the University goals, in spite of falling graduate student enrollments here and nationwide, the Program has clearly contributed to the generation of new revenues (see attached spreadsheet).

In order to assess what students are able to demonstrate at varying times during their M.A. in Communication Program, we evaluate specific student performance criteria across diverse courses taught by a wide variety of predominantly full-time Communication faculty. In addition, prior to graduation, student-learning outcomes (see Table below) are assessed independently by two faculty members who serve as the student's Thesis, or Project, Director or Second Reader. This evaluation is possible because each student is required to develop a comprehensive proposal and thesis or project that includes:

a. a demonstration of understanding of one or more key theoretical concepts related to their research plan
b. an extensive review of the scholarly literature related to the theory(ies)
c. research questions that further the discipline's current knowledge of, or applies a new approach to, a line of research related to the theory(ies) being studied
d. an appropriate methodology to answer the research questions
e. ethical and accurate data collection (including IRB approval)
f. critical thinking that demonstrates not only the student's assessment of the results, but his/her ability to communicate the breadth and depth of communication scholarship assimilated throughout not just the thesis/project, but the entire M.A. in Communication Program

The faculty use rubrics for assessing the student's proposal and final thesis/project submissions and measure both the quality of the graduates’ writing as well as the their research, critical thinking, and effective communication.

Assessment Rubric:
1. Command of language
2. Authenticity/originality of idea and/or research questions
3. Appropriateness of Research methodology
4. Data collection and analysis (quantity/quality/ethics)
5. Assimilation and application of course materials from entire graduate program
6. Scholarly research skills
7. Critical thinking
9. Communication effectiveness as a writer

Furthermore, the Communication Department faculty continues to discuss additional ways to assess our graduate students’ performance. Among the topics being considered is a baseline assessment of either the students’ initial essays in their applications, or their research papers in CO 400 compared to the effectiveness of their written communication in their final Thesis/Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MA in Communication Program</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The research (scholarly and field) is accurately gathered and communicated</td>
<td>The writing demonstrates the student’s focus and understanding of the theory(ies) to be explored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scholarly research is thorough</td>
<td>The literature review communicates what prior researchers have discovered and reported relative to the theory/topic being explored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The research (scholarly) explores the topic from multiple Communication/social science perspectives</td>
<td>The student’s research questions are appropriate to further a line of prior research, or to go in a new direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student demonstrates her/his understanding for the institutional review process and includes IRB approval of research methods, subject selection, and data collection</td>
<td>The student has strategically chosen both a methodology and population that can be expected to provide data for answering the study’s research questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The research is done ethically and protects the subjects’/institutions’ confidentiality and anonymity (where assured)</td>
<td>The student’s analysis illustrates her/his assimilation of Communication theories related to the topic and her/his ability to apply that learning to the answers of the research questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The choice of a research method highlights the student’s command of research methodology options.

The writing should demonstrate the student’s ability to identify the limitations in her/his study and how her/his findings could be used in future studies.

4. In order to determine the impact of our Program on our 32 students who have graduated with an M.A. in Communication the past 5 years, we created a 5-point, Likert-type questionnaire that was posted on www.surveymonkey.com. Over a 10-day period in Fall 2013, the link to the survey was distributed via email to our 32 graduates. The alumni were sent reminders four times and encouraged to provide feedback and assured anonymity. Of the 32 potential subjects, 19 (59%) responded and all of them completed each of the 10 questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree/Agree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree/Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The M.A. in Communication Program met, or exceeded, my expectations for graduate education.</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The oral communication skills required in the M.A. in Communication Program enhanced my professional career.</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The M.A. in Communication Program offered a variety of course formats (full semester, accelerated hybrid, and fully online) that met my professional and/or personal needs.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The M.A. in Communication Program allowed me to customize my graduate education.</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The written communication skills required in the M.A. in Communication Program enhanced my professional career.</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. The individual work with my Thesis/Project Director exemplified Fairfield University’s commitment to develop my creative intellectual potential.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. The M.A. in Communication Program offered courses that directly related to my personal and/or professional goals or interests.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>84%</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>16%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. The communication theories I learned in the M.A. in Communication Program have enhanced my professional career and/or relationships.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>79%</th>
<th>21%</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. Earning an M.A. in the Communication Program has enhanced my self-perception.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>95%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Completing the M.A. in Communication Program directly contributed to me getting a promotion, raise, or a new position.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>74%</th>
<th>21%</th>
<th>5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Communication Department is extremely pleased with these very positive responses to our Program from our alumni. These data support the department’s perceptions that the M.A. in Communication Program is meeting or exceeding the proposed department, student, and University objectives and goals. The results of this survey combined with anecdotal reports from students, and their performances in courses and in their Theses/Projects illustrate the Program’s ability to provide a graduate education that not only supports the mission and values of Fairfield University, but also meets or exceeds the expectations and personal/professional needs of our graduate students.

While the overwhelming majority of responses were extraordinarily positive in terms of the alumni’s perceptions of their graduate education—we were most pleased with the nearly unanimous agreement to statements 1, 6, and 9. These three statements in particular focus on the University’s and the department’s mission. We were also very pleased that the alumni in their responses to questions 2, 5, 7, and 10 found their intellectual pursuits in our Program directly applicable to their professional and personal lives. Finally, the responses to statements: 2, 5, 8, and 10, reinforce the career outcomes that the Program markets to new applicants and strives to accomplish for our students/alumni.

In addition, our graduate students have positively impacted Fairfield University’s perception at conferences and in scholarly publications. Over 15% of our students during the first 5 years of our M.A. in Communication Program have presented papers at regional, national, or international conferences. Two students had “Top Papers” at a National Communication Association Conference. And Furthermore, two other students have been co-authors on publications with department faculty.
The University has also been positively impacted by our students “spreading the word” about our program and their recruitment of work colleagues and friends. In addition, approximately 20% of our students have served and/or are serving as Graduate Assistants in a breadth of departments, schools, and programs across campus. And several of our graduate students have been members of the Graduate Student Assembly. Furthermore, numerous students have participated in service learning courses and supported our community partners in those classes. And three of our graduate students have participated via Independent Study in interdisciplinary research projects with faculty from Communication and the SON.

Finally, our 81% retention rate over the past 5-years is another example of how our students have demonstrated their commitment to Fairfield University’s values, goals, and mission.

5. Dr. James Shanahan was the initial Director of our on-campus M.A. in Communication Program (Dr. James Keenan had been Director of our off-campus M.A. in Organizational Communication Cohort Program prior to the start of the on-campus program). However, with Dr. Shanahan’s departure to Boston University in September 2009, Dr. Michael Pagano was voted by the Communication Department to serve a three-year term as the Director of Graduate Studies. That initial term was extended for another three-years beginning in September 2012. Dr. Pagano remains the Director of Graduate Studies and is the adviser for all M.A. in Communication students until they enroll in their proposal course (CO 560 or CO 570) at which time they are partnered with a Thesis/Project Director who becomes their adviser for the remainder of the program. Dr. Pagano will be on sabbatical in spring 2014 and Dr. Qin Zhang has been selected by the Communication Department to serve as the Director in his absence.

6. Our M.A. in Communication Program has adequate resources to accomplish our goals and mission. We have been given increased funds to assist graduate students in attending conferences where they are presenting papers; however, these funds are very minimal and unfortunately generally only help with conference registration and a small portion of travel. Consequently, our students are financially unable to stay beyond their presentation date to attend some of these valuable scholarly discussions and interact with graduate students and researchers from across the country or the world. Additionally funding that would allow graduate students to truly participate in the conference experience would be greatly beneficial to these exceptional members of our Program.

We have adequate classrooms, although the furnishings for most of the classrooms are antiquated and not conducive to a seminar environment. Recently, the University opened a graduate student lounge in Donnarumma, but it can only comfortably accommodate a handful of graduate students at one time and with nearly 1,000 graduate students now matriculating on campus a larger space dedicated to graduate students, or individual spaces for each program would be very helpful to student-team projects, collaboration and networking. Our Program budget, except for the addition of $1,000 for graduate student travel and a shared GA position, has remained essentially unchanged over the past 5 years.
In terms of the revenue and especially the “net contributions” of the M.A. in Communication Program (see attached spreadsheet), the Communication Department is very pleased to have contributed $256,239.00 to the University over the past 5 years. However, we are acutely aware that the number of new applicants and enrolled students has declined over the past two years and not met the 2007 enrollment projections. Among the reasons for these declines are the struggling economy the past five years, as well as the creation of Communication graduate programs locally (Sacred Heart University in 2011 and University of Bridgeport in 2012). In addition, our new on-campus graduate programs (MPA and MLS) may not be directly in conflict with our applications, but are clearly diluting our marketing funds and reach. Furthermore, it should be reiterated that in 2007 when these enrollment guesstimates were made, it was an entirely different national and regional economy, a different graduate education environment locally, and therefore resulted in unrealistic marketing/potential interest projections.

We are hopeful that the nine new students enrolled this AY (26% of our current matriculating students), are a good indicator of the continued interest in our M.A. in Communication Program. In addition, the increase in graduate programs across the University provides interdisciplinary opportunities for students in the SON, MPA, MLS, DSB, and AS Programs to enroll in Communication courses that will enhance their Fairfield University graduate education.

In an effort to get closer to/reach the 60 full- and part-time matriculating students that we feel would be the ideal continuing enrollment for this Program, the Communication Department is discussing offering a 5-year BA/MA option for exceptional Communication majors. In addition, we continue to work with the Office of Graduate Admissions and the Marketing Department to create messages and opportunities to attract new applicants.

Respectfully submitted November 29, 2013, by Dr. Michael Pagano, Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Communication.
6. Graduate Program Update

MP reminded everyone that as starting January 15 – June 01, 2014, QZ would be the interim Director of Graduate Studies. MP stated that he had been sending QZ material related to the Grad Dir process and policies. MP said he would work with DG to set the fall grad schedule before 1/15/14 and that only one faculty member, MP, had expressed an interest in offering a summer course—so MP will be offering CO 430 in summer ’14.

MP mentioned that 3 graduate students: Angela Rudas & Matthew Beasley co-authored a paper at NCA and Ryan Cassella presented his solo-authored paper as well. MP attended the presentations and discussed how well the 3 grad students did. MP also met with the 3 of them for a celebratory gathering after their presentations and informed the faculty how grateful the grad students were for the faculty’s support of their work and for the Program’s financial support for their trip to DC and their registration.

MP reminded everyone that there are 9 new grad students in the Program this AY and at least one more is applying for spring enrollment. DG said he spoke this week with a Comm alumnus from last year who intends to apply for spring semester in our grad program as well.

MP mentioned that the 5-Year Program Review he had circulated to faculty was being reviewed by the ASCC this Tuesday. He also promised that he would shepherd it through the EPC and Academic Council Committees in the spring while he is on sabbatical so QZ would not have to deal with it.

SR commented that it was obvious from the survey that our alumni felt that our M.A. in Communication Program was providing both the skills and theories they need to apply their learnings to their professional work. CA & MS added their support for the review and its clear illustration of how we have met our intended mission and goals. CA mentioned that it was great that our courses would help out the new programs--MPA & MLS. DG reminded everyone about how many of our grad students had presented at Communication conferences and that two of them had been awarded “Top Paper” distinctions. MW and QZ felt the low attrition rate reflected the hard work of our faculty to meet grad students needs, but that we need to continue to work with the Athletic Department to try and identify applicants who are trying to only get a 5th year of sports and not commit to finishing their M.A. degree. SR made a motion to approve the 5-year review of the M.A. in Communication Program, everyone agreed--unanimous approval.

Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee
meeting of December 10, 2013
meeting in BCC 204

Draft Minutes
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1. M.A. in Communication Five-Year Review

Prof. Pagano presented the five-year review of the M.A. communication program. MA/BA 5th year is proposed to attract students. Prof. Miecznikowski asked who the prospective students are. Prof. Pagano responded that prospective students are from various sectors. Prof. Sauer asked what percentage of the program includes funded athlete students? Prof. Pagano responded that they have been phased out. Prof. Rosivach questioned the justice of drawing such athletes without sufficient funding for their entirety of their academic career. Dean Crabtree stated that there exists a pool of money for these student. We are credited for the revenue. Prof. Rosivach inquired about the current number of students (32) in the program and the program finances. Prof. Pagano is satisfied with with the current numbers. From proposed number of 60, the optimal number is in reality 30. Prof. Rosivach asked whether the success of other programs impacted the decreasing numbers. Prof. Pagano commented that early enthusiasm for the program has stabilized. Dean Crabtree discussed the marketing difficulties. Enrollment projections faltered; the program did well and students raced through. The marketing preceded the economic crisis. Cross-listing courses also helped to maximize resources. We will see whether this has been rectified in the 2015 budget. Prof. Nantz was curious to know how success in the MA in Communication compared to GSEAP and other graduate programs in general. Prof. Nantz moved to endorse the program; Prof. Sauer seconded. The review was unanimously accepted.

EPC Meeting February 20, 2014

Present: Cathy Giapponi (Chair), Angela Biselli, Olivia Harriott, Qin Zhang, Paul Fitzgerald, Lynn Babington, Nancy Manister, Mark Scalese, Evelyn Bilias Lolis, Robbin Crabtree.

Regrets: Peter Bayers, Cinthia Gannett, Diana Mager (Sabbatical),

Professor Giapponi called the meeting to order at 3:30 PM.

Agenda Item 1: M.A. in Communication Program, Five Year Review.
Guest: David Gudelunas (standing in for Michael Pagano who is on sabbatical).

A report was submitted to EPC Committee for review: M.A. in Communication Program, Five Year Review.

Professor Giapponi reviewed past minutes of EPC regarding our role in the review of a 5 year plan, including the review of the Film, Television and Media Arts program. She received input from SVPAA Fitzgerald and Professor Scalese. To clarify, EPC’s role is to provide consultation, make recommendations or suggestions, express any concerns regarding the program. The EPC votes on the endorsement of the 5 year review. The Journal of Record does not explicitly outline the committee’s role.

SVPAA Fitzgerald indicated that the role of EPC is deeply informative, likening our role to that of a “think tank.” The EPC is one of the last necessary steps in the “routing procedures” for new programs, closing programs, as well as review of programs. The committee provides expertise and serves as a resource.

Professor Gudelunas was invited into the meeting.

Discussion of M.A. in Communication Program:
Professor Gudelunas provided an overview of the Five Year Review. He indicated that although the numbers are down, the program is healthy. A lot of classes have been introduced over the last 5 years, and many students have graduated. At this time, there are a larger number of students at the end of the program finishing theses, than entering the program. This is viewed as a challenge.

Professor Zhang noted that applications are starting to pick up, and this is encouraging. SVPAA Fitzgerald indicated that that the target number of credit hours was 123 and 129 are currently offered. Professor Gudelunas noted that the vast majority of students are full time rather than part time students. Some are Fairfield University graduates from both Communications and other majors.
In terms of the future, the Communication Department is planning a 5 year BA/MA program. The challenge is to provide a variety of courses of different content at undergraduate and graduate levels.

Students from other programs are taking Communication master's level courses and Communication students can take up to 2 courses from outside their program.

Professor Gudelunas feels that program is going well and that students are happy. Students often form a cohort, although the program is not designed as such, and lend support to each other. Demographics for program vary from new graduates to students in their 50's. Some are 5th year athletes. Reportedly, graduates of both the graduate and undergraduate Communication programs are successful after graduation.

Dean Babington noted that MSN nursing students will need electives in a year or so, and might be interested in Communications classes to fill these electives.

Dean Crabtree indicated that the trend is an increase in enrollment at the undergraduate level and a decrease at graduate level. She also suggested one credit tech related course offerings.

In terms of resources, Professor Gudelunas and Professor Zhang noted that it is a struggle to finance graduate students attending and presenting at conferences. Additionally, there is a need for computer laboratory space, and statistical and qualitative software. Also, digital media skills and web production classes are needed. Special topics courses are designed to meet some of these needs.

SVPAA Fitzgerald indicated that we are in a competitive market regarding tuition. Student fees are a way to bring in additional revenue when needed. He also suggested practice-based and online courses.

Professor Gudelunas reported that students are surveyed every semester, and that is how special topics courses are developed.

Professor Giapponi thanked Professor Gudelunas for his report. He left the meeting.

A motion was made by Dean Babington, seconded by Professor Bilias Lolis, to endorse The MA in Communication – Five-year review. The motion passed unanimously.