ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, September 9, 2013
CNS 200
3:30 – 5:00 PM

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

1. Presidential courtesy

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
   b. Correspondence
      i. Memo from GFS with roster and meeting dates (attached)
      ii. Guide to taking AC minutes (attached)
   c. Oral reports

4. Council Subcommittee Reports
   a. Subcommittee on the status of part-time faculty (attachment)
   b. Subcommittee on sexual misconduct policies (attachment)
   c. Subcommittee on broader academic freedom language for governance documents
   d. Subcommittee to consider proposing IDEA form for administrators
   e. Subcommittee on grievance procedures
   f. Subcommittee on maternity leave policy
   g. Subcommittee to review hiring procedures

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

6. Old Business

7. New business
   a. Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees: report on June meeting and guidance for October meeting
   b. Motion on Subcommittee on Calendar Issues, and election of members (attachment)

• Lists of Attachments, Pending, and Ongoing Items are on page 2
List of Attachments:
For item 3.a. Academic Council minutes of April 8 (pp. 3-7), April 29 (pp. 8-13), May 8 (pp. 13-16), and May 28 (p. 17)
For item 3.b.i. Memo from GFS with roster and meeting dates (p. 18)
For item 3.b.ii. Guide to taking AC minutes (p. 19)
For item 4.a. Report of the Subcommittee on the Status of Part-Time Faculty (pp. 20-26)
For item 4.b. Report of the subcommittee on sexual misconduct policies (p. 27-34)
For item 7.b. Motion on calendar issues (p. 35)

Pending Items:
A. Faculty Data Committee (AC 12/3/07).
B. MFA in Creative Writing, Five-Year-Review due in 12/2012 (AC 12/3/07).
C. Re-evaluation of offering both paper and online options for IDEA forms, spring 2014 (AC 5/14/12)
D. Re-evaluation of continued use of “yellow sheet” qualitative evaluations, spring 2014 (AC 5/14/12)
E. AC revisits the accessibility of teaching evaluation data, Due spring 2012. (AC 4/19/10)
F. AC three year review of Merit Appeals Policy, fall 2013. (AC 11/1/10)
G. AC three year review of Intellectual Properties Policy, spring 2014. (AC 3/7/11)
H. MPA, five year review in 2017-2018 (AC 9/10/12)
I. Handbook items to be revisited (AC 4/16/12)

Ongoing Items:
1. Report by SVPAA to AC each semester to inform the council of any approved exceptions to the Athletic Department’s policy of not scheduling athletic events that conflict with final exams.
2. Report from the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees after each meeting with board members. At the end of each academic year, discuss items for the Conference Committee to put on the agenda for their meetings with members of the board the following year
Academic Council Meeting Draft Minutes
Monday, April 8, 2013
3:35-5:10pm

Present: Professors Shawn Rafalski, Elizabeth Petrino, Phil Lane, David Winn, Roxana Walker-Canton, David Downie, Bob Epstein (Executive Secretary), Wendy Kohli, Dennis Keenan (Chair), Susan Rakowitz (General Faculty Secretary), Chris Huntley, John Lasseter, Mousumi Bhattacharya, James He, Nancy Dallavalle, and Joe Dennin

Student: Rob Vogel

Administrators: Deans Susan Franzosa, Lynn Babington, SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald SJ

Guests: Prof. Jocelyn Boryczka, Melissa Quan, Prof. Paula Gill Lopez, Assoc. Dean Meredith Kazer Wallace, Prof. Danke Li, Prof. Laura McSweeney

Chair Keenan called the meeting to order at 3:35pm.

1. Presidential Courtesy.

SVPAA Fitzgerald said that the recent Open House was a great success, with almost 3000 people attending. Evaluations were very positive, with good comments about the faculty involved. In addition, graduate admissions numbers are ahead of last year.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty.

Prof. Rakowitz indicated that Academic Council may need to meet during finals week and perhaps over the summer. She suggested May 28 and/or June 26.

Prof. Rakowitz pointed out that the current and longstanding practice regarding the awarding of transfer credits for incoming freshmen does not match the Journal of Record (JOR). Apparently the JOR policy would put us at a competitive disadvantage with other schools. There is a committee planning on bringing forward a proposal to change the policy, but in the meantime, she authorized the continuation of the longstanding practice, with the understanding that the policy and practice will be aligned by Fall of 2014.

Prof. Rakowitz reported on the search for a new EVP/COO. She summarized the President's description of the position along with concerns she had expressed to him about the need for the position, the expense (especially in light of the current budget context), and the emphasis on business over higher education experience. She said that the Academic Council will likely be involved in an advisory capacity in the search.

Motion (Lane/He): Academic Council is on record that it opposes the addition of the new EVP position at this time to Fairfield University as a Jesuit and Catholic University.

Prof. Epstein expressed confusion over the new organizational chart. How does the EVP position differ from the VP for Administration? SVPAA Fitzgerald said that the new position expands the previous Executive VP position to include oversight of Enrollment Management and Marketing and Communication.

Prof. Bhattacharya expressed concern that the position did not require previous academic experience. The failure rate for positions that do not require relevant experience is pretty high. Prof. He agreed, saying that a COO manages production, which would seem to be academics at a University.

The motion passed, 10 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary.
Prof. Epstein submitted the minutes from the February 4 and February 25 meetings.

The minutes were approved 13-0-1

4. Council Subcommittee Reports.

Item 4f. Subcommittee on Community-Engaged Scholarship (CES).

Prof. Rakowitz agreed to chair the Academic Council so that Prof. Keenan could speak to the matter at hand.

Prof. Keenan reviewed the history of the committee and the recommended changes to the rank and tenure guidelines. There are no recommended changes to the Faculty handbook but only to the Journal of Record.

Jocelyn Boryczka noted that Fairfield University received a Carnegie Classification as a Community Engaged Campus in 2008. The university now needs to formalize a policy that recognizes and rewards CES in order to retain the classification into the future.

Melissa Quan said that the recommended evaluation criteria for CES in the rank and tenure process were based on what other schools that also have the designation have done. The subcommittee’s discussions about the criteria are described in the subcommittee minutes.

Motion (Epstein/ Lane) to approve the proposed changes to the Guidelines and Timetable for Applications for Tenure and Promotion presented on pages 17-21 of the AC packet for 4/8/13.

Prof. Dennin criticized the language of the guideline as being too vague. It was unclear how CES differed from consulting. SVPAA Fitzgerald said that it is up to the faculty member to submit his or her work for peer review, which should address whether the work meets the guidelines. Prof. Dennin again noted that the language did not indicate what exactly was being peer reviewed. Prof. Keenan responded by saying that it was up to the faculty member to make his or her case in the Rank and Tenure process. All the CES guideline does is provide a place for it in the dossier. Prof. Boryczka then gave an example of how a faculty member might make his or her case.

Prof. Petrino asked about the connection between service learning and CES. Melissa Quan said that service learning is about teaching, while CES is about research. Prof. Keenan described the guidelines as providing a bridge between teaching and scholarship that clarifies things for junior faculty.

Prof. Bhattacharya noted that the guideline can complicate assessment. Prof. Keenan again said that providing evidence remains the responsibility of the faculty member. SVPAA Fitzgerald then stated that the new guideline codifies what has been intended recent practice at Fairfield University. Prof. Kohli agreed, saying that the CES guideline is no different from any other tenure criteria, in that it’s always up the faculty member to make the case.

Prof. Dennin asked for clarification regarding payment. Why should it matter if the faculty member is getting paid for the work? Prof. Boryczka responded that it is a matter of intent.

Prof. Lane called the question.

Motion passed, 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

5. No petitions for immediate hearing.

A motion passed to reorder the agenda, taking up 7a, b and c before 6a.

7a. Committee on Conference with the Trustees.
Prof. Paula Gill Lopez recounted the activities at the recent trustees meeting. The main agenda item was academic priorities, with the discussion and tone being quite positive. Fr. Baldovin, SJ, Trustee and Chair, said in the end that there were two takeaways from the meeting: i) faculty feel that there is no compelling strategic plan; and ii) the morale issue with faculty was not solely about salary and compensation. The observed balance between academic and non-academic priorities was troubling to the faculty. Prof. Lane and Dean Babington confirmed Prof. Gill Lopez’s summary. SVPAA Fitzgerald concurred, saying that the meeting was fruitful and respectful, with the report by the chair to the full board of trustees reflecting Prof. Gill Lopez’s account.

Prof. Gill Lopez said that the crux of the discussion came down to the financial allocation given to academics, citing the current rebranding effort as an example of a costly activity that has no bearing on academics.

Prof. Lane, Prof. Dennin, and Prof. Downie described similar conversations at other Trustees committee meetings. There were further discussions of financial priorities and budgets, with Prof. Downie noting that sports seem to be a focus because of the fundraising implications.

7b. Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee (FDEC)

Prof. Kazer Wallace described proposed membership changes in the FDEC. With the closing of University College, the committee recommends allocating its slot to the School of Engineering.

**Motion (He/Winn) to accept the proposal to change the Handbook description of the membership of the FDEC as follows (additions in bold, deletions struck through):**

Seven members elected from the faculty for three-year overlapping terms, according to the following electoral divisions: **four three** from the College of Arts & Sciences, **one each from and the School of Engineering**, at most one faculty member from the School of Engineering may serve at any one time, **one each from** the School of Nursing, the School of Business, and the Graduate School of Education & Allied Professions. **The Dean of University College or the appointed representative of the same shall be an ex officio member with a right to vote. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs or the appointed representative of the same shall be an ex officio member with a right to vote.**

**Motion passed, 16 in favor, 0 against, and 0 abstentions**

7c. Faculty Research Committee (FRC)

Profs. Danke Li and Laura McSweeney summarized the FRC’s changes to the grant application process. The intention is to get more faculty funded for research. The new application forms clarify the process to improve the quality of the applications.

Prof. Rakowitz directed everyone to the revised sabbatical application process provided in the meeting agenda. Prof. Lane expressed concern that there was no appeals process if the proposal was denied. Prof. Dallavalle responded that appeals were outside the scope of the work being discussed. Prof. Epstein suggested that the FRC could be directed to consider an appeals process after the vote on the current proposal.

Prof. He returned to Prof. Lane’s concern, saying that it is possible to get denied even when the faculty member follows the rules. Prof. Li gave an example in which a proposal was returned to a faculty member for clarification. The intent is always to accept the proposal unless there is a reason to deny it.

Prof. Rakowitz noted the differences between pre-tenure sabbatical applications and the post-tenure sabbatical applications. Dean Franzosa noted that pre-tenure sabbaticals are mentioned in the offer letters to junior faculty hires. SVPAA Fitzgerald and Prof. McSweeney responded that the opportunity to apply is guaranteed but acceptance is not.
Motion (Fitzgerald/Epstein) to approve the changes to the JOR as presented on pages 35-50 of the AC packet for 4/8/13.

SVpAA Fitzgerald spoke in favor of the motion, saying that the revisions have been a focus of the FRC for four years. Fairfield University does not set a fixed budget for sabbaticals but awards all that are worthy. For the grants, we want more applicants.

Prof. Lasseter asked about academic renewal. Is that a justification for requesting a sabbatical? Prof. Li responded that it is justified only if it is specified as scholarship. It can’t be a vague request for time to renew a hobby. We want to reward faculty for being intentional in their scholarship. The new language is to give more guidance to faculty that the sabbatical application should address specific professional goals.

Motion passed 14 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Motion (Lane/Dallavalle): The AC requests the Faculty Research Committee to deliver to the Academic Council a proposal for an appeals process for sabbaticals and pre-tenure research leaves.

Prof. Dennin and Prof. Lane spoke in favor of the motion, saying that it is important to have a transparent appeals process. Dean Franzosa agreed, saying that we need to have due process in the matter of appeals. Prof. Walker-Canton added that both the decision and the appeal should be in writing. Prof. Keenan said that the need for written record should be taken as a recommendation to the FRC.

Motion passed, 14 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

6a. Proposed changes in final exam policy from the UCC

Prof. Rakowitz asked to untable the motion about the final exam policy. The issue centered around the percentage of the course grade to be determined by an in-class final exam. Under the proposed policy an in-class final exam could not constitute more than one-third of the overall course grade.

Motion (Rakowitz/Second): to amend the final exam policy in the JOR as follows (additions in bold, deletions struck through):

Final Exam Policy:
1. Each instructor should be given a wide latitude, so as to provide for a degree of creativity and flexibility in how the students will be tested. The form of evaluation should be in keeping with the goals and purposes of the course.
2. In every case the form of the final, end-of-semester comprehensive evaluation (such as written examination, take-home, oral exam, paper, etc. or a combination of these) must appear on the syllabus at the beginning of the semester.
3. The normal form of final evaluations is a written examination, two to three hours in length, to be administered at the date and time assigned by the Registrar. Written examinations less than two hours or more than three hours will require written notification of the students, Dean, and chairperson, program director or area coordinator, as appropriate.
4. If the professor chooses a method of evaluation other than the normal 2 to 3 hour written examination on the assigned date and time, the following criteria must be met:
   a. A memorandum must be submitted in writing to the chairperson, program director or area coordinator and the appropriate dean, reasonably in advance of the end of the semester, describing the alternate form of the final evaluation to be used.
   b. No greater demands should be made of a student's time and effort by an alternate form of final examination than would be required by preparation and taking of the normal 2 to 3 hour written examination.
3. c. No alternative form of final evaluation is to be due prior to the date assigned by the Registrar for that course's final examination.
4. The final comprehensive evaluation should reflect integration of course materials discussed during the semester.


Final Exam as a Percentage of Total Grade: The final examination should constitute approximately 1/3 of a grade with exceptions requiring written notification to student, dean, and chairperson.
CR: 11/02/1987

Weighting of Course Components for Grading Purposes
There is no single formula for the weighting of course components, but in all classes, students should receive feedback on their work at multiple points during the semester. In classes for which the final assessment is an in-class examination, that exam should not count for more than 1/3 of the course grade.

Prof. Petrino asked about the intention of the motion. Is the change mostly about in-class vs. out-of-class final exams. Prof. Rakowitz confirmed, referring to the original concerns raised by the FDEC about high stakes testing.

Rob Vogel asked if a final presentation (instead of a final exam) with 50% weight conform to the proposed policy. Prof. Rakowitz responded that the focus is on final exams and that other kinds of assignments could be considered separately.

James He spoke against the motion, saying that there might be some cases where having a final exam with more than 33% weight might be reasonable. He saw the proposed policy as being too restrictive.

David Downie called the question.

Motion passed, 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 3 abstentions

The meeting adjourned at 5:10pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Chris Huntley
ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES (DRAFT)
Monday, April 29, 2013

Present: Professors Nancy Dallavalle, Joe Dennin, Bob Epstein (Executive Secretary), James He, Chris Huntley, Dennis Keenan, (Chair), Ginny Kelly, Wendy Kohli, Phil Lane, John Lasseter, Susan Rakowitz (General Faculty Secretary), Shawn Rafalski, Joyce Shea.


Invited Guests: Professors Paula Gill-Lopez (item 7b), Kathy Nantz (item 4c), Marice Rose (item 7i), Carl Scheraga (item 7c).

Regrets: Mousumi Bhattacharya, David Downie, Elizabeth Petrino

Chair Keenan called the meeting to order at 3:30.

1. Presidential Courtesy

SVPAA Fitzgerald S.J. announced that AVPAA Mary Frances Malone is working on commencement. 882 bachelor’s degrees; 394 master’s degrees; 18 Certificates of Advanced Study; and 3 doctorates will be awarded.

SVPAA Fitzgerald S.J. announced that next year will be his fifth year in his current position and that he is planning to step down. In addition, Dean Susan Franzosa will be stepping down from her position as Dean of GSEAP this summer.

Professor Dennin asked how many freshmen were expected to enroll for the fall 2013 semester. SVPAA Fitzgerald, S.J. stated that we are slightly above last year’s numbers at this time. Last year’s enrollment included 991 freshmen.

Professor Rakowitz reported on an email exchange she had with President von Arx, S.J. that included two subjects. 1. The Council approved a motion indicating that we are on record opposing the addition of a new EVP at this time. The President indicated that this is a responsibility that rests with him. He will get back to the Council regarding the interviewing process, and 2. The Council approved a motion requesting that the President continue to invite the Chair of the Faculty Salary Committee (or designee) to the Budget Committee. The President indicated his intention to do so.

2. Report from the Executive Secretary

a. Approval of minutes from 3/4/13

Corrections: Prof Rafalski noted that on page 4, in the 1st paragraph a question that was attributed to Prof Rakowitz was in fact asked by Prof Rafalski.

MOTION (Lane/Fitzgerald): To approve the minutes of 3/4/13 as amended.

MOTION PASSED: 13 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

b. Approval of minutes from 3/18/13

MOTION (Lane/ Dallavalle): To approve the minutes of 3/18/13.

MOTION PASSED: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.
c.  Oral Reports

Prof Epstein informed the Council that a faculty member was potentially planning to give material directly to members of the Academic Council, without vetting it through the Executive Committee. Prof Epstein indicated that this is not within normal protocol and informed the Council that if we receive information that is not part of our agenda, we should treat it as correspondence between faculty members and not as official Academic Council business.

4. Council Subcommittee Reports

a.  Subcommittee on the status of part-time faculty

Prof Kathy Nantz presented an interim report, beginning by bringing the Council’s attention to the categories of inquiry (located on p. 1 of the NTT Task Force Update) in the meeting packet. The subcommittee is in the process of conducting a survey to answer the questions that have emerged in these 4 areas and to develop a profile of non-tenure track (almost 400) faculty.

A survey has been developed and is ready to go out (with the support of Amy Boczer, Director of Institutional Research). The primary issue at this point is the development of an appropriate email list for distributing the survey.

Prof Nantz brought the Council’s attention to information pertaining to a similar task force at the University of Maryland. While the two school profiles differ, this issue seems to be experienced at other universities.

Finally, Prof Nantz respectfully requested of the SVPAA a small stipend to complete this work over the summer (perhaps $1000.00 to cover small stipends and administrative costs associated with development and distribution of the survey).

Prof Lasseter suggested that CNS should be able to assist in finding a technical solution to the email list development issue. In addition, he asked about our retention rate as it pertains to non-tenure track faculty positions that tend to be ongoing.

Prof Nantz was unable to answer this question with specific data but reported that, based on the latest survey data, a large percentage of part-time faculty report long-term relationships with the university.

b.  Subcommittee on sexual misconduct policies

Chair Keenan reported that this subcommittee has been formed and includes Profs. Dallavalle and Shea.

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

SVPAA Fitzgerald, S.J. asked that the Council charge the executive committee with beginning the process of electing faculty members to 2 search committees; one for the position of SVPAA and one for the position of Dean of GSEAP. He noted that in recent similar searches the search committees consisted of 6 or 7 faculty members and 6 or 7 administrators/”friends” of the university.

Dean Franzosa suggested that we might want to consider how this process was approached previously.

SVPAA Fitzgerald noted that it would be helpful to begin this process during the summer, as the bulk of the work for both committees will take place in October of 2013.

MOTION (Fitzgerald/Lane): To charge the executive committee of the Academic Council with proposing a process for providing faculty representation on these 2 search committees, including what the composition of both might be.
Discussion:

Prof Rakowitz reminded the council that the President ultimately determines the size of each committee and that the Academic Council decides the composition of faculty representation.

Prof Kohli proposed that the Council let the executive committee do some research and report back with additional information.

MOTION PASSED: 13 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

6. Old business

a. Proposed changes to Spring 2014 Academic Calendar

Prof Epstein reported that the most pressing and necessary calendar change was to the length of the spring semester. The subcommittee has proposed schedule changes in response to the disparity of teaching days and overall length of the semester, in the form of a 3-part motion:

MOTION (Epstein/Lane):
(1) That the first day of classes for the Spring 2014 semester be changed from Tuesday, January 21, to Thursday, January 16.
(2) That Tuesday, February 18 should follow a Monday schedule rather than a Tuesday schedule for undergraduate day classes. The administration should communicate to faculty that flexibility should be allowed for instructors who have unavoidable teaching conflicts and for students who have obligations that cannot be rescheduled. Professors should be encouraged to demonstrate sensitivity to students with scheduling conflicts, particularly in scheduling exams and other major assignments.
(3) That Monday turbos should not be offered as regular undergraduate time codes in the Spring 2014 semester.

Discussion:

Prof Dallavalle suggested that we consider removing the text in part 2 of the motion beyond the first sentence.

AMENDED MOTION (Dallavalle/Kohli): To strike the 2nd and 3rd sentences in part 2 of original motion.

Discussion:

Prof Rakowitz spoke against the amended motion, stating that the proposed language might provide necessary support and clarity.

Prof Epstein spoke against the motion stating that the proposed language is helpful.

Prof Kohli suggested that it might make sense to consider placing an asterisk after the first sentence of part 2.

Prof Dallavalle reiterated that striking this text makes sense, given that we are so “thin”.

Prof Lane called the question.

QUESTION CALLED, AMENDMENT PASSED: 7 in favor, 6 opposed, 1 abstention.

AMMENDED MOTION PASSED: 13 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.
7. New business

a. Ballot of candidates for Committee on Committees

Prof Rakowitz reported that there are 2 openings for the Committee on Committees; both must be filled by faculty in the humanities. Beth Boquet and Ryan Drake have put their names forward.

**MOTION (Rakowitz/Lane): To place Beth Boquet and Ryan Drake on the ballot for the Committee on Committees.**

**MOTION PASSED: 13 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions**

b. Committee on Conference: advice on June meeting with Board

Prof Gill-Lopez joined the meeting, asking for input regarding the upcoming meeting of the Committee on Conference (CoC) with the Academic Affairs (AA) subcommittee of the Board of Trustees (BOT).

Prof Gill-Lopez reported that, at the conclusion of the last meeting with the AA subcommittee, Prof. John Baldovin, S.J., Chair of the subcommittee, was clear on 2 concerns among faculty, that he planned to present to the full Board: 1. The lack of a serious strategic plan for the university, and 2. Low morale, due in part to proposed changes in faculty compensation. Several members of the CoC have proposed following up on the full Board’s reaction/response to these concerns. In addition, Prof Gill-Lopez reported that the CoC might follow up on Bishop Murry’s, S.J. question regarding whether there has been an equivalent increase in faculty and administrative positions. SVPAA Fitzgerald responded by indicating that, depending on the timeframe, these numbers are not equivalent.

Prof Dennin suggested that we may know in a month’s time how faculty morale has truly been affected.

Prof Epstein suggested that the CoC propose to the AA subcommittee that a strategic long-term solution to the compensation issues is necessary, and this might eliminate the annual struggles that have become routine.

Prof Gill-Lopez mentioned that there is a desire on the part of the Board to come to a multi-year agreement.

c. Motion to require the administration to prepare a strategic plan

Prof Scheraga shared that, last year the university garnered a substantial budget surplus that “disappeared” without discussions with the Budget Committee (BC). When members of the BC raised questions regarding the surplus, they were unable to obtain cogent answers. The BC continues to argue that the process being employed does not align with best practices. In addition, the BC was informed that the academic division will bear all indirect costs associated with running the university.

**MOTION (Lane/Kohli): The faculty calls on the President and the Board of Trustees to present to the Fairfield University Community a written, formal, and comprehensive strategic plan reflecting both a five year and ten year vision for the institution. The document thus generated will reflect professionally accepted format and content guidelines for institutions of higher education. The document will also incorporate best practices assessment mechanisms across all levels and all divisions of the University. It is thus understood that all of the content of this document will span all divisions, without exception, across the institution.**

Discussion:

Prof Rakowitz supported the notion of having this plan, but she was unclear as to the role of faculty in the development of such a plan.
Prof Lasseter suggested adding language specifying that the plan will provide transparency and accountability. He also raised the question of who has the authority to put such a plan in place. Is the process top down or collaborative? In addition, who decides whether we are maintaining compliance with the strategic plan? His concern is that without knowing these things, we run the risk of weakening faculty governance.

Prof Epstein brought the Council’s attention to the first paragraph of *The Faculty Handbook* which clarifies that faculty must have a role in this process. In addition Prof Epstein asked if the Council might need to consider an additional motion regarding a specific, direct explanation for shifting financial support from the academic division to other divisions within the university.

Prof Dallavalle noted that Prof Scheraga listed a series of behaviors observed over the course of BC meetings. She asked the Council if any members possessed information that might contradict Prof Scheraga’s interpretation. Nobody possessed any such information.

Prof Huntley shared his concern that we do not have a recorded account of how or why the financial status of the university has been impacted. He wonders how we can begin the process of developing a strategic plan without this information.

SVPAA Fitzgerald, S.J. reminded the Council that we have a strategic plan with 3 goals that we have made progress on. In addition, he pointed out that over the past 4 years progress has been made in shared governance within the academic division. He also indicated that no money has been taken from the academic affairs division to be used elsewhere. His perception is that the increase in costs is the result of the large debt the university has assumed and the increase in the amount of financial aid granted. Finally he noted that net tuition revenue has gone up.

Prof Scheraga suggested that we could amend the motion to include explicitly requiring collaboration with faculty and staff in the development of the strategic plan. He added that a strategic plan can function as a benchmark that will provide the budget committee with a way to assess expenditures against what is deemed strategically consistent.

Prof Dennin noted that it seems that numbers are just plugged in with no real thought and that often the data are incorrect.

**AMENDED MOTION (Dallavalle/Lane):** The faculty calls on the President to join with the Fairfield University community in the development of a written, formal, and comprehensive strategic plan reflecting both a five year and ten year vision for the institution. The document thus generated will reflect professionally accepted format and content guidelines for institutions of higher education. The document will also incorporate best practices assessment mechanisms across all levels and all divisions of the University. It is thus understood that all of the content of this document will span all divisions, without exception, across the institution.

**MOTION TO AMEND ORIGINAL MOTION PASSES:** 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

Discussion of amended motion:

Prof He spoke in favor of the motion, suggesting that we have lacked a strategic vision.

Prof Huntley spoke in favor of the motion. He stated that, “to do otherwise would be striving for mediocrity.”

**AMENDED MOTION PASSES:** 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

d. – Procedures governing faculty searches.
SVPPAA Fitzgerald, S.J. reported that he has been working to eliminate inconsistencies in the university-wide procedures governing faculty search committees. His purpose is to give some structure to tenure track searches to maximize the likelihood of diverse pools of qualified applicants, as well as align appropriately with the *Journal of Record* and other campus initiatives.

Prof. Rakowitz noted that the Council may wish to form a subcommittee to review the edited procedures.

Prof. Lane suggested that these procedures should be presented to university counsel.

**MOTION (Rakowitz/Epstein):** The executive committee of the Academic Council will form a subcommittee to review the newly edited procedures for faculty search committees.

Discussion:

Prof. Dennin asked where this information would ultimately reside.

SVPPAA Fitzgerald, S.J. suggested that it be placed at the end of the *Journal of Record*.

**MOTION PASSED:** 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

**MOTION (Epstein/Rakowitz):** To reorder the meeting agenda to move to 7i.

**MOTION PASSED:** 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

**7.i. Proposal for VPA Concentration in Arts Administration**

Prof. Marice Rose presented a proposal for a new program, Visual Arts Administration Concentration, to be offered within the Art History major in the Department of Visual and Performing Arts.

Prof. Rose indicated that this concentration offers graduates a unique opportunity that expands beyond museum theory to include learning experiences incorporating for-profit models. This has been done with the cooperation of DSB faculty.

Discussion:

Prof. Rakowitz noted that the program requirements should be clarified.

**MOTION (Fitzgerald/Rafalski):** To accept this program proposal.

**MOTION PASSES:** 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

**MOTION (Lane/Dennin):** To recess the meeting.

**MOTION:** Passes unanimously.

Meeting recessed at 5:05

Respectfully Submitted,

Ginny Kelly

---

*DRAFT MINUTES*

*ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING*

*May 8, 2013 (Reconvening of April 29, 2013)*

*9:30am  CNS 200*
Present: Professors Dallavalle, Dennin, Epstein (Executive Secretary), Huntley, Keenan (Chair), Kohli, Lane, Lasseter, Petrino, Rakowitz (General Faculty Secretary), Shea, Walker-Canton, and Winn; Deans Crabtree and Gibson; SVPAA Fitzgerald.

Regrets: Bhattacharya, Downie, He, Kelly; Deans Babbington, Beal, and Franzosa.

The April 29, 2013 meeting of the Academic Council was to reconvene with the next item on the Agenda under New Business, item 7e, but the Council agreed to take up a petition for immediate hearing first.

Petition for Immediate Hearing: Faculty Membership on search committees for Senior Vice-President of Academic Affairs and the Dean of GSEAP

Prof. Rakowitz explained that the last time we searched for an SVPAA, the committee consisted of an administrative chair and 5 non faculty members appointed by the President (3 administrators, 1 student, and 1 member of the Board of Trustees) and 5 faculty elected by the Academic Council as follows: 2 from CAS, 2 from 2 different schools other than CAS, and 1 at large. She checked with President von Arx and he said that he would again use the basic structure of 5 and 5 plus an appointed chair, though he had not yet decided on how he would structure his appointments.

Motion: That the faculty membership on the SVPAA search committee consist of 2 faculty members from CAS, 2 from different schools outside of CAS, and 1 at-large.

Motion Passed: (10-0-0)

Prof. Rakowitz said that for recent non-CAS Dean searches, the committees, chaired by the SVPAA had 6 administrative appointees and 6 faculty members elected by the AC as follows: 3 from the school in question, 1 from CAS, 1 from neither the school in question nor CAS and 1 at-large. SVPAA Fitzgerald said he would chair the GSEAP Dean's search committee and would again have 6 appointees and 6 elected faculty.

Motion: That the faculty membership on the GSEAP Dean’s search committee consist of 3 faculty members from GSEAP, 1 from CAS, 1 from a School other than GSEAP or CAS, and 1 at-large.

Motion Passed: (10-0-0)

The Council agreed to meet on 5/28/13 at 10 am for the sole purpose of electing the members of both search committees so that faculty could be fully involved in any aspects of the search that would begin over the summer.

7. New Business

e. Regularization of language in Handbook and Journal of Record

Prof. Rakowitz explained that when the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 Executive Committees thoroughly reviewed the Faculty Handbook in preparation for the 11th edition, they found nine items of concern that they brought to the Academic Council. The Council chose to take up 6 of those items and today's materials include a memo from the current Executive Committee suggesting how these items may be handled. The items are numbered non-consecutively because they retain the numbering from the original nine items brought to the Council.

She noted that four of the items recommend referring the issue to an existing or newly formed committee, one recommends a change to the Journal of Record, and one recommends a change to the Handbook. Prof.
Lane suggested approving all six motions at once, but Prof. Rakowitz asked that the *Handbook* change be voted on separately.

Motion [Lane/Second]: to accept recommendations 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7 from pages 17-18 in the packet for 4/29/13.

1. A subcommittee be formed to compare the current Grievance Procedure to AAUP standards and to recommend revisions to the Council, if appropriate.
2. That the Rank and Tenure Committee be charged with recommending revisions to either the *Handbook* or the *Timetable and Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion* to remove the inconsistency regarding whether an appeal must present additional information or can simply present clarification.
3. Fairfield's maternity policy was designed so that women would not necessarily have their careers interrupted and tenure delayed when taking a leave for childbirth. A subcommittee, including faculty with recent experience on the Rank and Tenure Committee, should be charged with drafting language for the *Handbook* and/or Journal of Record clarifying how time spent on maternity leave will ordinarily be treated with regard to tenure.
4. That the Faculty Salary Committee be charged with making recommendations that would ensure that the reference to maternity leave in the *Handbook* reflects the current policy.
5. Add to the Journal of Record: A normal teaching load for tenured and tenure-track faculty is nine hours per week.

Motion carried without objection.

Prof. Rakowitz explained that the proposed *Handbook* amendment addresses the fact that in its zeal to protect the time of faculty on sabbatical, the *Handbook* policy on voting rights sometimes has the effect of disenfranchising those faculty from important votes.

Motion [Rakowitz/Second]: Amend the *Faculty Handbook* section I.A.4 by deleting items b. and c. and revising (shown below in underline) and re-lettering d.:

b. Faculty members have a contractual obligation to attend meetings of the General Faculty, except when on leave. A faculty member on leave may vote or designate a proxy to vote on his or her behalf in a General Faculty meeting, but is not counted in determining a quorum. An active faculty member [continue to end].

Motion passed: 12-0-1

7.f. Time Code Issues

After some discussion, prompted by a memo from Dean Crabtree (1/23/13), a motion was put on the table:

Motion [Rakowitz/Second]: That the Executive Committee of the Academic Council (ACEC) form a subcommittee of faculty and administrators to re-examine the current undergraduate time codes and make recommendations for changes if appropriate.

Motion Passed (10-0-0)

7.g. Issues involving required student purchase of class materials

Prof. Epstein explained that some faculty have been charging students for required course material that the professor has prepared, and that in some instances the charges are above cost and are intended to compensate the professor for the time required to prepare the material. This seems like a clear conflict of interest, as the professor can arbitrarily set any amount for the compensation of his or her time and effort, and the students are required to pay it. Prof. Lasseter remarked that faculty time is valuable and deserves compensation, that professors should have freedom over their own course content, and that the cost of this self-prepared material is often much less than that of published textbooks. He also noted that many professors assign their own
published works. Prof. Epstein responded that published work has been vetted by professional peer review and that prices are determined by industry standards and by the marketplace, whereas self-prepared and self-published material has not been peer-reviewed and the price, even if less than commercially published books, is arbitrary. SVP Fitzgerald noted that anything sold to students must be sold through the Bookstore, so that the proper sales taxes can be collected; professors should never be selling any material directly to students.

Motion: If students are required to purchase unpublished course materials generated by the professor, then such materials can only be sold through the university bookstore and only for the cost of printing and publication, with no profit margin for the professor.

Motion passed: 10-2-1

7.h. Motion from Committee on Committees regarding composition of the Educational Technology Committee

Motion: In light of the recent administrative restructuring of information technology services at Fairfield, we recommend that, in the Fall of 2013, the Educational Technologies Committee propose restructuring its ex officio membership. The proposal should add the newly created Chief Information Officer as an ex officio position and decrease the total number of ex officio seats.

Motion passed: 13-0-0

7.j. Proposal to change the name of the Program on the Environment

Motion: to change the name of the Program on the Environment to Environmental Studies.

Motion passed: 13-0-0

8. Meeting adjourned at 10:30am.

Motion to adjourn

Motion Passed Unanimously

Respectfully submitted,
Wendy Kohli
MINUTES
ACADEMIC COUNCIL SPECIAL SUMMER MEETING
Tuesday, May 28, 2013
Cansius Hall 200 (The John Carroll Room) 10:00 – 11:30

Present: Professors Dallavalle, Dennin, Downie, Epstein (Executive Secretary), He, Huntley, Keenan (Chair), Kelly, Lane, Petrino, Rakowitz (General Faculty Secretary), and Winn; Dean Crabtree; Fr. Fitzgerald, S.J. (SVPAA).

Regrets: Professors Bhattacharya, Kohli, Rafalski, Shea, Walker-Canton; Deans Babington, Beal, Franzosa, Gibson.

1. Select faculty representatives for the SVPAA Search Committee

Fr. Fitzgerald, S.J. reported that the President had agreed to the Academic Council’s recommendation on the configuration of the SVPAA search committee. Fr. Fitzgerald reconfirmed his agreement on the structure of the search committee for the new Dean for the Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions.

Fr. Fitzgerald, S.J. requested that faculty members who are serving in temporary administrative position be able to run for a faculty position on search committees.

**MOTION: (Rakowitz/Dennin): Faculty serving as administrators cannot serve as faculty members on search committees for academic administrators.**

**MOTION PASSED: 11 in favor, 1 opposed.**

As a result of this motion, Profs. Kazer and Preli were removed from the ballots.

There was some discussion of the possible use of proxies because of the unusual timing of this meeting. Prof. Rakowitz explained that the Council had voted to allow proxies the last time they elected an SVPAA search committee at a similar summer meeting.

**MOTION: (Petrino/Huntley); For the two search committees to be selected today, proxies would be allowed, and only for this meeting.**

Prof. Dallavalle objected that not everyone was aware of this possibility. Prof. Rakowitz explained that in announcing this meeting, the Executive Secretary had asked members to let him know if they would not be able to attend and had told all such respondents that the ACEC would be suggesting allowing proxies. So those who sent regrets knew that if they chose to leave a proxy, it might be accepted.

**MOTION PASSED: 8 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstention.**

Ballots were distributed by Professors Dennin and Epstein for the Search Committee for the new Academic Vice President and after several rounds of voting the following faculty were elected:

Professors Crawford, Dallavalle, Rakowitz, Robert, and Schmidt.

2. Select faculty representatives for the GSEAP Dean Search Committee

Ballots were distributed by Professors Dennin and Epstein for the Search Committee for the new Dean of the Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions and after several rounds of voting the following faculty were elected:

Professors Bowen, A. Campbell, Conelius, Goldfield, Gill Lopez and V. Kelly.

3. Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,
Philip Joseph Lane, Associate Professor, Department of Economics
Date: September 2, 2013
To: Academic Council
From: Susan Rakowitz, General Faculty Secretary
Re: Academic Council Meetings and Roster

Meeting Dates for 2013-2014

According to the Faculty Handbook,

The first meeting of the Academic Council shall be on the Monday of the first full week of the academic year, and subsequently the first Monday of every month. Otherwise the Council shall determine the frequency of additional meetings and the duration of its meetings, as dictated by the nature and volume of its work, consistent with speedy action on all outstanding issues.

Because the first Monday in May is after classes end, I propose moving the May meeting to April 28. This change will need to be approved by the Academic Council. With that in mind, here are the meeting dates for 2013-2014. Note that the Council always has the right to add meeting dates if necessary, and in recent years has added about 3 meetings (most often by recessing and reconvening) per year. Given that recent history, it would be very helpful if members try to avoid filling up Monday afternoons later in the month, at least until we've had that month's regularly scheduled meeting.

All meetings are 3:30-5 in CNS 200.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 9, 2013</td>
<td>February 3, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 7, 2013</td>
<td>March 3, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 4, 2013</td>
<td>April 7, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2, 2013</td>
<td>April 28, 2014 (needs approval)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Downie</td>
<td>Behavioral and Social Sciences</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Rafalski</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences at large</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James He</td>
<td>Dolan School of Business</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Kohli*</td>
<td>Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxana Walker-Canton</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences at large</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginny Kelly</td>
<td>Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Huntley</td>
<td>Dolan School of Business</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Epstein**</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences at large</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Harding</td>
<td>Behavioral and Social Sciences</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Petrino</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Nguyen</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Thiel</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Mulvey</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences at large</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraig Steffen</td>
<td>NaturalScience/Mathematics/Engineering</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Kris</td>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikki Lee-Wingate</td>
<td>Dolan School of Business</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Dennin</td>
<td>NaturalScience/Mathematics/Engineering</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Fitzgerald, S.J.</td>
<td>Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbin Crabtree</td>
<td>Dean, College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Babington</td>
<td>Dean, School of Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Gibson</td>
<td>Dean, Dolan School of Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Berdanier</td>
<td>Dean, School of Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith-Anne Dohm</td>
<td>Dean, Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Rakowitz</td>
<td>Secretary of the General Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHAIR:
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY:

*Spring 2014 replaced by
**Spring 2014 replaced by
Taking Minutes of Academic Council Meetings

Below are guidelines for taking minutes of Academic Council meetings, drawn from requirements in the Faculty Handbook and Journal of Record, and on what has worked well in the past.

1. The Faculty Handbook specifies that the Council minutes “shall indicate the votes of members (i.e., tally or roll call) as well as major proposals and their proponents and opponents.” Most votes on the Council are taken by tally, in which case the total number of votes for and against need to be recorded in the minutes. If a roll call vote is taken, the name of each Council member voting in favor and against needs to be recorded in the minutes.

2. As stated in the Handbook, “the Academic Council shall be the executive arm of the General Faculty. As such, it is empowered to consider, make decisions and make recommendations on any matter of academic concern that falls within the purview of the faculty, except for matters specifically reserved to the General Faculty. It shall also provide the opportunity for exchange of opinion between faculty and administration in the ordinary working of the University.” It is important that accurate minutes be recorded, as the Academic Council minutes are generally the only way that faculty will know what the Council has done on their behalf, and why it was done.

3. The Handbook also specifies that records of Handbook committees contain minority as well as majority opinion. This has been a good practice for Council minutes as well, and Council minutes should continue to follow this practice.

4. The Journal of Record (1/22/68) requires that “the gist of all communications to the Academic Council be published in the Council minutes.” The communications themselves, including committee reports, documentation, etc. are included in the agenda and packet distributed before every meeting, copies of which are maintained by the General Faculty Secretary.

5. The Council acts by voting on motions. To avoid misunderstandings at a later date, it is essential that the exact wording of a motion be known before the Council votes and that the exact wording be recorded in the minutes.

6. To facilitate consultation of the minutes:
   a. In the minutes, number the agenda items exactly as the items are numbered on the agenda for that meeting.
   b. Provide a separate boldface caption for each agenda item.
   c. Place each motion in an indented and boldface paragraph, and indicate in boldface the result of any vote on the motion.

7. The Faculty Handbook specifies that “the Recording Secretary shall be responsible for the preparation of the minutes in consultation with the Executive Secretary.” Minutes should be prepared as soon as possible after the meeting, ideally within one week. The minutes should be clearly labeled as draft minutes, and forwarded to the Council’s Executive Secretary. The Recording Secretary is not responsible for distributing the minutes.
Mandate:

In a motion passed nearly a year ago, the Academic Council formed the Task Force on Part-Time Faculty. The Council instructed us to: “Explore the status, roles and conditions of part-time faculty at Fairfield University [and]…provide a final report along with recommendations for action to the Council at its September 2013 meeting.”

Overview:

After we were assembled, we met six times as a committee of the whole, including a half-day workshop in July. We worked more intensively throughout the year in sub-committees. We sought out other faculty, administrators, and staff as needed to learn more about campus practices related to non-tenure track faculty. To fulfill our mandate, we:

- developed a part-time faculty profile
- examined various components of contingent employment such as the letter of agreement
- gathered data on the number of faculty hired off the tenure track
- looked at evaluation procedures
- examined reports from professional organizations such as the OAH, MLA, AAUP and NEA as well as the current literature on the topic
- determined access to resources such as library privileges
- discussed part-time faculty and governance across departments and schools.

Profile:

To develop a profile of part-time or contingent faculty, we conducted a survey of non-tenure track faculty through the Office for Institutional Research. We received 90 responses to the survey, administered in April 2013 to approximately 300 faculty, giving us a satisfactory response rate of nearly 30%.

An analysis of the responses to the survey provided the following information:

1. The profile of respondents roughly fit the overall population of those surveyed, though in some individual departments the sample was not representative of gender, age, or other demographic markers.

   Respondents were: 55% female, 46/90 over 51 years of age, 92.21% white, 31.25% Ph.D. qualified, 27.5% master’s-level qualified. A number of other professional credentials were reported, appropriate to disciplinary norms. The average number of semesters taught by respondents was 14.32. From this we conclude that non-tenure track faculty at Fairfield are
older, experienced professionals who bring a wide variety of skills and talents to our classrooms.

2. Over half of respondents teach 2 course sections per semester. A common request in the comments field was for more courses per semester and/or courses in summer.

3. Professional development activities: 37.5% of respondents conduct research in their professional field and 43.75% attend conferences. Over 36% attend workshops, exhibitions, or other in-service training. 25-30% indicated they would like to participate in these activities but lacked time and/or support for these activities.

4. Evaluation: 77.27% of respondents indicated their teaching effectiveness was regularly evaluated by the department chair or supervisor, an appropriate colleague, or the dean. 72.73% indicated that they also relied upon student evaluations.

5. A total of 82.5% of respondents indicated that the income they receive from teaching at Fairfield was “critically or somewhat important” to their total household income. 40.7% report devoting 10 or more hours per week per course to teaching at Fairfield.

Notes from Open-ended Questions:

1. Commitment to student: The overwhelming response to the questions about the “best thing about Fairfield” was “the students.” This is consistent with our Jesuit mission and professed institutional goals. It also speaks to the quality and level of engagement of the people we employ in NTT positions.

2. Service: Many respondents to the survey indicated they are already doing “service” tasks (advising, writing letters of recommendation, overseeing honor societies, etc.) without pay or other compensation.

3. Participation in other faculty tasks: NTT faculty who responded to the survey indicated interest in doing the following:
   - Curriculum development – 40.24% of respondents would like to participate in department curriculum committees, 25.61% only if given stipends.
   - Advisement – 40.25% of respondents would like to participate in advising activities, 26.83% only if given stipends.
   - Independent study – No consistent policy exists across the institution. Some departments allow NTT faculty to conduct independent studies with students, others do not. It was unclear whether or not this activity was remunerated in the past. Policy varied across departments and schools for full-time faculty as well; some departments can “bank” independent study credits, others cannot. 60.77% of respondents would like to direct independent study work with students, 53.17% if paid a stipend.
   - Development of new courses – Once again, it became apparent that there is not a consistent policy on this across the institution. Some departments/schools allow NTT
faculty to develop courses, some do not. In the CAS, a new syllabus developed by a NTT faculty member had to be “sponsored” in some way by a full-time person. There were no reports of stipends or payments for new course or syllabus development, leaving open questions of ownership of the syllabi developed by any faculty member. 44.3% of respondents would like to develop new courses, 30.38% only if compensated.

4. Resources: NTT faculty who responded to the survey indicated they don’t have but would use:

- Private office space, particularly for confidential conversations. This seemed to be more important for some disciplines than for others. There also seemed to be a split here. Some NTT faculty have access to much better office accommodations than others (about 40%).

- Over 40% wanted access to and support for professional conferences and workshops.

- Over one quarter cited interest in software for home computer/laptop. This can be very important for NTT faculty in fields where curriculum support requires specific software applications.

- Though most faculty, over 60%, responded that they have access to information needed to work effectively with students, others suggested a lack of clarity in accessing and using student support services, knowing health center rules concerning excused absences, etc.

- A large number of respondents expressed frustration over the lack of continuity of campus services for NTT faculty who teach regularly (semester after semester). For example, at the start of the fall semester library privileges and e-mail accounts have had to be reinstated for faculty continuing teaching responsibilities on campus. This is a hassle for faculty who need to communicate with students and prepare syllabi and library materials in a timely fashion. Since NTT faculty in many cases appear in the schedule bulletin by name for the following semester, it is clear that the institution has every intention of continuing the employment relationship.

As a result of our deliberations and research, we determined that three major issues confront part-time faculty: lack of voice, absence of respect and unstable employment. In response, we make the following recommendations in two categories: structure and governance and conditions of employment.

Recommendations:

I. Issues of Structure and Governance
1. Develop a vision statement, a long-term planning process and policy positions on the employment of NTT (non-tenure track) faculty. This statement would reflect a variety of voices, including administrators, NTT and full-time faculty, and staff, working in partnership to define the institutional faculty mission.

   **Rationale:** Fairfield must deploy faculty resources in an intentional and considered way to best benefit from the talents and productivity of all faculty. Careful planning at the institutional level provides schools and departments with the guidance they need to make good staffing decisions. Professional schools with accreditation responsibilities are often required to do this kind of planning; the institution as a whole should be doing the same. We need to clearly articulate our position and practices to avoid acting on assumptions that may or may not agree with reality or with institutional priorities.

2. Institute a university-wide statistical annual report on the employment of part-time faculty, to include aggregate numbers, distribution among schools, percentages of courses taught, for example.

   **Rationale:** Such a report will make part-time faculty visible, encourage a “one faculty” environment, and equip us with information to use when we are asked by prospective students, parents, or accreditors about our faculty resources. Information collected as part of the departmental annual reporting process can be shared with institutional research. The PR Department may also find such information valuable.

3. Appoint a permanent *Faculty Handbook* Committee on non-tenure track faculty employment, roles and conditions.

   **Rationale:** Our Task Force is the fourth initiative in less than 15 years designed to address this issue. It appears to us that little change has been achieved as a result of these initiatives. We need to institutionalize measures since employment of part-time and non-tenure track faculty is neither temporary nor likely to decline. NTT faculty must be represented on this committee. *This investment is the single most cost-effective way to impact the educational experience of the maximum number of students at Fairfield.* Other schools (University of Maryland, for example, [http://www.senate.umd.edu/meetings/materials/2012to2013/030613/NTTF_Task_Force_Report_12-13-41.pdf](http://www.senate.umd.edu/meetings/materials/2012to2013/030613/NTTF_Task_Force_Report_12-13-41.pdf)) are making strides ahead of Fairfield with regard to this high-visibility issue of equity and educational quality.

4. Open up governance structures according to AAUP suggested guidelines (summary in the Appendix) or institute a format of representation at the departmental level and in the General Faculty.

   **Rationale:** The absence of representation for part-time faculty continues to marginalize a vital part of our university. This recommendation provides access to institutional business that affects the compensation, status, roles, and responsibilities of NTT faculty. It also makes visible a large cohort of faculty on campus who do the same sort of work with students that full-time faculty are required to do.

5. Explore the possibility of a PT faculty caucus as part of our FWC/AAUP Chapter.

   **Rationale:** Though this may beyond the scope of the AC, we believe that integration of NTT faculty must be addressed at all levels and in parallel with the organizational structures appropriate to full-time faculty.
6. Establish and resource a PT Faculty Association.

**Rationale:** Creating a venue for pt faculty to exchange ideas, share strategies and engage in professional development is essential. Such a forum encourages interdisciplinary conversations and better understanding of the curriculum as a whole, particularly for faculty who are teaching courses that prepare students for later work. This recommendation responds to a need clearly articulated in the NTT survey for community and collegiality. Such a Part Time Faculty Association is consistent with efforts to create similar community for graduate students. Without the faculty dining room and its collegial culture, we no longer have spaces to engage in a wide variety of conversations that encourage dialogue across institutional structures. We need more shared communal space on campus.

II. Conditions of Employment

1. **Develop an institutional format for one-year or multi-year contracts for part time faculty.**

**Rationale:** Multi-term contracts promote greater efficiency for the institution, but more importantly from a faculty perspective, sends a message of commitment to individuals who teach on our campus regularly. We lower the cost of contracting and at the same time, improve the quality of life for part-time faculty members, who clearly depend on the money earned through part-time teaching to live. A number of NTT faculty names are in the schedule bulletin semester after semester, indicating that the institution has every expectation that those particular people will be teaching in the subsequent semester.

2. **Establish a senior lectureship category, and possibly other NTT faculty “ranks”. Establish criteria on emeritus status for NTT faculty.**

**Rationale:** Such a series of ranks provide incentives for part-time faculty to commit to Fairfield, when other local colleges and universities may also demand their services. It also recognizes length of service to the institution. Some titles might include senior lecturer, lecturer, adjunct, etc. Allowing emeritus status has the power to reward our longest serving NTT faculty members with an honorary title. The cost to the institution is quite small, while the benefit to the recipients could potentially be large.

3. **Establish a compensation schedule for NTT faculty who do course and curriculum development, provide workshops on campus, take part in assessment activities, engage with students in independent study work, advise honor societies, etc.**

**Rationale:** As the institutional work of the faculty grows in various ways, NTT faculty responsibilities should mirror that growth. The size of the tenure track faculty has stabilized in recent years, but the workload and student class size has increased. With more work and more students, additional faculty are hired on a part time basis, but only to do classroom teaching. Thus, the burden on the full-time faculty grows; they shoulder more responsibilities than ever before. By contracting clearly with NTT faculty, this gap can be filled without exploiting the time and talents of our NTT faculty colleagues. Clear job descriptions and contracted deliverables make the contracting and assessment process manageable.
4. Establish clear institutional guidelines for both formative and summative teaching evaluation. **Rationale:** Though most respondents indicated that their teaching effectiveness was assessed by faculty colleagues and/or students, the process of this assessment varied widely across schools and departments. In the interest of fairness, all NTT faculty should have access to formative and summative assessments that are clearly articulated and appropriate to their disciplinary responsibilities. The committee’s conversations led to a number of questions that need further exploration:

- What is the purpose of the evaluation process? Is it designed for improvement in classroom practice or for contract renewal?
- Who does the evaluation: part time or full time faculty colleagues? How is mentoring provided for NTT faculty?
- How is feedback from an evaluation process distributed to administrators and faculty? Who “owns” the evaluation results: the individual faculty member or the supervisor? How is information shared for reappointment or other decisions? How/_do these processes for NTT faculty mirror procedures for full-time faculty?
- How do we determine the regularity of evaluation? Once someone has been rehired for multiple years, do we do evaluation in different ways and construct different criteria? Do all NTT faculty have to be evaluated in the same way in every course every semester?
- What are the criteria for evaluation process? How do these criteria relate to the smaller departmental and disciplinary norms, as well as to the broader institutional mission?
- What resources are available for departments and schools to conduct appropriate formative and summative evaluations for NTT faculty?

5. Examine the possibility of a health care buy-in schedule for NTT faculty

**Rationale:** A number of NTT faculty have not had access to employer-provided health insurance. This means that the insurance they do have is expensive and not always satisfactory. This recommendation allows NTT faculty access to the Fairfield University pool, providing them with a better and more cost effective solution than currently exists for them. It affects only those people who have no access to other policies, and so may be doable at relatively low cost to the university.

6. Extend library and e-mail privileges across semesters and over the summer after five years or ten semesters or some other agreeable period of continuous employment. Extend all full-time faculty campus privileges to NTT faculty, including reduced cost gym membership, Quick Center discount, sports event discounts, etc.

**Rationale:** This is obvious. E-mail and library access should be maintained for NTT faculty who have a reasonable expectation of returning to the university in the following semester. This provides students with access they might need to faculty and also allows for expected course preparation. If we expect NTT faculty to have courses that are equivalent to those of the full-time faculty, we must provide our colleagues with the tools they need, including course management software and library services, to prepare those courses.
Our conclusion: Security + Voice + Respect = Equity

In conclusion, our committee recommends that we work together as an academic community to provide a welcoming and engaging experience for all of our non-tenure track colleagues.

We recognize the differences across schools and departments regarding the need for and use of part time faculty. We understand the importance of flexibility in meeting staffing requirements for each semester. However, we believe that we can do better than we have. Our recommendations reflect our conversations as a committee, discussions with a variety of faculty, administrators, and staff members who we consulted, and the data collected in our survey of the 300+ NTT faculty members who were on campus during the spring 2013 semester.

We are aware that some of the issues we identified are not peculiar to us but national in scope. We believe we have the opportunity to lead in implementing solutions. To do so, we must stabilize and clarify employment conditions, ensure representation of NTT faculty in the governance structure and institute concrete measures that demonstrate respect for the “invisible” members of our faculty.

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

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

Members of the committee:

- Cinthia Gannett, English Department and Director of Core Writing
- Elizabeth Hohl, History Department
- Wendy Kohli, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, GSEAP
- Mark Ligas, Marketing Department and Associate Dean, DSB
- Kathryn Nantz, Department of Economics, Subcommittee Chair
- Meredith Kazer, Associate Dean, School of Nursing
- Brian Torff, Visual and Performing Arts Department
- Eileen Wilkinson, Modern Languages and Literatures – German
MEMO

Date: 2 September 2013
From: Nancy Dallavalle and Joyce Shea, Academic Council Subcommittee on the Sexual Misconduct Policy
To: Robert Epstein, Chair, Academic Council
Re: Final Report

The matter of the sexual misconduct policy came to the attention of the Academic Council via a 10/2/2012 email from Steve Bayne, Philosophy, which expressed concern about this new role for faculty as reporters of sexual misconduct (attach, p. 1-3). It was briefly discussed at the 5 November 2012 meeting, at which time a decision was made to invite VP for Student Affairs Tom Pellegrino to a future meeting for questions (attach, p. 4).

Pellegrino met with the Council at its regularly scheduled meeting on December 4, 2012. At that time, he outlined the current (still fluid) environment in higher education, post-Penn State, in which the practical and legal trend is for increased reporting of sexual misconduct. The point of this expanded reporting is that Universities, at various levels, should not be sitting on reports of sexual misconduct in an ad hoc fashion, these accounts need to be reported to our Title IX agent, who will serve as the investigator (unless there is an immediate reason for Public Safety to act). This is the legal environment in which we now operate. Discussion ensued, with a focus on the breadth and limits of this new requirement for University employees, particularly as this impacts the faculty-student relationship. This discussion is found in the minutes of 4 December 2012 (attach, p. 5-8)

The Council asked for a subcommittee to continue the conversation and report back. On Monday, April 29th, AC Chair Dennis Keenan reported that we (Joyce Shea and Nancy Dallavalle) would serve as this subcommittee.

We met with Tom Pellegrino in May, after which there was considerable email as we worked on a statement that faculty might use on their syllabi about sexual misconduct (as a way of clarifying for both parties the role of the faculty member). This statement is understood by all three of us to be nothing more than suggested syllabus language, language, however, that has been vetted, given the complexity of the reporting requirement.

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


The broader context for the language about reporting is found in the student handbook, pp. 45-51.

We have asked Tom Pellegrino to briefly summarize here the current status of the policy, after the conversations of last year. He writes [9/3/2013]:

“The first point to note is that the institutional policy language as set forth in the handbook was itself revised for Academic Year 2013-2014 based on the points made by Academic Council in its December 2012 meeting with me. My thanks to the Academic Council for raising this issue, which led to the modification. The modification itself now makes it clear that while all Fairfield University employees are, by policy, mandated reporters of what they know, only some employees will necessarily have to share ALL they know (e.g., “responsible employees” under Title IX – which does not generally include faculty). Some employees [ND: most faculty, exceptions know who they are] can satisfy the duty to report by reporting the incident itself, along with date, time and location (if known), but can withhold at least initially any personally identifiable information (e.g., the name of the victim, the name of the accused, witnesses). By revising the scope of the reporting requirement, I believe we have addressed the concerns raised about the faculty-student relationship as well as issues of consent by the alleged victim, while still bringing the University within compliance of its own policy, as well as law. [ND: the suggested syllabus language reflects the understanding of the reporting requirement in this paragraph.]

In terms of the broader context of reporting in higher education, I should note that no law currently requires Fairfield to adopt a mandatory reporting requirement. With that said, recent deliberations by the Connecticut State legislature indicate a high probability that law makers will require across-the-board mandatory reporting at both state and private colleges and universities. For these reasons, schools including UConn, Wesleyan and, I am proud to say, Fairfield, took a leadership role in adopting across-the-board mandatory reporting for all employees in 2012.

There are multiple reasons for going to an “across the board” mandated reporting requirement but in short, three reasons rise to the top: A mandatory reporting scheme is best suited to give effect to the University’s intent of having all employees share in the responsibility to create a living and working environment free from incidences of sexual misconduct; it removes the confusion that faculty (and staff) may have around who has to report and who does not; and finally, it places Fairfield in the best position possible to fulfill its legal reporting requirements.

In addition to the syllabus language that Nancy, Joyce and I have crafted, I want to acknowledge and thank the Academic Council. Its comments in December led to the modifications of our policy (as described above), making it a better approach.”

TCP
E-mail of 10/2/12:

Dear members of the Academic Council Executive Committee,

At its meeting of 9/26 the Philosophy Department discussed the new Sexual Misconduct policy that has been adopted as part of the Student handbook by the Student Affairs division. The department faculty recognize the importance of the issues raised here. We are concerned that a policy that may directly impact the relationship between students and faculty was adopted by the University without direct consultation with the faculty through its normal governance procedures. We are particularly concerned that the policy would require faculty to breach the general parameters of confidentiality with which we treat our students in the context of individual discussions with them. The policy effectively mandates that faculty report on either our suspicions of sexual misconduct or explicit instances which students have divulged to individual faculty in the context of private conversations.

Faculty who are not licensed social workers, nurses or counselors are not state mandated reporters in this area, yet this policy would require them to become such mandated reporters within the institution. This may be a good thing, it may not. It certainly represents a substantial change to the relationship between individual faculty and individual students. As we ourselves do not feel that we have the expertise to think through the implications of such a change that would affect all faculty, we would ask that the Academic Council address this issue by either referring it to an appropriate faculty committee or constituting an ad hoc committee to advise the Academic Council. There are faculty on this campus who may have expertise in these matters (counseling, clinical psychology, nursing, others perhaps) who could advise the faculty on these issues. It may be that the faculty needs to retain some outside expertise to guide us in thinking through the implications of the requirements set out in the new sexual misconduct policy.

In any event, the policy promulgated in the Student Handbook appears to apply to all faculty and represents a material change in the expectations and norms governing how students and faculty interact both in the classroom and in private conversations. We thus request that the Academic Council take up this issue, study the implications and follow the normal procedures for instituting new educational policy.

Sincerely, on behalf of the Department of Philosophy,

Steven M. Bayne, Chair
MEMORANDUM
Secretary of the General Faculty
Fairfield University

TO: Academic Council

FROM: Susan Rakowitz, General Faculty Secretary and Irene Mulvey, former GFS

DATE: October 8, 2012

RE: Philosophy Department’s email on reporting requirements re sexual misconduct

In an email dated 10/2/2012, Professor Steve Bayne reported that the Department of Philosophy had concerns about new reporting requirements in Fairfield’s Sexual Misconduct Policy. In our capacity as (current and incoming) Secretary of the General Faculty, Vice President Tom Pellegrino communicated with us last June about the changes to the Sexual Misconduct Policy, which were put into place in the wake of the sexual abuse scandal at Penn State University. The relevant reporting requirements for all University employees are below (the section on reporting requirements is at the end of this memo). In light of the memo from Professor Bayne, we ask the Academic Council to determine if there is any objection to these new reporting requirements that would necessitate putting the matter on the agenda for a future AC meeting.

In brief,

• Employees made aware of child abuse or neglect (as defined by CT statutes) involving a victim under age 18 must report that to Public Safety and Fairfield Police (and are strongly encouraged to report it to DCF hotline).

• Employees who witness or receive report of sexual misconduct involving a victim over age 18 must report the information they receive on the incident to Public Safety.


b. Reporting Sexual Misconduct
This policy on reporting is designed to assist the University’s Title IX Coordinator, in conjunction with the Department of Public Safety, in providing a comprehensive response to reports of sexual misconduct. It seeks to promote victim and campus safety, and a prompt and equitable resolution to incidents of sexual misconduct. In general, any employee who has reasonable cause to believe sexual misconduct has occurred, must comply with the University’s Sexual Misconduct Policy, regardless of the age of the victim.

i. Reporting by University Employees
When the victim is under 18: In instances where a University employee is made aware of child abuse or neglect as defined by Connecticut General Statutes Section 17a-101b, the first question the employee must ask herself/himself is whether she/he is a mandated reporter of child abuse or neglect as defined by Connecticut General Statutes Section 17a-101(b).

If the employee is a mandated reporter she/he must comply with Connecticut’s mandated reporting laws. When a mandated reporter is made aware of child abuse or neglect (as defined above and by Connecticut General Statutes Section 17a-101(b), she/he must call the Department of Children and Families (DCF) 24-hour hotline for reporting suspected child abuse or neglect at 1(800) 842-2288. All employees, including mandated reporters, must also report the matter to the Department of Public Safety (ext. 4090) and the Fairfield Police Department (911).

All other University employees (i.e., those who are not mandated reporters) are strongly encouraged to report suspected child abuse or neglect to the DCF hotline listed above, and are protected under Connecticut law for good-faith reporting of such suspected child abuse or neglect, even if later investigation fails to substantiate abuse or neglect. Employees who are mandated reporters must still report instances of child abuse or neglect to the Department of Public Safety (ext. 4090) and the Fairfield Police Department (911).

When the victim is 18 or older: Any employee, except those who are empowered by law to maintain confidentiality, who witnesses or receives a report of sexual misconduct of a victim 18 or older, must report the incident (including the date, time, and location of the incident, the date the incident was reported to them, and the identities of the victim and, if disclosed, the alleged perpetrator) as soon as possible to the Department of Public Safety at ext 4090. The Department of Public Safety will notify the Title IX Coordinator and the Fairfield Police Department. While University employees must report information they receive, it is not their responsibility to investigate or confirm what is reported to them. University officials within the appropriate offices will determine the appropriate next steps, including ensuring that victims have been made aware of available on- and off-campus resources.

While a University employee may advise the victim of sexual misconduct that any conversation they have with the victim will be private (will not be shared unnecessarily with others), they may not tell a victim that the conversation will be confidential unless that employee is subject to privilege by law to maintain confidentiality of an adult victim.

The law extends to a limited number of University employees the privilege to offer confidentiality to the adult victim and not to disclose communications with the victim. Typically, these are clinical employees who work within the Office of Counseling & Psychological Services, the Student Health Center, or clergy within Campus Ministry. Others accorded this privilege include: 1. licensed marital and family therapists; 2. licensed social workers; 3. Licensed professional counselors; 4. licensed psychologists; 5. psychiatrists licensed as physicians and substantially acting as psychiatrists; and 6. physicians and other medical professionals acting within a medical professional/patient relationship, including those recognized by the Privacy Rule of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA).
Excerpt from AC minutes of 11/5/12

i. Professor Epstein drew our attention to the correspondence (on page 12 of the packet) from Steve Bayne for the Philosophy Department on the new sexual misconduct policy from the student handbook, and additional correspondence (on pages 13-14 of the packet) from the current and former General Faculty Secretaries.

Professor Rakowitz mentioned that the purpose of the memo from the GFSs was to provide us with the content of the policy referred to in Professor Bayne’s memo, and to let us know that VP Pellegrino contacted both GFSs about the change.

MOTION (Bayne/Lane): To make the changes to the sexual misconduct policy an agenda item at a future AC meeting.

Professor Dallavalle asked whether we wanted to gather facts first before putting this item on an agenda.
Professor Rakowitz mentioned that is why we would want to invite VP Pellegrino to the meeting when we discuss this issue.
Professor Keenan suggested that maybe we can collect together the relevant information and invite the appropriate people to the meeting.

MOTION PASSED: 17 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Excerpt from AC minutes of 12/3/12

Chair Keenan directed the Committee to pages 36-37 of the Meeting Agenda packet.

Tom Pellegrino, Vice President for Student Affairs, described the policy for faculty if students come to them and report sexual misconduct. There is current discussion in Hartford about a change to the state requirement for reporting misconduct to appropriate authorities. The Federal Law is not very clear. The Clery Act, Title IX, Title VII provide guidelines. Are faculty members campus security authorities? Generally, the answer is no under the Clery Act. Title VII has provisions for sexual harassment in the workplace – if you are a supervisor of an employee, you need to report a sexual assault. Title IX adds sexual harassment to be reported, in addition to assault. We were called by the Connecticut State Legislature on a series of hearings. Some Fairfield employees are already mandated to report, the State is not there yet but is likely going to expand the categories of mandated reporters. We can have our own policy based on different groups. Recommendation of general authorities is to have a reporting policy. Title IX coordinators should decide how to report when complaints come in. UConn and Wesleyan are reporting. So we felt that we should be reporting too. To sum up, there are three federal statutes that require some reporting for some groups. The State is poised to do something. A lot of schools have changed their policies. One question, what about the confidentiality relationship between faculty and student – point is that confidentiality is not a legal requirement. It is not protected by statutes.

Professor Walker-Canton: if a victim comes and talk about it, not report it, and is over 18, why should we be reporting it?

VP Pellegrino: In the majority of such circumstances it is necessary to find the access points (faculty, residence life, public safety). You give them options, for example a brochure. Yes, faculty is required to report it, under our policy.

Professor Dallavalle: Is it correct that “reporting” is not equivalent to “filing” a complaint?

VP Pellegrino: Yes

Dean Crabtree: Dawn DeBiase in my office is one of the trained people. I have asked her to write up a script. “Just so you know I am a mandated reporter, I can put you in touch with a confidential reporter who is not a mandated reporter.” It may have a chilling effect but also give them a resource.
Professor Rafalski: What is the status of a faculty member who is a mentor?

VP Pellegrino: Same as everybody else. An argument can be made that you may have an increased responsibility.

Professor Rafalski: We may have confessional responsibility.

VP Pellegrino: The law expects increased responsibility if it goes to court.

Professor Bayne: Is it true that charges would not be automatically filed if something is reported? It is the right of the victim to decide whether or not to press charges. Would Security contact the victim?

VP Pellegrino: The university’s Title IX agent does the investigation, Security is the first responder. An investigation can end quite quickly. The University can proceed if it can have effect on the community. The university counsel decides whether to continue with an investigation.

Professor Bayne: Suppose an assignment in class reveals sexual misconduct. Does the faculty member have to report it?

VP Pellegrino: If the student is giving you information for an assignment, not for discussing the incident, it is not a claim. So a fair argument can be made that it is outside the purview.

Professor Bayne: Office hour discussions? Are they reportable?

VP Pellegrino: My inclination is no. You can have Title IX investigator proceed on it.

SVPAA Fitzgerald S.J.: What are the values in our community? Every person merits respect. Sexual harassment is rampant in society. If it comes from an employee to a student there is a power differential involved. When such knowledge comes to the attention of a faculty member, this is the point of the reporting responsibility. I have been part of a few investigations. It is a good thing because sometimes the victims step up and make a complaint, the bad behavior is investigated and stopped,, and it is not repeated on others.

Professor Huntley: Who are protected under confidentiality?

VP Pellegrino: Counseling, Campus ministry. If the victim is a minor, call 911.

Professor Huntley: Do we have to investigate date, time etc?

VP Pellegrino: No, provide what information you have. The idea is, from an external viewpoint, universities should not be perceived as sitting on this information.

Professor Walker-Canton: I feel some of it goes against Jesuit pedagogy – reflection etc. I feel that students are opening up personal lives without recognizing the reporting requirement. I think it is a backlash from Penn State.

VP Pellegrino: I can provide you with standard that courts use when Universities have been sued. If there are pedagogical concerns, I am all for disclosures in the syllabus. So give some scripted language ahead of time.

Professor Epstein: I share some of the same concerns that my colleagues have. Reflective essays, major memoir requirement. If we are having this language, then we need to detail the obligations. Also, what is the difference between the conversation being private and confidential? What concerns me most is the word ‘misconduct’. I don’t know what it is.

VP Pellegrino: it is the broadest possible language.

Professor Epstein: Don’t you see the problem with it? From the administration point of view broad is good, but for faculty we need more specific language because we are implementing it. I need to know what misconduct it.
VP Pellegrino: The Student Handbook defines it. The question raised here is could we craft some language for faculty member to say, this is a case when the policy does not apply? I have a lawyer engaged to work on exclusions (such as memoirs, reflections, etc.)

Chair Keenan: We are beyond time. Two more questions, then we want to adjourn.

Professor Dallavalle: I understand Roxana’s point, but our students feel that they told someone. It is our responsibility to take them to the right place.

Dean Babington: Nurses are mandatory reporters for everything. So we have scripted language for everything. A student relates something about an incident of childhood abuse. We still have to report.

Professor Sapp: Faculty should not think of themselves as repository of confessions. I have several acquaintances who sue regularly. We are not friends of students.

Professor Sapp: Can we vote on whether or not we should put this on a future agenda?

Professor Epstein: We already voted that, and we are discussing it now.

Vogel (student representative): If a student is coming to a faculty member, it shows that they are ready to talk to somebody. Faculty members are not trained to do the talking. Mentors are more equipped. But reporting is helping the student to go to somebody who can help them.

Chair Keenan: I need a sense of whether we need future discussion on this.

Professor Rakowitz: My understanding is that we do not have too much leeway with the law.

VP Pellegrino: That is correct.

Chair Keenan: Do we need to learn more about this?

Professor Petrino: I do. I am in favor of a venue for more discussion. For example, what is the difference between misconduct and assault? It is in the student handbook but not in the faculty handbook.

Professor Bayne: I suggest that the Academic Council form a sub-committee to study this.

Professor Lane seconded.

Professor Walker-Canton: That would be a good way to bring back suggestions.

Professor Shea: What is the subcommittee supposed to do?

Professor Bayne: For example, language on exclusions. Do more research than we would be able to do here.

Professor Walker-Canton: For example, victims – are they ready to go to a broader audience? For me a further discussion on that is needed.

Professor Dallavalle: I would be hesitant to form a subcommittee right now. Let it play out somewhat so that we have more information.

**MOTION (BAYNE/LANE): To form a subcommittee of the Academic Council to study the Sexual misconduct policy**

**MOTION TIED: 7 in favor, 7 opposed 0 abstentions.**

Chair Keenan: I will vote in favor of the motion, only because it is very close, and we should continue the conversation.

**MOTION PASSED. 8 in favor, 7 opposed 0 abstentions.**
Date: September 2, 2013  
To: Academic Council  
From: Academic Council Executive Committee  
Re: Motion on standing Calendar Review Subcommittee

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

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

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