Academic Council Meeting  
Monday, April 7, 2014  
CNS 200

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

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

Regrets: SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, S.J.

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

1. Presidential Courtesy
None

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

3. Report from the Executive Secretary

Professor Mulvey presented the minutes from February 10, 2014

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

Professor Mulvey presented the minutes from March 3, 2014

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

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

4. Council Subcommittee Reports

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

7. New Business

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MOTION (Thiel/Yarrington)
Approve the Proposal for a Bachelor of Science Degree program in Bioengineering

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

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

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

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

Professor Petrino noted that this represents an opportunity to move more women into engineering.

Professor Huntley noted that there is a lot of potential in this program. He feels that it fits will within the mission of the University. He shared his feelings about the concern over resources, especially since there is some ambiguity in the numbers.

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

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

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

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

**MOTION FAILED 5-9-1**

**MOTION (Thiel/Yarrington)**
To approve the Bachelor of Science Degree program in Bioengineering

**MOTION PASSED 9-5-1**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**MOTION (Mulvey/Harding)**
To approve the Academic Planning Committee’s proposed revision to the Journal of Record as stated:

College Courses in High School:

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

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

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

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

Professor Kelly spoke against the motion. She felt that if we have high school teachers teaching college courses here on campus, then it is not consistent to reject courses taught by high school teachers outside the University.

Professor Kelly also expressed concern about the “C or better” requirement. She wondered if we should set the bar higher. Professor Rakowitz noted that “C or better” is the standard for transfer credit.

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

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

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

Professor Greenberg noted that this is impossible to adjudicate.

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

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

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

**MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION (Greenberg/Mulvey)**
MOTION FAILED 2-8-5
MOTION (Mulvey/Greenberg)
Send the document back to the Academic Planning Committee for further revision
MOTION PASSED 13-0-1

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

Professor Andreychick presented the report from the FDEC. The report recommends that tenured full professors and adjuncts default to the IDEA short form. Everyone else defaults to long form. Professor He asked what the differences were between the short and the long form. Professor Andreychick noted that the long forms provide formative evaluations allow for additional feedback to junior faculty. This would include items like the provision of feedback to students.

MOTION (Kelly/ Steffen)
Tenured full professors and adjuncts will default to the IDEA short form. Instructors, Assistant Professors and Associate Professors will default to the long form.

Professor Harding spoke in favor of the motion. She noted that when she was on the evaluation committee this was always the intention of the IDEA form.

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

Professor Dennin also spoke in favor of the motion.

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

MOTION PASSED 13-0-1

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

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

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

MOTION PASSED: 11-0-1

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

MOTION to adjourn (Dennin/Downie)
MOTION PASSED unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 4:49 PM

Respectfully submitted,
Alison Kris