ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, October 6, 2014 from 3:30 to 5:00 PM
CNS 200

0. Elect a Chair for 2014-15.

1. Presidential courtesy

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
   a. Approval of minutes of AC meetings
      i. Minutes of Meeting on September 8, 2014 (attached)
   b. Correspondence
      i. Email correspondence between President and Faculty Secretary re HB amendments (attached)
      ii. Memo from GFS to AC 9/23/2014 Re: AC Meetings and Roster, Updated (attached)
   c. Oral Reports

4. Council Subcommittee Reports (No reports are expected at this meeting.)
   a. Subcommittee on broader academic freedom language for governance documents (AC 2/27/12)
   b. Subcommittee to consider proposing IDEA form for administrators (AC 4/4/11)
   c. Subcommittee on grievance procedures (AC 5/8/13)
   d. Subcommittee on time codes (AC 5/8/13)

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

6. Old Business
   a. Discussion of AC approved amendment to the Faculty Handbook for Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty (See Correspondence, item 3.b.i above)
   b. Discussion of AC approved amendment to the Faculty Handbook on language on maternity leave policy (See Correspondence, item 3.b.i above, and page 14)
   c. Further discussion of Report from AC Subcommittee on Mission Statement re non-tenure track faculty (attachments)

7. New business
   a. Election of faculty representatives to the Honorary Degree Committee
   b. Proposal for a Master of Science degree in Business Analytics (separately stapled)
   c. UCC proposal for Pass/Fail option (attachments)
   d. Report from the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees (re October 3 meeting; Ongoing item 2)

Lists of Attachments, Pending, and Ongoing Items are on page 2
List of Attachments:
For item 3.a. Draft minutes of 9/8/2014 AC meeting (pages 3-8)
For item 3.b.i. Correspondence between Faculty Secretary and President re AC Recommendations to amend the Faculty Handbook (pages 9-11)
For item 3.b.ii. Memo from Faculty Secretary (9/23/14) re AC Meetings and Roster, updated (page 12)
For item 6.a. See attachment for item 3.b.i (page 10 and bottom of page 11)
For item 6.b. See attachment for item 3.b.i (page 11) and Excerpt of Benefits Plan Overview (top of p. 13)
For item 6.c. Charge to AC SC on Mission Statement re non-tenure track faculty (bottom of page 13), Report from the AC Subcommittee on Mission Statement re non-tenure track faculty (p 14)
For item 7.b. Proposal for a Master of Science degree in Business Analytics (separately stapled)
For item 7.c. Proposed Policy on Pass/Fail Option for Undergraduate Courses from UCC (page 15); Excerpts of relevant UCC minutes (page 16-17)

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. AC revisits the accessibility of teaching evaluation data, Due spring 2012. (AC 4/19/10)
D. AC review of Merit Appeals Policy, once one or more have been adjudicated. (AC 11/1/10)
E. AC three year review of Intellectual Properties Policy, spring 2014. (AC 3/7/11)
F. MPA, five year review in 2017-2018 (AC 9/10/12)
G. Revisit report from ACSC on Mission Statement re non-tenure track faculty in fall 2014) (AC 9/8/14)

Ongoing Items:
1. Report by SVPAA to AC each semester to inform the council of any approved exceptions to the Athletic Department’s policy of not scheduling athletic events that conflict with final exams.
2. Report from the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees after each meeting with board members. At the end of each academic year, discuss items for the Conference Committee to put on the agenda for their meetings with members of the board the following year.
3. Standing Calendar Review Subcommittee: A subcommittee of two people will be elected by the AC each September from its elected membership. The subcommittee’s charge is to review all Fairfield academic calendars before their publication and make any necessary recommendations for changes to the Academic Council and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.
Members Present: Professors Mousumi Bhattacharya, Dave Crawford, Joe Dennin, Shannon Harding, Irene Mulvey (Executive Secretary), Martin Nguyen, Elizabeth Petrino, Shawn Rafalski (Outgoing Chair – only for the first part of the meeting), Susan Rakowitz (Secretary of the General Faculty), Amalia Rusu, Emily R. Smith, L. Kraig Steffen, Debra Strauss, John Thiel, Jo Yarrington

Administrators: SVPAA Lynn Babington, Deans Bruce Berdanier, Robert Hannafin, Meredith Kazer, Jim Simon

Regrets: Dean Don Gibson

Invited Presenters: Kathy Nantz, Maggie Wills

Chair Rafalski calls the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

0. Select a Recording Secretary. Elect a Chair and an Executive Secretary for 2014-15.

By drawing a name from the cup, the recording secretary for the meeting was selected to be Prof. Rusu.

Outgoing Chair Rafalski asks for nominations from the floor for AC Chair in 2014-15.

Prof. Thiel makes the observation that there are several new members of the academic council coming for the next meeting as well as some absentees and proposes to elect a chair for this meeting only.

Chair Rafalski asks if anybody wants to volunteer for the day.

Prof. Thiel is happy to volunteer for this meeting. By acclamation, Prof. Thiel is elected chair for the day and Prof. Rafalski excuses himself for the rest of the meeting.

Prof. Thiel asks for nominations for an Executive Secretary for 2014-2015.

Prof. Rakowitz nominates Prof. Mulvey. No other nominations. Prof. Mulvey is unanimously elected as the Executive Secretary for 2014-2015.

1. Presidential Courtesy

SVPAA Babington’s remarks:
Welcome back to a new year! Looking forward to working together this year.

Lots of great work to do this year and as I have said multiple times, in multiple venues, this is our time – faculty's time.

As faculty, we have the opportunity to take the leadership in creating some of the changes necessary to place us in a good position as a Jesuit University focused on excellent teaching and student mentorship with amazingly productive faculty who share their expertise with students in the classroom, though their research, and on and off campus in the many service related activities they engage in.

We are in a unique position to take leadership on initiatives that arise from the Fairfield 2020 Strategic Plan which includes over 180 faculty, staff, administrators and alumni involvement.

Enrollment Update

Undergraduates – As of 9/5 - 1076 freshman (and 49 transfer students) higher yield, stronger students (higher SAT scores, more merit scholars accepted our admission offer, lower summer melt) 37% male/63% female; average SAT = 1767
895 soph, 732 juniors, 818 seniors = 3512 total undergraduate
14% students of color

All these things are good, but – 44% discount rate for the freshman class meaning that our students are paying 56% of our published rates – the discount is too high

Graduates – As of 9/5 (note that graduate student enrollment tends to increase through the second week of classes – 1121 (GSEAP= 430, SOE= 254, SON= 191, DSOB= 133, CAS = 118) 63% female, 37% male).

38% students of color; 24% international

Faculty-At the new faculty orientation a couple of weeks ago, we welcomed 17 tenure track and 10 visiting faculty. Please welcome them to your various departments.

Searches – Three major searches are currently underway
Director of the Quick Center (Arts Consulting Group)
Director and Chief Curator of University Museums
CAS dean (Isaacson & Miller)

Academic Council – President von Arx would like to attend at least one AC meeting each semester to meet with faculty.

Prof. Smith asks if the financial aid promises are for 4 years for the undergrads.
SVPAA Babington responds that they are for 4 years but can go lower based on family income.

Prof. Nantz asks if there were any surprises in the graduate education enrollment.

SVPAA Babington responds that in terms of statistics, compared to last year, the enrollment for GSEAP went lower, SOE higher, SON higher, and CAS and DSB lower.

Prof. Rakowitz asked about the appointed members of the CAS Dean's search committee. In addition to SVPAA Babington, they are: Associate VPAA Mary Frances Malone, Dean Meredith Kazer, Ms. Janet Canepa, and a member of the CAS advisory board.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

Prof. Rakowitz mentions that filling replacement openings for faculty committees is under way and reminds about the General Faculty meeting on Friday, 9/12/14.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary

3.a. Approval of minutes of AC meetings

Prof. Mulvey explains that there are 4 sets of minutes to approve and asks if there are any questions or corrections before approving them. Also explains that AC could approve them all together.

Prof. Thiel clarifies his statements on distribution of funds on page 18 of the packet as follows: The proposed change extends the spirit of the agreement on merit reached between the faculty and administration in the governance discussions several years ago.

MOTION [Mulvey/Steffen] to approve all 4 sets of minutes as amended
MOTION PASSED 9-0-4

3.b Correspondence
Prof. Mulvey explained the memo on page 21 of the packet. Specifically, that former SVPAA Fitzgerald rejected an item passed by the AC for Journal of Record. His explanation was shown via “tracked changes” in the memo to him listing all items passed by the AC for the JoR and stated, "Father von Arx would like the Faculty Salary Committee to discuss this in the context of next year’s collegial discussions with the administration team."

**MOTION [Rakowitz/Crawford] the AC sends this matter back to the salary committee to discuss with administrators**

**MOTION PASSED 13-0-0**

Prof. Mulvey expresses her disappointment about the administration’s response to this matter and supports the motion.

Prof. Mulvey draws attention to page 22 of the packet and informs the AC that this will be an item that will be back on the agenda for our next meeting and advised the AC members to read it for more reference.

Prof. Mulvey introduces the proposed meeting dates for 2014-2015 (as per page 28 of AC package). Because the first Monday in April is during Easter break for the undergrad and on the first Monday in May there are exams scheduled, the proposed alternate dates for the last 2 meetings are April 13 and April 27.

Prof. Dennin asks if last Monday in March (March 30) has been considered and proposes that date as a better alternative instead of April 13.

**MOTION [Mulvey/Dennin] to approve the meeting dates as amended, with last 2 meetings being on March 30 and April 27**

**MOTION PASSED 14-0-0**

**4. Council Subcommittee Reports**

**4e. Subcommittee on Mission Statement re non-tenure track faculty (AC 9/9/13)**

Prof. Nantz presents the report of subcommittee on non-tenure track faculty. The charge was “to develop the a long-term mission statement for the optimal employment and deployment of Non-Tenure Track faculty at Fairfield.” The subcommittee considered 3 elements as guiding principles: employment, campus climate, and compensation and resource allocation.

Prof. Rakowitz points out that item #2 of the recommendations contradicts with what we know about the Professor of the Practice position which explicitly rules out promotion.

Prof. Nantz explains that the subcommittee was thinking the other way around. That people in any position can achieve some kind of advancement and wanted to provide consistency throughout all job descriptions. There were discussions and people on the subcommittee who wanted to give more explicit job descriptions (e.g., lecturer) but at the end they were left open on purpose.

Prof. Crawford mentions that the idea is wonderful but costly. The economics are hard to beat and wondering where is this going from here.

Prof. Thiel wants to clarify that the subcommittee just suggests the guiding principles and not the actual mission statement.

SVPAA Babington suggests to start thinking of other categories than visiting and professor of practice, and then asks if the subcommittee was suggesting investigating other job descriptions.

Prof. Nantz responds that by implications we will have to consider all kind of other types.
Prof. Mulvey thanks the subcommittee for their work but has concerns. What is it that we expect faculty to do? Do we expect the same from all faculty or do we have 2 faculty tiers? See descriptions on teaching and service. There should be a statement on what faculty duties are.

Prof. Nantz responds that the institution mission states teaching, research, and service. No discussion was on 2 faculty tiers. If we come up with that as university, with different job descriptions, then there will be more discussion about it. This is the subcommittee report to AC, not correct or to a level of specificity.

Prof. Mulvey highlights that the word tenure does not appear in the subcommittee’s report.

Prof. Steffen mentions that we have large number of faculty from whom we do not have any expectations (i.e., adjuncts) and asks Prof. Nantz to elaborate on item #9, what the subcommittee envisioned by “access to shared governance”. Does that mean that they should know how our governance works? Was that part of the subcommittee discussion?

Prof. Nantz responds that we can have a committee that deals with needs of faculty and that could be anything.

Prof. Bhattacharya asks if the subcommittee considered anything specific for each school.

Prof. Nantz responds that faculty duties were not considered other than broadly. We could do that but this would have to spell out obligations that various faculty have to do (e.g., maintain license for practicing nursing, etc.). So intentionally trying not to include particularities.

Prof. Dennin asks why the subcommittee referred to faculty as teaching faculty, why is teaching in there, and also item #7 seems to relate contractual obligations only to teaching.

Prof. Rakowitz points out that there are all kind of definitions for tenure-track and then we have all these other kind of categories and what do they have in common? Could this be that teaching is common and the committee was looking only at the things in common?

Prof. Nantz responds that research was not excluded on purpose.

Prof. Mulvey points out that the way the document was written, the guideline principles seem to include both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty, but the charge for the subcommittee was for non-tenure track. So it seems that the guideline principles were discussed more broadly than the charge.

Prof. Yarrington feels like we have various categories of faculty, and one of them, the tenure track, is already well discussed somewhere else.

Prof. Mulvey agrees that we want more focus on the non-tenure track faculty rather than broadly.

Prof. Crawford expresses his appreciation for the document because it is provocative and useful to address.

Prof. Petrino asks if anything came out on how contracts affect faculty responsibilities.

Prof. Nantz responds that stability came up and consistency for more transparency was the guiding principle.

Dean Simon asks if the subcommittee looked at peer schools and gathered any data.

Prof. Nantz responds that the subcommittee looked as some data and they are yet to organize and disseminate but could do so.

Prof. Thiel suggests that this might become an imminent item on the agenda in next meetings.

MOTION [Babington/Yarrington] to accept receiving the report from the subcommittee on non-tenure track faculty
MOTION PASSED 14-0-0

Prof. Thiel suggests to pay more attention to the report.

Prof. Crawford recommends that in case there is another subcommittee for adjuncts then that committee should consider consulting this report.

SVPAA Babington mentions that the AC passed a motion to establish a Faculty Handbook committee on contingent faculty and the President intends to communicate with the Council on that.

The consensus of the Council was to wait for the President’s reply before further discussion or action on this matter. We will return to this matter once we hear from the President.

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

None.

6. Old Business

None.

7. New business

7a. Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees – report on June meeting, prepare for October

Prof. Mulvey mentions that the June meeting was good, the Conference Committee presented the memo (in today’s packet on pages 25-27) and it was well received. The conference Committee has not yet elected a Chair for 2014-15, but the returning members are working with SVPAA Babington to plan the October meeting with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board.

7b. Proposal to amend the Faculty Handbook from Educational Technologies Committee

As part of last year ETC, Prof. Rusu provides an overview of the charge for the ETC to restructure the ex officio membership, and the suggested way to do that was to add the new CIO as an ex officio position and decrease the number of ex officio seats overall. ETC has updated some of the ex officio positions to better reflect the current job names as well as eliminating the Director of Distance Education ex officio position. However, a new ex officio has been added for SVPAA’s office as the liaison between Academic Affairs, ITS and the Registrar’s Office, so that the number of ex officio members stayed the same. Along these changes, ETC provided new language to be included in the faculty handbook based on the proposed changes.

MOTION [Rusu/Steffen] to recommend that the General Faculty approves the changes to Faculty Handbook as proposed by ETC (deletions struck through, insertions in bold face):

Seven members elected from the faculty for three-year overlapping terms; one member to be elected from each of the following electoral divisions: Behavioral and Social Sciences; Natural Sciences, Mathematics and Engineering; the Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions; School of Business; and School of Nursing; and two members from two different departments in the Humanities. The Directors of Library Services, Distance Education for University College, Administrative Computing, Media Center, and Computing and Network Services The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs or designee, the University Librarian or designee, the Chief Information Officer, and the Directors of Academic Computing and the Media Center shall be ex officio members.

MOTION PASSED 11-0-1

7c. Proposal to change name of the Bachelor Degree in Professional Studies
Prof. Wills briefly explains the proposed name change for the bachelor degree in Professional Studies, and reminds that it is a name change not a curriculum change, to better align with the mission.

Prof. Dennin points out that it seems like there are 2 types of students for the program. Which is the breakdown?

Prof. Wills responds that it is half and half and overall about 70 students, not necessarily all active.

**MOTION [Rakowitz/Dennin] to change the name of the Bachelor of Professional Studies to the Bachelor of Liberal Studies.**

**MOTION PASSED 12-0-0**

Prof. Crawford is happy to vote but raises the point that the document does not seem to be data driven or market driven.

Prof. Dennin agrees completely. It seems reasonable though to assume that the students will come to liberal studies.

Prof. Bhattacharya suggests we grandfather the existing students.

Dean Simon conveys the idea that there is a feeling that we are underperforming with part-time students.

**7d. Elect the AC Calendar Subcommittee for 2014-15**

Prof. Rakowitz asks for volunteers for the AC Calendar Subcommittee. Prof. Harding and Prof. Yarrington volunteer for it. Prof. Harding and Prof. Yarrington are unanimously elected.

A motion to adjourn [Dennin/Crawford] **PASSED** without objection.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Amalia Rusu
To: Jeffrey von Arx, S.J., President  
From: Susan Rakowitz, General Faculty Secretary  
Re: Academic Council recommendations to amend the Faculty Handbook  
CC: Shawn Rafalski, Irene Mulvey, Lynn Babington

At its final meetings of the 2013-2014 academic year, the Academic Council passed three motions recommending that the General Faculty amend the Faculty Handbook. Per the Handbook, "The President or his officially designated representative shall report in writing to the Academic Council either agreement or disagreement with the proposed amendments". This memo constitutes a request for that feedback.

Each of the Council's recommendations is presented below, followed by a brief summary of its background. Attached to this memo are relevant subcommittee reports and excerpts of draft minutes of the Academic Council discussions and votes. [The attachments are not included in the AC 10/6/2014 packet.]

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to ask.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion 1: April 28, 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to recommend that the General Faculty approve amending the Faculty Handbook [II.A.3.c] as shown on page 12 of the packet for today’s meeting [new language underlined and bold; items following insertion to be renumbered]:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Other Matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) The normal maximum probationary period shall be…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Time spent on leave from Fairfield University will not …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) <strong>Upon return from an approved maternity leave, an untenured faculty member may choose that the time of her probationary period toward tenure not include the academic year in which the maternity leave was taken. This declaration will be made in writing to the SVPAA by the 15th of October subsequent to a spring maternity leave or the 1st of March subsequent to a fall maternity leave. The faculty member will send copies of this letter to her department chair and Dean.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) A candidate may be required to spend up to …”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Currently, there is no consistent policy regarding the relationship between maternity leaves and the probationary period prior to tenure. A subcommittee charged with "clarifying how time spent on maternity leave will ordinarily be treated with regard to tenure" recommended that the faculty member be allowed to decide, soon after the leave, whether the academic year including the leave would count in the probationary period. Excerpts from the subcommittee report, a follow up memo from the AC Executive Committee, and the draft minutes of 4/28/14 are attached.
Motion 2: May 13, 2014

To recommend that the General Faculty amend the *Faculty Handbook* (Eleventh edition 2013) by inserting on page 12 before the Committee on Student Life (and renumbering accordingly here and in the Table of Contents) the following text:

5. **Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty.**

**Membership**
Three members of the General Faculty, at least one with tenure, elected for three-year overlapping terms in the usual manner, and three non-tenure track faculty members elected for three-year overlapping terms by the non-tenure track faculty in an election overseen by the Secretary of the General Faculty each spring. The SVPAA or his/her designee shall be an *ex officio* member. The election of the three non-tenure track members will take place before the election of members from the General Faculty, and committee membership shall include at most three members from the College of Arts and Sciences. Non-tenure track faculty members serve for three years as long as they are employed at Fairfield. Members with part-time faculty status receive a stipend equal to 1/8 of their stipend for one course for each semester they serve on this committee.

**General Purpose**
To study and make recommendations on the employment and the employment conditions of non-tenure track faculty, and to represent non-tenure track faculty.

**Specific Duties**
1. To draft or review policies on any matter pertaining to non-tenure track faculty;
2. To receive suggestions from any source on matters pertaining to non-tenure track faculty;
3. To facilitate interaction between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty;
4. To promote the professional development of part-time faculty;
5. To receive from the Office of Human Resources each semester a list of non-tenure track faculty with contact information.

In response to a recommendation of a task force exploring "the status, roles, and conditions of part-time faculty at Fairfield," a subcommittee was appointed to "consider developing a general purpose for a Faculty Handbook Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty employment, roles, and conditions." The subcommittee was also charged to "provide a membership requirement and specific duties for such a Handbook committee." The resulting report is attached along with an excerpt from the 5/13/14 AC draft minutes.
The Council recommends that the General Faculty approve amending the Faculty Handbook [page 29] as shown [deletions in strikethrough and additions in bold and underlined]:

```
Motion 3: May 13, 2014

The Council recommends that the General Faculty approve amending the Faculty Handbook [page 29] as shown [deletions in strikethrough and additions in bold and underlined]:

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

The subcommittee examining maternity leave policy in relation to tenure (see Motion 1) recommended explicitly adding release from service responsibilities to the existing release from teaching. Furthermore, the current Handbook language describing "maternity disability leave" is inconsistent with the updated maternity leave policy detailed in the Benefits Plan Overview (BPO). This proposal removes the inconsistent language while adding the recommended reference to service. Excerpts from the subcommittee report on maternity leave and the draft minutes of 5/13/14 are attached.

From: "von Arx, Jeffrey, S.J." <President@fairfield.edu>
Date: September 15, 2014 at 10:29:26 AM EDT
To: "Rakowitz, Susan" <SRakowitz@fairfield.edu>
Cc: "Babington, Lynn" <lbabington@fairfield.edu>
Subject: Academic Council Recommendations to amend the Faculty Handbook

Dear Sue:

I agree to the first amendment to Faculty Handbook [II.A.3.c] regarding the probationary period toward tenure in the case of maternity leaves and will recommend it for acceptance to the Board.

As I indicated when we spoke about this in the spring, I am not agreeing to the second motion regarding the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty until the administration and the Executive Committee of the Academic Council agree to the parameters of the committee – composition, charge to the committee, responsibilities, deliverables. SVPAA Lynn Babington will work with the Executive Committee and the Academic Council on this matter.

I am not agreeing to the third motion because this is a benefits issue that does not belong in the Faculty Handbook, but rather in the BPO.

Jeffrey P. von Arx, S.J.
President
Fairfield University
1073 N. Benson Road
Fairfield, Connecticut 06824-5195
203-254-4000 x2217
Fax 203-254-4292

Meeting Dates for 2014-2015

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.

The Council agreed that rather than meeting on Easter Monday, we would move the April meeting to March 30. Also, because the first meeting in May is after classes end, we agreed to move the May meeting to 4/27. Here are the meeting dates for 2014-2015. Note that the Council always has the right to add meeting dates if necessary, and in recent years has added 2 or 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>2014-2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 8, 2014</td>
<td>February 2, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 6, 2014</td>
<td>March 2, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 3, 2014</td>
<td>March 30, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1, 2014</td>
<td>April 27, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shannon Harding  Behavioral and Social Sciences  2015  
Elizabeth Petrino  Humanities  2015  
Martin Nguyen  Humanities  2015  
John Thiel  Humanities  2015  
Irene Mulvey  Arts and Sciences at large  2015  
Kraig Steffen  Natural Science/Mathematics/Engineering  2015  
Alison Kris*  School of Nursing  2015  
Mike Cavanaugh  Dolan School of Business  2015  
Joe Dennin  Natural Science/Mathematics/Engineering  2015  
David Crawford  Behavioral and Social Sciences  2016  
Bob Epstein**  Arts and Sciences at large  2016  
Mousumi Bhattacharya  Dolan School of Business  2016  
Emily Smith  Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions  2016  
Amalia Rusu  Arts and Sciences at large  2016  
Rona Preli  Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions  2016  
Deb Strauss  Dolan School of Business  2016  
Jo Yarrington  Arts and Sciences at large  2016  
Lynn Babington  Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs  ex officio  vote  
James Simon  Dean, College of Arts and Sciences  ex officio  no vote  
Meredith Kazer  Dean, School of Nursing  ex officio  no vote  
Don Gibson  Dean, Dolan School of Business  ex officio  no vote  
Bruce Berdanier  Dean, School of Engineering  ex officio  no vote  
Robert Hannafin  Dean, Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions  ex officio  no vote  
Susan Rakowitz  Secretary of the General Faculty  ex officio  vote  

CHAIR:  Irene Mulvey

*Fall 2014 replaced by Kate Wheeler  
**2014-2015 replaced by Don Greenberg
Agenda Item 6.b. Language in 2014-15 Benefits Plan Overview on Maternity Leave:

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

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

The University requires a physician’s certification for any medical leave of absence.

Agenda Item 6.c. Motion to create and charge the AC Subcommittee on Mission Statement re non-tenure track faculty, passed by Academic Council on 9/9/2013:

MOTION. That the AC empower the Academic Council Executive Committee to 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.
GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR A FACULTY MISSION STATEMENT
Academic Council Subcommittee
Final Draft -- June 12, 2014

Subcommittee membership: Steve Bayne, Gayle Bogel, Rosemary Danaher, Christine Earls, Paul Fitzgerald, S.J., Rosemarie Gorman, Faith Hunt, Laura Marciano, Kathryn Nantz (Chair), Terry Quell.
The following points define principles upon which decisions about faculty appointments of all types will be based:
1. Deploy all members of the teaching faculty judiciously with the objective of maintaining and improving upon the quality of student learning and educational experiences in alignment with Fairfield University’s institutional mission.
2. Provide stability in employment and in work life for all University faculty members, along with the possibility for upward mobility and professional advancement through various appropriate job categories or ranks.
3. Provide access to due-process protections and an appeal process for non-reappointment to all faculty. Faculty appointments will be made in a timely manner before the start of the academic semester and will clearly state the longest possible term of employment.
4. Create a bi-directional climate of clear and transparent commitment between all faculty members and the institution. The nature of this commitment may differ across faculty cohorts, but its conditions must be clearly articulated and understood by all parties.
5. As an institutional priority, cultivate a culture of respect for all faculty on campus, regardless of their contractual status.
6. As an institutional priority, share information consistently across departments, programs, and schools, to include students, faculty, appropriate staff, and administrators.
7. Compensate all faculty work fairly, based on documented and available guidelines regardless of the type of faculty position or length of contract. Contractual obligations for any faculty member will be clearly articulated, with compensation attached to these obligations. The university will strive for consistency between job descriptions and the actual teaching responsibilities.
8. Provide all faculty with access to appropriate formative assessment and summative evaluation of their work performance, as well as to mentoring of both formal and informal sorts. Such evaluations will include input from students and from peers and from administrators.
9. Provide all faculty with access to the shared governance structure.
10. Provide all faculty with access to faculty development resources appropriate to their job descriptions and teaching responsibilities. Specific training and development needs are met using on and off campus resources.

Policy on Pass/Fail Option for Undergraduate Courses
Submitted by the UCC to the Academic Council

Rationale: Generally speaking courses should use the traditional (A, B, C, D, F) grading system. However, some courses (e.g. many internships) do not lend themselves to traditional grading by multiple letter grades, and a Pass/Fail grade may be preferable in these cases.

Details:
1. All students in the course will receive a grade of either Pass or Fail.
2. The requirements for a Pass grade must be specified in the course syllabus.
3. The decision to designate a course Pass/Fail must be approved by the department within which the course is taught and by the curriculum committee of that school.
4. A Pass/Fail course will count as a regular course toward graduation, determining full-time status, etc.
5. The grade in a Pass/Fail course will not be included in calculating a student’s grade point average but will appear in all cases on the student’s transcript.

Relevant portions of UCC minutes

UCC Meeting on 10/1/2013 (excerpt of minutes):
4. Pass-fail grade option – Currently there is no pass/fail grade option at Fairfield. Should this be reconsidered? When might it be most appropriately offered? Discussion.

UCC Meeting on 11/5/2013 (excerpt of minutes):
(4) Report from the Pass/Fail Policy Subcommittee:

Rosivach referred to the policy drafted by the subcommittee as submitted to the meeting. He mentioned that the 3.5 GPA in item B-2 of the draft is up for the committee’s discussion and consideration

The following discussion and Q&A followed the presentation:
- Pagano: asked if this policy for only undergraduate courses or will also apply to graduate courses
- Rosivach: said that it is mainly for undergraduate courses, and asked if graduate students are expected to take a P/F course
- Dean Crabtree: asked if this will be considered in the AACSB accreditation for the Business School, and Dean Gibson answered no
- Dean Crabtree: mentioned that a graduate student may take some course (i.e. Statistics course) just for general skills without seeking a grade
- Pagano: asked about the distinction between the two groups A and B in the draft policy. Rosivach explained the difference between the two groups of courses. In group A, the whole course is designated as P/F course. Group B courses are regular courses where some students may be permitted to take it as P/F instead of the regular grade according to the requirements and conditions detailed in the draft
- Peduti: wondered about the reason behind picking GPA 3.5 for a student to be eligible for P/F election under group B. Rosivach replied that we decided to start with students on the Dean’s list. However, the subcommittee needs guidance from committee members on that issue
- Perkus: we have to consider how this policy will affect other student choices and designations like applying for Fulbright Scholarship, joining associations like Beta Alpha Sigma, and others. Rosivach replied that we will need to make students aware of any of these consequences of their P/F election.
- Agresta: it is good that the suggested policy will expand the choices available to students. However, students electing P/F may not work as hard for these courses. In addition, the minimum 3.5 GPA means this is already an accomplished student who may not need that option to start with.
- Perkus: this option will be offered and applied to very narrow area of course work.
- Gerard: 3.5 GPA is too high and we may need to make it available to more students
- Pagano: it will be good to make this election available to graduate students too
- Jones: supports the higher 3.5 GPA but wonders how we will get enough enrollment in these courses with such high requirement. Rosivach replied that the option will be for selected students already enrolled in regular courses under group B in the draft, and the instructor will have the final say
- Staecher: asked about item B-8 in the draft that makes the election “ordinarily” available only for junior and senior students. Is this a policy or just an expectation? Rosivach replied that we may leave this part for Deans to decide
- Miecznikowski: wondered how many students have GPA 3.5 or higher. We may need to obtain this information
- Perkus: commented on item B-6 in the draft that allows students to switch back from P/F to regular grade during the semester. He thinks that students should be bound to their original choice. Rosivach replied that is why the draft includes a time period of 10 weeks. Perkus asked if the student will need the instructor’s approval for the switch. He added that we may need to educate the faculty not to treat students any different
- Gerard: it sounds like the draft policy will be limited to elective courses
- Dean Crabtree: certain courses will be fit for this draft policy. We may need to consult with FUSA about this change
- Campbell: item B-6 of the draft will give incentive for students to register as P/F first, and then switch to regular grade based on their performance. Rosivach agreed and added that –in addition to encouraging students to explore new areas- it is still encouraging them to do well and be engaged in the course
- Campbell: asked if we can also apply that option to switching from regular grade to P/F in case a student is not doing well and would prefer the P/F option than the W option. Rosivach replied that we are trying to avoid having this option available
- Nantz: wondered what will happen when a student takes a P/F course as elective and, then, decides to declare the area as a major or minor after completing the course. Rosivach replied that, under the draft policy, the course will not count towards that newly-declared major/minor, and students will need to take additional course to meet the major/minor requirements
- Perkus: wondered how group B of the draft policy will work for courses that depend heavily on teamwork when members of the same team are electing P/F while others are under the regular grade system. Rosivach replied that is why we are leaving the final approval to the instructor
- Pagano: asked why the P/F course will not count for a major or minor if minimum C is required to pass? Rosivach replied that it is a motivational issue for the student
- Peduti: referred back to item B-2 of the draft policy and mentioned we may need to consider a lower GPA than 3.5. Etemad replied that the 3.5 is open for discussion
- Sauer: we may need to open it for students who would like to try new areas and don’t meet the 3.5 GPA requirement
- Perkus: wondered how the draft policy will affect Financial Aid eligibility. Rosivach replied we should consider such implications.
- Staecker: asked if we can count the P/F course towards major requirements if student changes major.
- Ebrahim: asked why we don’t count the P/F course if a student later declares the area as a second major or a minor as long as the C- meets the requirements of that major/minor. Rosivach said that we need to consider all these issues.
- Garvey: for the inter-disciplinary minors, we need to consider how the proposed P/F policy will work.

Rosivach concluded the discussion of this agenda item by stating that the subcommittee will consider all the above points raised by members and will report back to the committee.

**UCC Meeting on 4/1/2014 (excerpt of minutes):**

2. Discussion of Pass/Fail Subcommittee Report

a. Prof. Rosivach explained that the original proposal to offer a Pass/Fail option has been modified based on prior discussion of the UCC. Prof. Ebrahim asked for clarification as to how the P/F option would be limited to juniors and seniors. Prof. Rosivach indicated that as per communication with Financial Aid this is a concern and could be done by requiring any P/F student to have a minimum of 60 credits. Prof. Garvey asked about limiting the number of students taking P/F. Prof. Rosivach explained that this will be determined by the individual schools as issues may arise which make this desirable. Assoc. Dean Perkus asked for clarification on how grades would be assigned. Prof. Rosivach explained that the professor for the class would not know which students are taking P/F and would maintain and submit grades normally. The registrar would then record the P or F for those students electing this option. Prof. Peduti confirmed that the professor would record the grade, and the registrar would switch for those students.

b. **MOTION:** The UCC endorses RECOMMENDATION A (Pass/Fail Courses) and recommends its approval by the Academic Council for inclusion in the Journal of Record. Motion to approve by Prof. Miecznikowski and seconded by Prof. Fernandez. Motion PASSED (16-0-1).

c. **MOTION:** The UCC endorses RECOMMENDATION B (Taking a Regular Course for a Pass/Fail Grade) and recommends its approval by the Academic Council for inclusion in the Journal of Record. Motion to approve by Prof. Miecznikowski, seconded by Prof. Reckinger. Assoc. Dean Perkus clarified that under this proposal, if a student chooses P/F and earns a D the student will get no credit. He spoke against the motion stating that it was too confusing and he did not see how the institution would be better off with this policy. Prof. Fernandez expressed mixed feelings about the motion. She likes that students would be encouraged to broaden their experiences but sees too many complications. Prof. Rosivach reiterated that the subcommittee tried to incorporate all changes suggested by the UCC and he wants to make sure that this objective has been met but he added that these changes have resulted in the proposal moving away from the original intent. Prof. Ebrahim stated that the original intent was simply to encourage students to try new things. Prof. Garvey expressed gratitude to the subcommittee for doing a lot of good work but spoke against the motion saying there were too many steps that needed to be met. The motion was called to a vote. The motion FAILED (3-14-0). The subcommittee’s work on the Pass/Fail option has been concluded.