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

1. Presidential courtesy (The President is expected to attend and address the Council.)

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 October 6, 2014 (attached)
   b. Correspondence
      i. Memo AC Executive Secretary to President dated 10/21/2014 re Handbook amendment on maternity leave (attached); Response from President dated 10/21/2014 (attached)
      ii. Memo GFS to President dated 10/20/14 re Handbook amendment ETC membership (attached); Response from President dated 10/21/14 (attached)
   c. Oral Reports

4. Council Subcommittee Reports (Report from 4.e. only at this meeting)
   a. SC 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)
   e. Standing Calendar Review Subcommittee (Ongoing Item 3; attachments)

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 (attachments)
   b. Discussion of AC approved amendment to the Faculty Handbook on language on maternity leave policy (attachments)
   c. UCC proposal for Pass/Fail option (attachments)
   d. Recommendations from FDEC re online IDEA evaluations (attachments)
   e. MFA in Creative Writing, Five-Year-Review (Pending Item B; attachments)
   f. Report from Committee on Committees re language for Journal of Record and Handbook to implement the dissolution of University College (Pending Item G; attachments)

7. New business
   a. Report from the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees (report on October meeting and plan for December meeting; Ongoing item 2)
   b. Confidentiality and liaisons/faculty representatives to Board Committees (attachments)
   c. Request for clarification of Faculty Handbook from EPC (attachment)

Lists of Attachments, Pending Items, and Ongoing Items are on page 2
List of Attachments:
For item 3.a.i. Draft minutes of 10/6/2014 AC meeting (pages 3-12)
For item 3.b.i. Memo from AC Executive Secretary to President dated 10/21/2014 re Handbook amendment on maternity leave (page 13); Response from President dated 10/21/2014 (page 14)
For item 3.b.ii. Memo from Faculty Secretary to President dated 10/20/2014 re Handbook amendment on ETC membership (page 15); Response from President dated 10/21/2014 (page 14)
For item 4.e. Report from AC Subcommittee on Calendar Review (pages 16-18); Draft 2015-16 academic calendar (pages 19-22); Draft 2016-17 academic calendar (pages 23-26)
For item 6.a. Correspondence between GFS and President (pages 28 & 29); Proposed revisions to Handbook language from the President (pages 30-32)
For item 6.b. Correspondence between GFS and President (page 29); Memo from AC Executive Secretary to President dated 10/20/2014 (page 13); Response from President dated 10/21/2014 (page 14)
For item 6.c. Proposed Policy on Pass/Fail Option for Undergraduate Courses from UCC (pages 33-35) and see 10/6/14 AC draft minutes (page 12)
For item 6.d. Excerpt of AC minutes of 5/13/2014 (pages 36-37); Recommendations from FDEC re IDEA evaluations online (pages 38-39)
For item 6.e. Five-Year Review of MFA in Creative Writing (pages 40-46); relevant ASCC minutes (pages 47-48); relevant EPC minutes (pages 48-51)
For item 6.f. Report from Committee on Committees (pages 52-60)
For item 7.b. Memo from Senior VP for Administration & Chief of Staff to Board Committee liaisons (pages 61-62); Correspondence between GFS and VP Reed (pages 63-64); AAUP statement on Confidentiality and... (page 65-68)
For item 7.c. Email from EPC Chair to AC Executive Secretary dated (page 69)

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 & 5/13/14)
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. Committee on Committees report on JrR and Handbook language to implement the dissolution of University College (AC 11/4/13)
H. 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.
ACADEMIC COUNCIL
Monday, October 6, 2014
CNS 200
DRAFT MINUTES

In attendance:
Faculty: Professors Mousumi Bhattacharya, Mike Cavanaugh, Dave Crawford, Joe Dennin, Don Greenberg, Shannon Harding, Irene Mulvey (Executive Secretary), Martin Nguyen, Elizabeth Petrino, Rona Preli, Susan Rakowitz (Secretary of the General Faculty), Amalia Rusu, Emily Smith, L. Kraig Steffen, Debra Strauss, John Thiel, Kate Wheeler, Jo Yarrington.
Administrators: Deans Bruce Berdanier, Don Gibson, Meredith Kazer, Jim Simon; SVPAA Lynn Babington
Student Observer: Jason Abate
Absent with regrets: Dean Bob Hannafin
Invited Presenters: Professor James He, Associate Dean Mark Ligas, Professor Kathy Nantz.

Prof. Rakowitz called the meeting to order at 3:31.

Quick introductions were given for the new student observer, Jason Abate

0. Elect a Chair for 2014-15.

Prof. Rakowitz opened floor for nominations for chair

Prof. Mulvey nominated Prof. Preli

Prof. Dennin seconded the nomination

With no other nominations, Prof. Preli was named chair by acclamation and thanked for serving.

[The agenda was unofficially reordered due to SVPAA Babington’s delayed arrival; however, the minutes are presented in the order of the original agenda.]

1. Presidential courtesy

SVPAA Babington shared the following information (which she provided in writing for these minutes):

Enrollment: The final first-year student numbers: 1056.

Fairfield 2020 Strategic Planning: The eleven 2020 task forces—consisting of faculty, staff, students, administration and alumni—have been working very hard for the past 9 months. All together, there are over 200 people involved at some level. Final recommendations from each task force will be presented in December in a public forum. The Steering Committee will then vet those recommendations and develop an implementation plan with a focused timeline. Please be involved in the areas that you have specific interest in. All of the meeting agendas, minutes, preliminary reports and other materials are available on the Fairfield 2020 web site (linked from the main web page). The task force addressing the Core Curriculum is particularly in need of feedback and input. Those task force members include 16 faculty whose names are listed on the 2020 website. Faculty are encouraged to speak to their colleagues about the progress of any of the task forces.
This week's 2020 speaker is Andrew Delbanco. In his recent book, titled *College: What is Was, Is and Should Be*, Dr. Delbanco offers a defense of a four-year college experience that should be an exploratory time for students to discover passions and test ideas and values with the help of teachers and peers. He believes this concept is often at odds with the growing commercialization of higher education and the narrow view of obtaining a bachelor's degree as a pre-professional credential. He will be speaking Wednesday, from 3:30-4:30 in the Oak Room followed by a more informal discussion. Faculty are encouraged to attend.

**Campaign Update**
We presently sit at just over $86 million on a $160 million goal. Our FY 14 goal is $90 million so we are on pace and have $5m in pending asks. Student scholarship goal is $60M and we are at $29m, so on pace here. Academic endowment goal is $30 million and we are behind pace at $6M. This is the next point of emphasis and Advancement is working with deans and faculty to develop specific cases to support fundraising efforts. (Academic initiatives such as INHSI, CFPL, Center for Entrepreneurship & Endowed professorships in many areas- case statements have been developed to support endowments in gender studies, philosophy, studio arts, economics, chemistry, music, palliative care, aging, etc.) Advancement will also be working with faculty to identify prospects that might be helpful in this area. There is good potential; we need to clearly identify and state the priorities, and produce collateral to carry and make the solicitations. Rafferty Stadium had a $9m fundraising goal and that has been achieved and exceeded – estimated cost $10.1 million (Prep budgeted $1.1m since they had to upgrade the football stadium). RecPlex goal is $20m and we have secured commitments of $15.6m to date. Fundraising should be concluded by the end of the calendar year and then a hard press on academic endowments and the SON/Health Science Building.

**Faculty**
There are currently 237 FT tenured or tenure track faculty. This is the highest number ever. There are 30 FT non-tenure track faculty (visiting/POP), also highest ever, for a total of 267 FT faculty. There are 285 adjuncts teaching across the university this fall.

Prof. Thiel asked when the capital campaign will be officially announced.

SVPAA Babington replied that it’s likely to be announced next Fall, explaining that you usually raise half the funds before going public, which we’ve done.

2. **Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty**

Prof. Rakowitz stated that there is a General Faculty Meeting scheduled for October 17th. However, the only items of business at this time are the 3 Handbook amendments from AC. Since two of these amendments are not supported by the President, Prof. Rakowitz suggested that we might hold off on bringing them to the faculty for now, and cancel the 10/17 meeting.

Prof. Rakowitz shared a concern about a memo sent from VP Mark Reed to the faculty members who serve as liaisons to Board Committees. This memo from VP Reed indicates that the proceedings of the Board Committee meetings are confidential. Given that a number of committees send a liaison to the Board meetings, she informed VP Reed that this is problematic and she will have the Council follow up on this at a future meeting.

3. **Report from the Executive Secretary**

a. **Approval of minutes of AC meetings**
i. Minutes of Meeting on September 8, 2014

No corrections were proposed.

**MOTION [Mulvey/Harding] to approve the minutes.**
**MOTION PASSED** [14 in favor; 0 opposed; 3 abstentions]

b. Correspondence

Email correspondence between President and Faculty Secretary re HB amendments (included in packet)

Prof. Mulvey briefly reviewed the three motions discussed in the correspondence; two of these appear later on today's agenda:

**Motion 1:** Maternity leave/probationary period. This will move forward to General Faculty, then to Board.

**Motion 2:** Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty. The AC approved this *Handbook* amendment. The President expressed disagreement with this amendment (response is on p. 11.) He'd like the faculty to work through this with SVPAA Babington. This is on today's agenda, item 6.a.

**Motion 3:** Maternity leave and service. The change would excuse someone from service, as well as teaching, during a maternity leave. This is on today's agenda, item 6.b.

Memo from GFS to AC 9/23/2014 Re: AC Meetings and Roster, Updated (attached)

Prof. Mulvey asked the AC to please note the changes to original schedule of meetings.

c. Oral Reports

Prof. Mulvey reminded members that we elected an AC calendar subcommittee at our September meeting (Profs. Harding & Yarrington) and she asked that they be allowed to give a brief report at this time.

Prof. Harding shared that discussions with administration regarding the calendar are ongoing, going well, and spirited. She noted that the subcommittee will have a full report for the next AC meeting and expects to recommend approval of a two-year calendar.

4. Council Subcommittee Reports

No reports given.

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

None.

6. Old Business

a. Discussion of AC approved amendment to the Faculty Handbook for Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty
Prof. Mulvey reminded the Council that the Motion on p. 10 is what the Council already approved. Page 11 is the President’s objections. What he is asking for, Mulvey suggested, (composition, charge, responsibilities) is already in the approved amendment.

SVPAA Babington said that she’d speak to the President about this motion. She explained that the president wants to clarify some language to bring back to the Council, mainly related to the responsibilities of the Committee. In addition, SVPAA Babington recommends taking out duty #5, which implies that HR can provide lists of adjunct faculty, because their lists are not necessarily up to date. SVPAA Babington said that her adjunct lists are more accurate. Further, Prof. Babington feels that this should be an advisory committee to AC, not to anybody else. These two items are the type of thing that SVPAA Babington will speak about with the President. She does not think this will be a problem—just a few language tweaks. She will work with the President and bring proposed revisions to our next meeting.

b. Discussion of AC approved amendment to the Faculty Handbook on language on maternity leave policy

Prof. Rakowitz referred the AC to pp. 11 and 13 of the agenda packet, focused on maternity leave policies. She reviewed the motion, which recommends including a leave from service as well as teaching during maternity leave, and updating the policy to be in line with practice. Prof. Rakowitz added that we have asked the salary committee to work with the administration to insert “and service” into the benefits plan overview. The President says that this is problematic because it’s about benefits. But, Prof. Rakowitz explained, this is already in the Handbook.

Prof. Thiel commented that the President’s reason for refusal does not make sense since the language is already in the Handbook, and the president already approved the revised maternity leave policy on p. 9, which is also about benefits. Prof. Thiel shared his hope that the SVPAA could talk with president about this matter when speaking about Motion 2.

Prof. Crawford asked why language about the maternity probationary period goes in one document, and exclusion of duties while on maternity leave goes in a different document.

SVPAA Babington shared her understanding that the probationary period refers to a faculty member’s time period before tenure, which isn’t a benefit, but rather part of the employment contract. The maternity benefit, however, is a benefit and thus shouldn’t be in the Handbook.

Prof. Thiel stated that the language is not about benefit, but about a faculty’s professional duties, i.e., service.

SVPAA Babington stated that the President doesn’t disagree about the proposed motion regarding service; however, he doesn’t feel that it should be in the Handbook. Human Resources is going to say it’s a benefit.

Prof. Mulvey asked where the assertion that benefits don’t belong in Handbook is coming from, stating that this assertion is not true and should not be the last word on this issue. Prof. Mulvey pointed out that there are benefits in Handbooks all over the country. What’s more, she pointed out, the result of rejecting this motion is to leave the benefit in there incorrectly. She proposed the option of sending this on to the General Faculty, reminding the Council that the president doesn’t have to approve a Handbook amendment; we don’t have
to have his agreement to move forward. The *Handbook* is an agreement between the faculty and the Board.

Prof. Dennin suggested that this issue might be part of an ongoing plan to take all benefits out of the *Handbook*.

Prof. Mulvey reiterated that the rejection of this motion would leave the benefit in the *Handbook*, and incorrectly.

Prof. Crawford shared that he doesn’t think the move by the President is nefarious; rather, the administration’s desire to move benefits out of the Handbook was a stated administrative goal when he was on the Salary Committee. The argument, he explained, was to bring clarity to an unclear situation—separate benefits out. But, Prof. Crawford explained, there’s no clear red line between these two things.

**MOTION [Greenberg/Mulvey] to direct Academic Council’s Executive Secretary to write to von Arx explaining that the maternity benefit is already in the Handbook, so he cannot refuse the amendment based on this. Further, we are requesting a more substantive rationale for the rejection.**

Prof. Preli asked if there was any discussion.

Prof. Crawford spoke in favor of the motion, indicating that we’d be happy to remove 3 ½ sentences of benefits in exchange for two words.

**MOTION PASSED [17 in favor: 0 opposed; 1 abstention]**

c. Further discussion of Report from AC Subcommittee on Mission Statement re non-tenure track faculty

Prof. Mulvey referred the Council to the report on p. 14 and reminded members that we talked about the subcommittee’s report in September. She explained that the Executive Committee wanted the Council to see the charge to this subcommittee [Prof. Mulvey Reads charge on page 13 of packet.] so that the Council can compare the subcommittee’s report with the original charge.

Prof. Bhattacharya asked about what the subcommittee produced as compared to what they were asked to do, and suggested that we request a much clearer document focused on non-tenure track faculty.

Prof. Crawford wondered if we could ask them to go back to the original charge.

Prof Mulvey reminded the Council that we simply “received” the report in September and the subcommittee considers itself disbanded.

Prof. Thiel pointed to ambiguity in the word being used—*non-tenure track faculty*—suggesting that the AC’s discussion of this issue last year assumed that the word meant adjunct (i.e., part-time faculty member).

Prof. Mulvey clarified that we did not mean only adjuncts (part-time faculty members).
Prof. Thiel replied that he thought it meant *adjunct* and had assumed that this subcommittee was dealing with guiding principles for part-time faculty only and not full-time faculty who were non-tenure track. He indicated that there is confusion in the way we’ve been talking about this.

Prof. Mulvey replied that non-tenure track means what it says here, and that’s what the committee was talking about. She went on to explain the need to include the needs of PoPs and visiting full-time faculty, as these types of positions, like part-time ones, are vulnerable without the protection of tenure. In addition, the profession is heading more and more in the direction of these types of appointments. Prof. Mulvey suggested that we might need to discuss this further.

Prof. Yarrington agreed with Profs. Thiel and Mulvey, agreeing that we should include everyone and have some generalized statements and structure, while acknowledging that different appointments have different issues.

Prof. Thiel said that if what Irene says is true, that he missed point of the discussions last year. He then asked if anyone on the subcommittee membership was a PoP.

Prof. Rakowitz replied that Christine Earls is a PoP.

Prof. Mulvey agreed with Prof. Yarrington that groups have different issues; however, they share the status of not having tenure and thus being vulnerable.

Prof. Yarrington added that the lumping of everyone together leads to some of the confusion.

Prof. Preli asked how we want to move forward and asked if we wanted to postpone this discussion until we get a report on the Handbook committee.

*The consensus of the Council is that we take up this issue at a future meeting, once we hear back about the Non-tenure track Handbook committee.*

7. **New business**

a. **Election of faculty representatives to the Honorary Degree Committee**

Prof. Rakowitz explained the process for appointing folks to the Honorary Degree Committee: The Committee on Committees collects names, and then Academic Council appoints faculty to serve on this committee. She added that the three nominations are Profs. Dawn Massey, Phil Lane, and Nancy Dallavalle.

**MOTION [Rakowitz] to elect Dawn Massey, Phil Lane, and Nancy Dallavalle to the Honorary Degree committee for 2014-2105.**

**MOTION PASSED [16 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstained]**

b. **Proposal for a Master of Science degree in Business Analytics**

Guests Professor James He and Associate Dean Mark Ligas were invited in to present their proposal for a Master of Science degree in Business Analytics.
Prof. Ligas provided a brief background and rationale for the program, focused largely on the need for businesses to have people who can oversee the collection and analysis of massive amounts of data and provide guidance on how to better use “Big Data” to make strategic decisions. He concluded that this need, along with the expertise of the faculty in ISOM, makes this an opportune time to develop this program.

Prof. Preli asks for questions.

Prof. Greenberg asks if the courses listed on p. 8 are all graduate courses and if so, what program they are in.

Prof. Ligas replied that they are all foundational graduate courses in the MBA program.

Prof. Greenberg followed up by asking who will teach the new courses.

Prof. Ligas replied that they will be taught by existing ISOM faculty.

Prof. Greenberg asked if these additional courses would put greater strain on these faculty, and if this additional strain would be counterproductive.

Prof. Ligas responded that the graduate ISOM program is currently not very active, so there is room at the graduate level to use existing faculty to teach the graduate courses. At the undergraduate level, he went on, there are many more required ISOM classes, which they can balance with adjuncts and FT faculty. Prof. Ligas explained that they can hire more adjuncts and stay in compliance with accreditation guidelines.

Prof. Harding asked how they will cap cohorts at 10-12 students given the noted demand in this particular area.

Prof. Ligas explained that they would be thrilled if the demand was great, though they couldn’t take in 50 students with their current staff. As for admission criteria, they’d focus on applicants whose backgrounds are more appropriate to the field.

Dean Gibson added that they can use adjuncts to solve short-term spikes.

Prof. He added that we can manage 10-12 students and that not all applicants will be qualified.

Prof. Dennin asked how they’ll plan to accommodate 4-5 additional courses per year when they currently offer one advanced elective each year, and how this will affect staffing and enrollments in current courses.

Prof. Ligas explained that the enrollments in the current 400-level courses are low because most students come from MBA programs and already have had these courses. So, there are 12-14 seats in these classes. With respect to the new courses, he went on, they have run 2 ISOM electives per semester in the past. So, they have the ability to staff these. Finally, they have the winter and summer sessions to play with.

Prof. Dennin asked how many students would typically be in these classes now.

Prof. Ligas replied there are about 9, but in a typical finance class, there could be 25-27.
Prof. Dennin asked about numbers for some of our competitors mentioned in the program proposal.

Prof. He explained that because this program is relatively new, they don't have statistics for graduating students. Quinnipiac just started their online program this semester. UCONN is new, too.

Prof. Gibson added that the Dean at QU says that they have 20-25 students in their online program.

Prof. Dennin pointed to an error on p. 8 in the Math Department chair's name, which was discussed and clarified.

Prof. Steffen, referring to p. 13, asked who our competitors are in this new field, how we see our relative position, and why this is the right time to offer this program.

Prof. He responded that the program at QU is entirely on line, which offers a different format than our largely face-to-face format. Additionally, he added, ours will attract more students from the local area.

Prof. Rusu asked if there was any discussion with SOE for synergies with this program, noting that the SOE offers courses in data mining and business intelligence.

Prof. Ligas replied that there was not any discussion. However, he went on, if they can get this off the ground, then they could discuss the different tracks and open discussions with other schools.

Prof. Rusu added that the SOE also offers a software management class.

Prof. Rakowitz asked for clarification regarding the two seemingly contradictory points: 1) they have classes that are under-enrolled; and 2) Prof. He told EPC that in Spring 2015 all faculty will have to teach an overload because they're stretched so thin.

Prof. He explained that one FT faculty member left and has yet to be replaced.

Prof. Dennin asked about their vision for what a class would look like. Could it be a cohort if the bulk of the people surveyed are working? Would working folks be able to complete this in one year? Given this, he surmised that they’d likely have a lot of PT people and asked if they could clarify what a typical class will look like.

Prof. Ligas responded that they expect to attract a good number of international students, going for a STEM designation, and they'll have to have FT status due to their visa status. He went on to say that they’d also be interested in select UGs from other programs, who tend to study full time. But, he concluded, the program could serve both populations.

Prof. Dennin asked if they surveyed any international students.

Prof Ligas replied that they did a demand study with Institutional Research, which included the purchase of a recipient list to reach some international students.
Student representative Abate asked about the current undergraduate population for information systems that the program would be drawing from. He also suggested that this program would be particularly appealing to Sikorsky.

Prof. Ligas replied that they are counting on Sikorsky as a feeder.

Prof. He said that in terms of the IS major [a likely major from which applicants might come], they have about 20 students per year, with an upward trend.

Prof. Crawford asked about the tables/schedules in Appendix B on p. 20.

Prof. Ligas explained how he made the chart in Appendix B and that both FT and PT students can do either option reflected in the chart.

At 4:46 PM, Executive Secretary Irene Mulvey took over as Recording Secretary since Prof. Smith left to teach a class.

Professor He and Prof. Ligas were thanked for their presentation and left.

**MOTION [Thiel/Bhattacharya] to approve the Masters of Science in Business Analytics**

Dean Kazer spoke in favor of the motion, saying the proposal was well-developed.

**MOTION [Rakowitz/Dennin] to amend the motion to include a review of the program in Spring 2020.**

**MOTION to amend PASSED** (16 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstaining)

Prof. Rakowitz spoke to the amended motion, saying there are strengths to the program. She noted that we often get strong proposals, but they have implications with regard to faculty lines and other resources. She asked where the strategic discussion is on how we allocate faculty lines and resources and suggested we need a more serious discussion, although her concerns did not necessitate holding up the current proposal.

SVPAA Babington noted that the graduate programs are where we can expect growth and it behooves us to develop programs. As programs develop, faculty resources will follow. This has happened in the SON and SOE.

Prof. Crawford spoke in favor of the proposal and said he was glad DSB was taking the lead in this increasingly important area. He expressed similar concerns with regard to synthesis. Are we considering what resources are already here and whether or not we are maximizing them? He suggested that we need a more robust bureaucratic structure to address these concerns.

Dean Kazer said that the Deans have been trying to coordinate more closely with regard to graduate offerings.

Prof. Bhattacharya noted that the Graduate Committee in DSB did discuss issues of resources and synergy as this program was developed.

Prof. Dennin spoke in favor of the proposal but had problems with the presentation. In particular, the budget numbers are suspect since they are making predictions. They quote competitors, but don’t know what the competitors are actually doing. The idea is good, but the presentation is not helpful.
Prof. Greenberg spoke against the amended motion. Each new program may look OK, but how much does it degrade our overall position? We add discretely but never look at the overall impact. CAS is getting depleted by all these new graduate programs and we never consider the overall issue of what is Fairfield supposed to be all about. He is opposed to the program not because it is bad but because it is unclear what it does to the institution overall.

Dean Simon spoke in favor, noting that it’s a balancing act. We can’t hire new faculty without students and we can’t have too many new students without new faculty.

**MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED.** (14 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention)

Prof. Mulvey suggested that the concerns over this proposal should lead the Academic Council to do something about our process and procedures. If we aren’t happy with the information that gets to us at this, the last stage of our process, then we should consider revising the process and the routing procedures we have in place. There was a general consensus that the Council would take up this matter at a future meeting.

General Faculty Secretary Rakowitz took over as Chair when Prof. Rona Preli left at 5:00 to teach a class.

c. UCC Proposal for a Pass/Fail option.

Prof. Kathy Nantz, UCC Chair in 2013-14 when this proposal was developed, made a brief presentation to the AC of the materials in the packet. She noted that there were two proposals discussed in the UCC, but only one was approved. A proposal for an individual student to choose to take a class Pass/Fail was not approved by the UCC. There were too many technical problems with this and the UCC could not agree on how to address the details. The second proposal is for an entire course to be designated as a Pass/Fail course (packet, top of page 15).

Prof. Nantz answered a number of informational questions. In particular, Prof. Dennin asked if the UCC had talked to students. Prof. Nantz said that the student on UCC was very much in favor and had checked with FUSA, also in favor. There was a desire to make the other proposal work (individual option for a Pass/Fail), but there was a struggle with the details.

Prof. Rakowitz asked if the Council wanted to address this now, or if the Council wanted to adjourn and take this item up again at our next meeting.

**MOTION [Crawford/Greenberg] to adjourn passed without objection at 5:07 PM.**

Respectfully submitted,
Emily Smith
TO: President von Arx, S.J.

FROM: Irene Mulvey, Academic Council Executive Secretary

DATE: October 21, 2014

RE: Handbook amendment on maternity leave

At its meeting on October 6, 2014, the Academic Council discusses the correspondence between General Faculty Secretary Susan Rakowitz and you regarding Academic Council recommendations to amend the Faculty Handbook.

As you will recall, on May 13, 2014, the Council recommended that the General Faculty approve the following [page 29 of the Eleventh edition, 2013]:

“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.”

Prof. Rakowitz inquired as to your agreement or disagreement with this amendment per the Handbook, and you replied, "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."

Your response to Prof. Rakowitz might make sense if this language were not already in the Handbook, but this description of the maternity leave policy is already in the Handbook. Moreover, the proposal to amend decreases the level of detail given about the policy. The effect of not amending the Handbook in this way is that the Handbook remains factually inaccurate. Your grounds for disagreeing with the proposed amendment are puzzling to the Council. I am writing, on behalf of and as directed by the Council, to request a more substantive rationale for your opinion.

CC: AC Executive Committee
From: "<von Arx>", <Jeffrey>, "S.J." <President@fairfield.edu>
To: Irene Mulvey <mulvey@fairfield.edu>
Cc: Susan Rakowitz <srakowitz@fairfield.edu>, "Preli, Rona" <RPreli@fairfield.edu>, "Babington, Lynn" <lbabington@fairfield.edu>
Subject: RE: Handbook amendment on maternity leave

Dear Irene:

Thanks for your message.

This is actually a pretty simple matter. As I am sure you and the faculty are well aware from our discussions in 2008, the administration and the Board of Trustees believe in principle that the Faculty Handbook should not contain any specification of benefits, which belong in the Benefits Plan Overview. Accordingly, we are not prepared to approve any changes in language regarding benefits in the Faculty Handbook, except to remove them.

In the present matter, we look forward to discussions with the Faculty Salary Committee on making the change you propose in the BPO.

Jeffrey P. von Arx, S.J.
President

Fairfield University
1073 North Benson Road
Fairfield, Connecticut 06824
T. 203-254-4000 ex. 2217
#fairfieldu
www.fairfield.edu
President@fairfield.edu
At its September 2014 meeting, the Academic Council passed a motion 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.

The Council voted to accept the recommendation of the Educational Technologies Committee for updating its membership to better reflect the university's current organizational structure.

The motion, passed on September 8, 2014 is 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.

Attached are the memo from the chair of the Educational Technologies Committee, along with relevant excerpts from ETC minutes and from the September AC minutes.

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

To: Academic Council
From: Shannon Harding and Jo Yarrington
(Academic Council Calendar Subcommittee members)
Date: Monday November 3, 2014
Re: Academic Calendar 2015-2017

On October 1, the subcommittee took a look at the first draft of the calendar, focusing on the number of meeting times (requirements for the semester and equal distribution across days), reading days, breaks, and time off between semesters. We met briefly as a subcommittee before discussing these issues with the other members of the calendar committee. This year we tried to set the calendar for the next two years, looking at Fall and Spring semesters independently, since the issues are similar. In attendance, in addition to the two of us, were Mary Frances Malone, Bob Russo, Heather Petraglia, Sue Peterson, Tracey Robert, Faith Hunt, Ryan Munden.

Following is a tally of the days we would be meeting from Fall semester 2015 to Spring semester 2017, a summary of the comments and suggestions by the Academic Council Calendar subcommittee and the discussions and ultimate consensus on individual issues by the Academic Calendar committee members.

FALL
Meeting times:
2015: 13M, 14T, 14W, 13TH, 13F  MTh=26; TF=27, W and Th turbo = 28
2016: 13M, 13T, 13W, 14TH, 14F  MTh=27; TF=27, W and Th turbo =28

COMMENTS:
The semester is short (13-14 weeks of class and 1.5 weeks of exams), but fairly balanced in terms of meeting times. The Columbus Day break in both semesters (M and T) helps alleviate disparity between MTh and TF time codes that has been reported in the past.

Suggestions:
(1) Continue NOT having the “Academic Monday” on Tuesday after Columbus Day, and have the day off and change the name to a “Fall Break”.
(2) To balance out all days, you could end on Mon 12/8, having Reading days T,W, and Sun. This would have exams end 12/16 and allow a full month break. Grad classes would continue to F 12/18 to allow for 14 full weeks.

Consensus:
The group discussed the shortened semester, and the need for every class. The consensus was that it may be best to keep the calendar as is. Given the fact that the number of meeting times was fairly close, this seemed reasonable.

2016: (1) We are starting before Labor Day. This was met with strong resistance.
    Consider starting Tuesday 9/6 (13 class meetings for all).
(2) Current reading days are T, F, and Sun. Consider switching to T,W, and Sunday.
    Otherwise only one exam day (Sat) between reading days.
DISCUSSION:
Faculty contracts start on 9/1, and the consensus was that more classes were preferred during the semester (see above). There was some discussion of having different calendars or at least start dates for graduate and undergraduate programs in the future, since graduate courses often require more time for internships. There was also some initial discussion about having students on campus for the Labor Day weekend during 2016, but the Dean’s office seemed to think this would be okay. Landlords at the beach have been contacted about this potential change.

CONSENSUS:
The consensus from the group was that changing reading days made sense.

FOLLOW UP: Additional emails were received from Admissions and the Registrar about the logistics of a move-in day for freshman on a weekday. It was suggested that we consider changing faculty contracts to reflect an earlier start date (August 25-May 25?), which would alleviate the short semester and allow freshmen to move in on the weekend before Labor Day.

SPRING
Meeting times:
2016: 13M, 14T, 15W, 15TH, 14F MTh=28; TF=27, M turbo =26; F turbo 28;W/R turbo =30
2017: 13M, 14T, 15W, 15TH, 13F MTh=28; TF=27; M & F turbo =26; W & Th turbo =30

DISCUSSION: For both semesters, the proposed start date is after MLK Day. Academic Monday after President’s Day is proposed for undergraduate students again. Easter Break varies for undergraduates (Fri-Mon) and graduate students (Thurs-Sun). Class meeting times are NOT well balanced. Academic Mondays help, and allow 13 class meeting times for Monday turbos (a problem last year). In general the calendar is closer to the ideal 14 weeks of instruction and 1-2 weeks of exams.

SUGGESTIONS:
2016: (1) Full month of winter break (12/16 or 12/18-1/19).
(2) End on Tuesday 5/3. Move reading days to Wed, Sun, and Monday.
Exams would run Th, F, Sat; then Tues, W, Thurs. Grad classes continue through Friday.
(3) Spring Break and Easter Break are close (less than two weeks apart).
However: the 7 week “break” may be advantageous for assessment.

2017: (1) Short winter break: 12/21-1/17.
(2) Spring and Easter Break okay.
Then reading days Wed, Sun, Mon. Exams Th, F, Sat; Tues, Wed, Thurs.
Grad courses continue to Friday.

DISCUSSION: There was an animated discussion about the following topics:
• Academic Mondays continue to problematic for graduate programs and the registrar (scheduling of rooms at night).
• We discussed other schools, and considering two separate calendars in the future (one graduate / one undergraduate).
• Easter Monday was addressed, and the committee was reminded of the discussion at Academic Council last year about undergraduates traveling for the holiday.
• Protecting the three reading days, and whether people are using them for their intended use.
• Keeping senior week to allow for calculation of graduation requirements and conferring of honors. The administration spoke about missing grades from a growing number of faculty.

CONSENSUS:
No changes to Easter and Spring Break. The group agreed to change the last day to Tuesday for both semesters, as written above.

SUGGESTIONS:
To have the AVP’s office send an email to faculty encouraging faculty to:
(1) inform their office of giving an alternative exam, to allow the registrar to keep tabs on available rooms and
(2) use reading days for their intended purpose: to prepare for exams.

CONCLUSIONS:
In our discussions throughout this process, all noted that the semester is SHORT (13 weeks) and that the sentiment expressed by the faculty and administrators at the Academic Calendar meeting as well as through email, was that the number of days mattered and we should try to not cut.

Bob Russo would like to solidify the 15-16 academic calendar, which has been agreed upon by all, so that it can be placed on the website, facilitating planning for next year. He would like to get the feedback from each area about the 2016-17 concerns and then meet again shortly after Nov 3 to review it one more time as a group.
## Academic Calendar 2015-2016

### Fall Semester 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 16-17</td>
<td>First-Year Students Orientation Class of 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 22-23</td>
<td>First-Year Students Orientation Class of 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 6</td>
<td>Registration Begins for Graduate and Non-Matriculated Continuing Studies Students for Fall 2015 (except for Non-Matriculated GSEAP Students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 20</td>
<td>Registration Begins for Non-Matriculated GSEAP Students for Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 31</td>
<td>Deadline for Selected Students on Financial Aid to Submit Verification Documents to the Office of Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 17</td>
<td>Online Registration Ends for Graduate and Continuing Studies Students for Fall 2015 (Registration Continues in Person and by Phone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 21</td>
<td>Deadline for Undergraduate Readmission Applications for Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 27</td>
<td>International Students move in from 8am to 8pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 28</td>
<td>Last Day to Apply for GSEAP Non-Matriculated Status for Fall 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 28-31</td>
<td>Orientation for International Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 30</td>
<td>Orientation and Welcome – Class of 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 31</td>
<td>Transfer Orientation for New Undergraduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 1</td>
<td>Transfer Welcome Continues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 1-8</td>
<td>Drop/Add for Undergraduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 7</td>
<td>Labor Day – University Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 8-14</td>
<td>Late Registration – GSEAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 18</td>
<td>Deadline for Make-Up of Summer 2015 Incompletes – GSEAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 9</td>
<td>Deadline for Make-Up of Spring and Summer 2015 Incompletes (except GSEAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 12</td>
<td>Columbus Day – University Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 13</td>
<td>No Undergraduate Classes (Extended Columbus Day Weekend for Undergraduates Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 21</td>
<td>Deadline for Undergrad Major and Minor Changes for Spring 2016 Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 23</td>
<td>Mid-Term Deficiencies Due for First-Year Students and Division I Athletes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2</td>
<td>Last Day for Course Withdrawals (except ASAP II courses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2-Dec 17</td>
<td>Registration for Winter Session 2016 One-Week and Online Courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Winter Intersession 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Jan 4-Jan 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Jan 4-Jan 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Business Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spring Semester 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Jan 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online Registration Ends for Graduate and Continuing Studies Students for Spring 2016 (Registration Continues in Person and by Phone)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Jan 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Students Arrive on Campus (New, Transfers, and International Students)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Jan 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther King, Jr. Day – University Holiday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Undergraduate Student Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation for International Students Continues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Halls open at 10am; BCC Dining Hall opens at 4pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Day to Apply for GSEAP Non-Matriculated Status for Spring 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Jan 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classes Begin for All Undergraduate and Graduate Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Jan 19-Jan 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drop/Add for Undergraduate Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Jan 22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for Make-up of Fall 2015 Incompletes – GSEAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Jan 26-Feb 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late Registration – GSEAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Feb 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for Study Abroad Applications for Fall 2016 and Spring 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Feb 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for Make-Up of Fall 2015 Incompletes (except GSEAP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Feb 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President's Day – University Holiday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Feb 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Classes Only – Monday Schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>March 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Term Deficiencies Due for First-Year Students and Division I Athletes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 7-</td>
<td>Spring Recess – All Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 11</td>
<td>3/5: BCC Dining Hall closes at 2pm; Residence Halls close at 6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/13: Residence Halls re-open at 12pm; BCC Dining Hall re-opens at 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Classes Resume – All Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 14</td>
<td>Deadline for Undergrad Major and Minor Changes for Fall 2016 Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 18</td>
<td>Last Day for Course Withdrawals (except ASAP II courses and GSEAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 21</td>
<td>Last Day for Course Withdrawals – GSEAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 24-</td>
<td>Easter Recess – Graduate Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 27</td>
<td>Easter Recess – Undergraduate Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 28</td>
<td>Classes Resume – Graduate Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 29</td>
<td>Classes Resume – Undergraduate Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4-</td>
<td>Undergraduate Advising and Registration for Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20</td>
<td>Registration Begins for All Students for Summer 2016 (except for Non-Matriculated GSEAP Students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>Deadline for Applications for Degree for May Graduation – All Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>Registration Begins for Non-Matriculated GSEAP Students for Summer 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Full-Time Undergraduate Students to submit FAFSA and CSS PROFILE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21</td>
<td>Last Day to Complete Spring Comprehensive Exams – GSEAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3</td>
<td>Last Day of Classes for Undergraduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last Day for Spring Financial Aid to Process – All Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 4</td>
<td>Reading Days – Undergraduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8</td>
<td>Final Examinations for Undergraduate Students (except for Reading Days) and Final Exams / Last Day of Undergraduate Evening Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 9</td>
<td>BCC Dining Hall closes at 2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residence Halls, Townhouses, and Apartment Complex close at 6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(undergraduate students with 3pm exams may remain until 8pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 13</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Mass: 4:00pm at Alumni Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 14</td>
<td>66th Commencement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate Ceremony: 9:30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Ceremony: 3pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 21</td>
<td>Residence Halls, Townhouses, and Apartment Complex close at 12pm for Seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 23</td>
<td>Summer Session 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 23-</td>
<td>Graduate Business Session I (Memorial Day Holiday, May 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 3</td>
<td>GSEAP Pre-Session (Memorial Day Holiday, May 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 23-</td>
<td>Engineering Summer Session (Memorial Day Holiday, May 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 23-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Wednesday  
| Wednesday | May 25-June 1 | Undergraduate One-Week Pre-Session (Memorial Day Holiday, May 30) |
| Monday   | May 30 | Memorial Day – University Holiday |
| Monday 
| Thursday | June 6-July 7 | Undergraduate Session I (Independence Day Holiday, July 4) |
| Monday 
| Thursday | June 6-June 30 | Graduate Business Session II |
| Wednesday | June 8 | Deadline for Make-up of Spring 2016 Incompletes – GSEAP |
| Wednesday 
| Friday | June 8-July 8 | GSEAP Session I (Independence Day Holiday, July 4) |
| Tuesday 
| Wednesday | June 21-June 22 | First-Year Students Orientation Class of 2020 |
| Monday 
| Tuesday | June 27-June 28 | First-Year Students Orientation Class of 2020 |
| Monday | July 4 | Independence Day – University Holiday |
| Tuesday | July 5 | Registration Begins for Graduate and Non-Matriculated Continuing Studies Students for Fall 2016 (except for Non-Matriculated GSEAP Students)  
| | | Deadline for Applications for Degree for August Graduation – All Schools |
| Tuesday  
| Saturday | July 5-Aug 6 | Graduate Business Session II |
| Monday 
| Monday | July 11-Aug 8 | Undergraduate Session II |
| Monday 
| Friday | July 11-Aug 5 | GSEAP Session II |
| Tuesday | July 19 | Registration Begins for Non-Matriculated GSEAP Students for Fall 2016 |
| Monday | Aug 1 | Deadline for Selected Students on Financial Aid to Submit Verification Documents to the Office of Financial Aid |
| Monday | Aug 8 | Last Day for Summer Financial Aid to Process – All Schools |
| Wednesday | Aug 10-Aug 16 | Undergraduate One-Week Post-Session |
| Monday 
| Wednesday | Aug 8-Aug 17 | GSEAP Post-Session |
| Monday 
| Saturday | Aug 8-Aug 27 | Graduate Business Session IV |
### Fall Semester 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 21-22</td>
<td>First-Year Students Orientation Class of 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 27-28</td>
<td>First-Year Students Orientation Class of 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 5</td>
<td>Registration Begins for Graduate and Non-Matriculated Continuing Studies Students for Fall 2016 (except for Non-Matriculated GSEAP Students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 18</td>
<td>Registration Begins for Non-Matriculated GSEAP Students for Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 1</td>
<td>Deadline for Selected Students on Financial Aid to Submit Verification Documents to the Office of Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 19</td>
<td>Online Registration Ends for Graduate and Continuing Studies Students for Fall 2016 (Registration Continues in Person and by Phone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 19</td>
<td>Deadline for Undergraduate Readmission Applications for Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 26</td>
<td>Last Day to Apply for GSEAP Non-Matriculated Status for Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 27</td>
<td>International Students move in from 8am to 8pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 28-31</td>
<td>Orientation for International Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 30</td>
<td>Orientation and Welcome – Class of 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 31</td>
<td>Transfer Orientation for New Undergraduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 1</td>
<td>Fall Welcome Continues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 1-8</td>
<td>Drop/Add for Undergraduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 5</td>
<td>Labor Day – University Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 8-14</td>
<td>Late Registration – GSEAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 16</td>
<td>Deadline for Make-Up of Summer 2016 Incompletes – GSEAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 7</td>
<td>Deadline for Make-Up of Spring and Summer 2016 Incompletes (except GSEAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 10</td>
<td>Columbus Day – University Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 11</td>
<td>No Undergraduate Classes (Extended Columbus Day Weekend for Undergraduates Only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 21</td>
<td>Mid-Term Deficiencies Due for First-Year Students and Division I Athletes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 26</td>
<td>Deadline for Undergrad Major and Minor Changes for Spring 2017 Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2-21</td>
<td>Undergraduate Advising and Registration for Spring 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2-16</td>
<td>Registration for Winter Session 2017 One-Week and Online Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Nov 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last Day for Course Withdrawals (except ASAP II courses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Nov 23-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Thanksgiving Recess – All Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/22: BCC Dining Hall closes at 2pm; Residence Halls close at 6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(undergraduate students with evening classes may remain until 10pm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/27: Residence Halls re-open at 12pm; BCC Dining Hall re-opens at 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Nov 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classes Resume – All Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Dec 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Applications for Degree for January Graduation – All Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registration Begins for Graduate and Non-Matriculated Continuing Studies Students for Spring 2017 (except for Non-Matriculated GSEAP Students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Dec 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last Day of Classes for Undergraduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last Day for Financial Aid to Process – All Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Dec 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Dec 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Dec 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading Days – Undergraduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Dec 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last Day to Complete Fall Comprehensive Exams – GSEAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Dec 14-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Dec 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Dec 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Registration Begins for Non-Matriculated GSEAP Students for Spring 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Dec 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last Day of Classes / Exams for All Graduate Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Dec 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BCC Dining Hall closes at 2pm; Residence Halls close at 6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(undergraduate students with 3pm exams may remain until 8pm)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Winter Intersession 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Jan 4-Jan 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Undergraduate Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Jan 2-Jan 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>Graduate Business Classes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spring Semester 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Jan 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online Registration Ends for Graduate and Continuing Studies Students for Spring 2017 (Registration Continues in Person and by Phone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Jan 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Students Arrive on Campus (New, Transfers, and International Students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Jan 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martin Luther King, Jr. Day – University Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Undergraduate Student Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation for International Students Continues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residence Halls open at 10am; BCC Dining Hall opens at 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Jan 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classes Begin for All Undergraduate and Graduate Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Jan 17-Jan 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Drop/Add for Undergraduate Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Jan 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Make-up of Fall 2016 Incompletes – GSEAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Jan 24-Feb 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Late Registration – GSEAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Feb 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Study Abroad Applications for Fall 2017 and Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Feb 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for Make-Up of Fall 2016 Incompletes (except GSEAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Feb 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>President's Day – University Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Feb 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate Day Classes Only (including 3:30pm classes) – Monday Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>March 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid-Term Deficiencies Due for First-Year Students and Division I Athletes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Packet for Meeting

### Spring Recess – All Schools

- **March 13:** BCC Dining Hall closes at 2pm; Residence Halls close at 6pm
- **March 19:** Residence Halls re-open at 12pm; BCC Dining Hall re-opens at 4pm

### Classes Resume – All Schools

- **March 20:**

### Deadline for Undergrad Major and Minor Changes for Fall 2017 Registration

- **March 22:**

### Last Day for Course Withdrawals (except ASAP II courses and GSEAP)

- **March 27:**

### Registration Begins for All Students for Summer 2017 (except for Non-Matriculated GSEAP Students)

- **April 3:**

### Deadline for Applications for Degree for May Graduation – All Schools

- **April 5:** Undergraduate Advising and Registration for Fall 2017

### Easter Recess – Graduate Programs

- **April 5-16:**

### Easter Recess – Undergraduate Programs

- **April 14-17:**

### Classes Resume – Graduate Programs

- **April 17:**

### Classes Resume – Undergraduate Programs

- **April 18:**

### Deadline for Full-Time Undergraduate Students to submit FAFSA and CSS PROFILE

- **April 15:**

### Last Day to Complete Spring Comprehensive Exams – GSEAP

- **April 27:**

### Last Day of Classes for Undergraduate Students

- **May 2:**

### Last Day for Spring Financial Aid to Process – All Schools

- **May 2:**

### Reading Days – Undergraduate Students

- **May 3-8:**

### Final Examinations for Undergraduate Students (except for Reading Days) and Final Exams / Last Day of Undergraduate Evening Classes

- **May 4-11:**

### Last Day of Classes / Exams for All Graduate Programs

- **May 12:**

### BCC Dining Hall closes at 2pm

- **May 13:**

### Residence Halls, Townhouses, and Apartment Complex close at 6pm

- **May 13:**

### Undergraduate students with 3pm exams may remain until 8pm

### Baccalaureate Mass: 4:00pm at Alumni Hall

- **May 20:**

### 67th Commencement

- **May 21:**

### Undergraduate Ceremony: 9:30am

### Graduate Ceremony: 3pm

### Residence Halls, Townhouses, and Apartment Complex close at 12pm for Seniors

- **May 22:**

---

### Summer Session 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>May 22-June 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Graduate Business Session I (Memorial Day Holiday, May 29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>May 22-June 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>GSEAP Pre-Session (Memorial Day Holiday, May 29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>May 22-Aug 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>Engineering Summer Session (Memorial Day Holiday, May 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday</strong> May 24-May 31</td>
<td>Undergraduate One-Week Pre-Session (Memorial Day Holiday, May 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong> May 29</td>
<td>Memorial Day – University Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong> June 5-July 6</td>
<td>Undergraduate Session I (Independence Day Holiday, July 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong> June 5-June 29</td>
<td>Graduate Business Session II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday</strong> June 7</td>
<td>Deadline for Make-up of Spring 2017 Incompletes – GSEAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday</strong> June 7-July 7</td>
<td>GSEAP Session I (Independence Day Holiday, July 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday</strong> June 20-June 21</td>
<td>First-Year Students Orientation Class of 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong> June 26-June 27</td>
<td>First-Year Students Orientation Class of 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong> July 3</td>
<td>Registration Begins for Graduate and Non-Matriculated Continuing Studies Students for Fall 2017 (except for Non-Matriculated GSEAP Students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong> July 3</td>
<td>Deadline for Applications for Degree for August Graduation – All Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saturday</strong> July 3-Aug 5</td>
<td>Graduate Business Session II (Independence Day Holiday, July 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday</strong> July 4</td>
<td>Independence Day – University Holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong> July 10-Aug 7</td>
<td>Undergraduate Session II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong> July 10-Aug 4</td>
<td>GSEAP Session II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong> July 17</td>
<td>Registration Begins for Non-Matriculated GSEAP Students for Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday</strong> Aug 1</td>
<td>Deadline for Selected Students on Financial Aid to Submit Verification Documents to the Office of Financial Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong> Aug 7</td>
<td>Last Day for Summer Financial Aid to Process – All Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday</strong> Aug 9-Aug 15</td>
<td>Undergraduate One-Week Post-Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong> Aug 7-Aug 16</td>
<td>GSEAP Post-Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday</strong> Aug 7-Aug 26</td>
<td>Graduate Business Session IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

Motion 1: April 28, 2014

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]:

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

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.
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.

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.
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
Dear Colleagues,

This is the President von Arx’s response to the Academic Council’s request to form a committee on non-tenure track faculty. Father von Arx welcomes the development of a committee on non-tenured track faculty. One of the first requests he will make of this committee is to foster development of a new employment category for non-tenure track faculty that provides greater job stability and professional development.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Best regards,

Lynn

Lynn Babington, PhD, RN
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
Robert Wood Johnson Executive Nurse Fellow

AS APPROVED BY THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL ON MAY 13, 2014

MOTION 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.

WITH CHANGES PROPOSED BY THE PRESIDENT SHOWN AND RATIONALE FOR THOSE CHANGES PROVIDED

New language in boldface and underlined.
[Deleted text in brackets and strikethrough]

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 to the Academic Council on the employment and the employment conditions of non-tenure track faculty, and to represent non-tenure track faculty.
Change: Eliminate “employment and”
Rationale: Faculty do not make recommendations on employing non-tenure track faculty.
Change: Eliminate “and to represent non-tenure track faculty”
Rationale: Non-tenure track faculty are not represented by the general faculty.

Specific Duties:
1. To draft or review policies on any matter pertaining to non-tenure track faculty;
   Change: Eliminate “any”
   Rationale: There are University policies (HR, employment) where faculty do not have input.
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 non-tenure track faculty;
5. To receive from the Office of Human Resources each semester a list of non-tenure track faculty with contact information.
   Change: Eliminate in it's entirety
   Rationale: A list of employees (including faculty) with contact information is not publicly available. Such requests are evaluated on a case by case basis.
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
- Staecker: 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.
EXCERPT OF Academic Council minutes for meeting on May 13, 2014:

7.g. Re-evaluation of offering both paper and online options for IDEA Form forms and re-evaluation of continued use of “yellow sheet” qualitative evaluations:

Chair welcomes Ms. Tracy Immeroso, Prof. James Simon, and Prof. Mike Andreychik.

Prof. Andreychik discussed the conclusions that the FDEC came to about what to do with different forms. As Chair of FDEC, he supported moving to online evaluation forms as the most reasonable move. Since the major problem is response rates, the committee researched the issue and concluded that paper evaluations tend to have higher response rates. The committee also determined that where the forms are completed is more important than whether the evaluation is paper or online. Students write more if they are completing the forms in class. Since faculty members tend to be more comfortable with the paper form, the Committee felt people need to be educated about how to get higher response rates using electronic methods.

Ms. Immerso explained that there are significant costs associated with paper evaluation forms—namely, $19,000 for each round. Hiring a part time worker to prepare packets and distribute them costs $6,100, plus shipping and envelopes. One concern about online evaluation forms was whether the University computer network had appropriate bandwidth to allow students to respond at the same time. CIO Paige Francis contends we now have the technical ability. In addition, faculty can access results from online evaluations from my.fairfield and retrieve course objectives. Ms. Immeroso added that the Committee has plans to discuss a URL for online evaluations that each faculty member could distribute on a single day. Online evaluations would reduce the costs associated with the labor, estimated at 670 work hours, required to process paper forms and result in easier administration and fewer mistakes.

Prof. Simon explained that he felt the need to have faculty benefit from the evaluation forms and analyze aggregate data for all departments. After attending an IDEA conference, he came to the same conclusion as his colleagues: online evaluation forms eliminate a delay of the response rate and guarantee faculty will receive results before the beginning of the term. There is currently a student who is under judicial review for tampering with the results, but these problems would be impossible if there were no yellow forms. In addition, the Dean’s Office has occasionally never received paper forms. Rather, he contended that the current method of omitting the yellow form in use for online courses should be applied for both online and traditional courses. According to IDEA studies, students will write more if narrative questions appear at end of the online form. He added that Prof. Bill Abbott has also endorsed the idea of online evaluations.

Chair Rafalski asked for questions.

Prof. Greenberg asked if all students would be required to have a laptop.

Prof. Simon responded that 98% of students have them, and others can borrow one. He suggested giving out evaluations on the second to last class, and shared his own method for discussing the development of the evaluation form at Kansas State University and reminding students about the need to have a voice in their own education.

Prof. Yarrington contended that some courses and areas are quite different – how can one customize the form? Also, what is the process by which adjunct forms are evaluated?

Prof. Andreychik explained that, although ownership of data is still under discussion, online forms would provide information needed for hiring more quickly.

Ms. Immeroso noted that, while the IDEA form has standard questions that cannot be changed, faculty members can add questions to the end of standard form, an easier task using the online method.
Prof. Yarrington explained that students are advised not to answer questions if they do not pertain to the discipline.

Prof. Storms expressed concern about support for students, since not all students have a laptop. Although we have increased bandwidth, will we have necessary technical support?

Prof. Simon offered a suggestion of a trial period for two years.

Prof. Andreychik contended that although the Committee was in favor of online evaluations, they realized the need to work out the specifics next year.

Prof. Storms asked when they were considering beginning online evaluations.

Prof. Andreychik responded at the beginning of next year.

Prof. Downie asked if online evaluations would be done only in class or at other times.

Ms. Immerso explained that a URL could be given to students for a class period, or they could decide to complete the evaluation outside of class.

SVPAAA Fitzgerald added that ITS has an office in the library with evening hours.

Prof. Dennin wondered if additional questions would need to be added every year.

Ms. Immerso responded that special questions needed to be added from a drop-down menu every year. Questions you add this year will be on the drop-down menu in case you want to add them again next year.

Prof. Downie asked how the cost for paper evaluation was arrived at, since the estimate seems low.

Ms. Immerso responded that there were administrative costs for each set of evaluations.

Prof. Rakowitz noted that their argument was compelling, but it appears to be based only on the URL method. There are other issues to consider.

Prof. Andreychik commented that we need specific implementation for the details, but we believe that the online option is preferential.

Chair Rafalski thanked the visitors for their report.

Prof. Mulvey asked if the Council should take action, or should simply think about contingency issues, since the decision would impact all faculty members.

Prof. Kelly was concerned about how to move forward on the issue.

MOTION (Fitzgerald/Mulvey): The Academic Council receives positively the report and awaits a further report for implementation.

Prof. Downie contended we should go farther and endorse the idea of moving online with the report.

MOTION PASSED 14 in favor, none opposed, three abstaining.

MOTION (Mulvey/Storms): To continue the use of qualitative evaluations.  
MOTION PASSED: 16 in favor, none opposed, none abstaining.

<>
Recommendations for Rollout of All Online IDEA Surveys

Goal: Provide a reliable method to deliver online IDEA surveys in a manner that achieves high response rates, in-class distribution, and faculty control over the date of the survey.

Recommendations:

• Eliminate paper option for IDEA surveys

• Eliminate “E-mail only” and “Both” delivery methods for online surveys

When the IDEA center e-mails individual links directly to students, they are able to respond any time/anywhere to the IDEA survey. Research indicates that the environment in which a student responds impacts the reliability of the data. Instead,

• All surveys will be delivered using URL only

• With the URL only method, each course has its own unique link. Students who are registered to the course can gain access to the survey by clicking on the course URL and entering their Fairfield University ID # for authentication.

Important: Faculty members need to be aware that students will only be able to respond to the survey if they actively distribute the link to the students. Faculty members will receive best practices that recommend they only give the link out in the class in which the evaluations are being performed. This will ensure faculty are availed of the best practice that they continue to perform in-class evaluations.

• The course URL’s will be sent to faculty members via e-mail from the IDEA center to their Fairfield U e-mail address prior to the “open” date of the survey window.

• Faculty members will distribute the unique course URL to students on the chosen day of the survey via Blackboard.

• Faculty members will allow time for in-class distribution of the IDEA surveys in their course syllabus.

• Faculty will request that students bring their laptops/tablets to class on the day they plan to distribute the survey.

• To ensure that no student is at a disadvantage for completing the survey, a limited number of ITS/Academic Affairs provided laptops and tablets will be made available during the evaluation window for those students who don’t have access to a mobile device. The equipment will be distributed on a first-come/first-serve basis by contacting the IDEA On-Campus coordinator in Academic Affairs at least 1 week in advance. It is expected that the loaned equipment will be released for special cases of extreme need only.
• Students will respond to all IDEA surveys in-class for all traditional lecture courses. For online taught courses, the Blackboard link will provide a means for students to participate in the surveys on the chosen date.

• Once the URL is distributed, students who missed the initial in-class delivery will still be able to complete the survey using the Blackboard-provided URL. As a result, the response rate for IDEA surveys may actually be higher than traditional paper distribution.

• Yellow Narrative Forms will continue to be distributed via paper packet but will no longer be distributed automatically for all courses. Instead, faculty will opt-in for Yellow Narrative Form paper-packet distribution via the IDEA preferences app. If faculty members do not actively choose distribution of the yellow narrative forms, the default will be no packet delivery.

Rather than adding the yellow narrative questions to the online IDEA survey, the FDEC proposes this interim change for at least 1 year to:
  o Gauge the interest in the continuation of the yellow narrative paper forms.
  o Preserve the valuable information provided at the bottom of the yellow narrative sheets regarding student demographics. (This information cannot be duplicated in the IDEA system which ensures complete student anonymity.)
  o Separate the mode of student response from the IDEA survey to promote reflective and qualitative responses on yellow forms

• Academic Affairs will continue to publish the IDEA timeline on the Fairfield University website.

• Academic Affairs will send reminders to faculty to distribute the URL via Blackboard and the dates in which the window will open for student responses. These e-mails will be sent to the faculty members’ Fairfield U e-mail address immediately before the survey window opens.

• Academic Affairs will change the Adjunct Contract template to reflect these changes to the IDEA survey and the Yellow Narrative form distribution.

• FDEC will create a list of “Best Practices” that will be published in Faculty Announcements, distributed to department chairs, and displayed on the Fairfield University website. It will also be available on my.Fairfield under the Faculty tab.

• FDEC members will make themselves available to discuss these best practices with department chairs or to field questions from faculty at departmental meetings. Any department chair requesting this interaction should e-mail the FDEC chair (Eileen O’Shea) directly.
MFA SELF-STUDY

1. Changes since the MFA program was approved in 2008:

Fairfield University’s Master of Fine Arts in Creative Writing began in December 2008. It was conceptualized and executed to support, sustain, and extend the Jesuit ideal of developing the whole person. Writers, by their very nature, exemplify the principles of Ignatius: a search for self-knowledge, a pursuit of spiritual truth, a quest for intellectual knowledge, and a flowering of creative expression. By virtue of its intensive nine-day residencies and its rigorous, five-month individualized mentoring system; the low-residency format of Fairfield’s MFA program is a collaborative, creative process between students and faculty, as well as among students. Student writers work closely not only with faculty mentors in developing their personalized course of study but also with other students, particularly in workshops and during the residencies. Fairfield’s program makes the connection between Jesuit philosophy and the graduate study of creative writing even more pronounced and “synergistic,” a word that in its Christian context suggests the pairing of the human and the divine for greater spiritual regeneration. Taking advantage of Fairfield’s position as a leader in the Jesuit field, the MFA seeks to make that synergy more clearly defined, to the benefit of its graduate students and the promotion of Fairfield’s mission.

Similar to many low-residency programs which offer students the option of doing some sort of experientially-based, socially conscious course of study during their two years, Fairfield’s program presents its students with the opportunity of doing work in the community, work that is related to creative writing and that is in keeping with the Jesuit philosophy of service to others. For instance, our students have developed and taught creative writing courses in prisons, worked on poetry writing with veterans returning from the Middle East, and have employed their talents and background in creative writing working with disadvantaged populations in America. The MFA program also furthers the University’s mission of supporting educational models that are both interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary. Creative writing draws from many different fields, and calls on our students to draw research from those fields. Students perform both scholarly (text-based) research as well as field research (interviewing relevant experts, traveling to various sites, even “experiencing” situations in the real world, such as internships). Fairfield also supports interdisciplinary efforts by allowing students to concentrate in more than one genre (for example, several of our students have had multi-genre theses, and almost all have worked outside their genre for at least one semester). Additionally, the MFA’s low-residency format gives adults a chance to return to school, without sacrificing their careers or families, thereby supporting the university mission of life-long learning. Finally, the MFA program responds to the University’s efforts to highlight the arts on campus and through its course offerings. We are able to do this by bringing nationally recognized authors both to campus and to the residency.

In summary, the MFA’s place in the University’s curriculum is another step in Fairfield development of graduate programs that are true to its Jesuit roots, its mission to develop the entire human being, to enhance life-long learning and self-reflection, and to develop high-quality arts programs on campus.
2. **Goals and Objectives**
The low-residency MFA program had several immediate as well as long-term goals/objectives relating both to University and to the student to be served by the program. All of these goals and objectives have been met. The program sought to:

- benefit the University financially (please see attached financial report).
- support the ideal of Jesuit pedagogy through life-long, collaborative learning, as well as develop individuals who are capable of reflecting on spiritual and intellectual issues (our students’ average age is approximately 38).
- focus on older, non-traditional students drawn from all over the country, a segment of the student population that is clearly underrepresented at Fairfield; (we have attracted students from 28 states and three different countries)
- accomplish its mission by using present resources; (only three full-time Fairfield faculty employed in teaching in the program)
- *not* adversely impact other programs (no University program has been adversely impacted)
- create positive synergies between the English Department and the MFA, including the sharing of a percentage of revenues with the former (the program supported the hiring of a full-time tenure-track professor (Professor Huber) and, providing $4000 annually to support faculty research, as well as supporting many English department and other University events).
- be an attractive draw for prospective students, and for students at the University eager to concentrate in creative writing (we have thus far enrolled some fifteen Fairfield University graduates in the MFA)
- employ distance learning technologies to help establish Fairfield as a leader in that area of pedagogy (on line learning, Blackboard, etc.)
- take advantage of Fairfield’s geographic position, since so many writers and those interested in becoming writers reside in the tri-state area;
- enhance Fairfield’s reputation not only because of the success of such a program, but also because the University will have on its staff many writers of national and even international reputation (for example, the National Book Award nominee, Howard Norman, a past poet-laureate of Maine, Baron Wormser, as well as NEA grant recipients and nominees for and a contributor to *The Best American Essays 2014*)
- help our students to become successful as writers (in the past three years alumni of the program have published or had accepted for publication 19 books, as well as hundreds of individual articles, essays, short stories and poems; additionally, the program sponsored and published, *Now What?* – the only publication of its kind – conceived and written by alumni and contributed to by students, alums and faculty)
- enable our students to pursue college-level teaching positions (our post-grad teacher training program has thus far enrolled 15 students, all of whom have been successful at and continue to teach Freshman comp courses as adjunct faculty at Fairfield and other schools, community colleges and universities).
Jesuit-related goals

- First of all, by its very nature, creative writing supports and sustains the Jesuit ideal of developing the whole person. Serious writers, both through their lives and their work, exemplify to the highest degree the very principles of Ignatius: a quest for self knowledge, a life-long pursuit of spiritual and intellectual reflection, respect for the dignity of oneself and others, a devotion to justice, and a commitment to serving the poor. These qualities form the very essence of the writing life.
- Additionally, a low-residency program is, by virtue of its format of workshops and close mentoring method, a collaborative process between students and faculty, and among students, tending to foster the very ideals of Jesuit pedagogy based on a “collaborative process.” Student writers work closely not only with faculty mentors in developing their course of study, but with other students, both individually and in small groups. Students work collaboratively in a number of ways. Informally they share their work by developing peer reading and writing groups, exchanging their work not only during the residency but during the intervening semester through on-line work; formally they share their work by attending and giving public readings throughout their two years in the program.
- More specifically, Fairfield’s unique MFA program will make this connection between Jesuit philosophy and the graduate study of creative writing even more pronounced and “synergistic,” a word that in its Christian context suggests the pairing of the human and the divine for greater spiritual regeneration. Taking advantage of Fairfield’s position as a leader in the Jesuit community, our MFA program would seek to make the synergistic energy between the two more prominent and clearly defined. We would hope to do this in a number of ways. For example, while coursework and emphasis would, of course, focus on the writing of fiction, poetry, and non-fiction, Fairfield’s MFA program might also wish to develop supplementary seminars and lectures on the relationship between spirituality and the creative life, between social, political, and moral activism and the isolated life and work of a writer, and between the mind and the spirit. We would hope to do this by utilizing the many on-campus experts on spirituality and creativity, as well as inviting other recognized authorities to lecture in the program.
- The program would further Fairfield’s goals of supporting educational models that are both interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary. Creative writing MFA programs, by their very nature, draw from many fields of study. Students are asked to write both critically and creatively; they need to study and investigate and synthesize various subjects to learn about the areas they are writing about; they perform both scholarly research and field research; many go into various fields to perform service during the third semester for their critical thesis (e.g., they teach creative writing in nursing homes, hospices, inner cities, homeless shelters, prisons and to groups of returning veterans).
- Fairfield’s program is interdisciplinary in that it is one of the few programs nationally to offer students the option of concentrating not just in one field (e.g., poetry or fiction) but in two (e.g., poetry and fiction, or one genre and publishing/editing). Students who want to write in more than one genre can pursue both areas.
• Finally, since most low-residency programs offer students the option of doing some sort of experientially based work for their “critical thesis,” we would expect to offer our students the possibility of doing work in the community that is in service to one’s fellow man. For instance, some programs, such as the Stonecoast Low Residency MFA program in Maine, permit students working on their critical thesis to teach creative writing in nursing homes, prisons, and the inner-city and to write about their experiences; other MFA programs foster the development of creative arts journals, writing groups, and writing activities such as poetry contests and poetry “slams” in areas where such cultural activities are not available. These are just a few of the ways that Fairfield’s unique Jesuit philosophy could be highlighted by and sustained through this new program.

We have made several important changes to the program since it started in Dec. 2008. These have included starting overseas residency options in both Galway and Florence. We have added a concentration in script-writing, as well as in publishing/editing and spiritual writing. The latter concentrations seems to be a natural outgrowth of our Jesuit connection and two of our workshops have been co-taught by Father Paul Fitzgerald. Additionally because many of our students are interested in teaching on the college level when they graduate, we have developed a very successful post-graduate teacher training option. Graduated students interested in teaching apply to the program and are accepted based on their application merits. Now in its third successful year, we accepted 6 out of 13 graduates who applied the first year, we accepted 5 out of 10 applications for the second year and this year we accepted 4 students out of 7. The students go through a rigorous 6-credit graduate-level course sequence in the teaching of composition (taught by Dr. Gannett, head of the Freshman English program at Fairfield) while teaching a comp course and being observed by her. It has been so successful that all of them have been offered at least one adjunct course at Fairfield and most have gone on to teach many courses.

A very vibrant MFA student reading series held at the new bookstore and in area libraries and bookstores as well as The Inspired Writer series, an MFA program bringing famous authors to campus on their book tours (both the brainchild and run by Elizabeth Hastings) bring together MFA students many times a year while also building awareness of the MFA within the larger Fairfield County community.

Other important changes have involved curricular and faculty changes. They would include:

• The **Fairfield Book Prize**, one of the few book competitions open only to students and alums of an MFA program. We have successfully run this contest twice now, with our second book to be published through New Rivers Press next month.

• The chance for our students to gain important editorial experience working on our national on-line magazine, **Mason's Road**, or with one of several faculty publishers, who are associated with 5 presses or magazines.

• Being close to New York, we invite agents, editors, and publishers to meet individually with students at every residency.
• We have just completed a project called *Now What?*, a 400-plus-page book written exclusively by Fairfield students, alums, and faculty, which launched in February, 2014 as an e-book while the launch of the paperback book was celebrated during our summer residency in July, 2014. The book is a unique resource and guide for all MFA graduates to help them negotiate their careers and lives after finishing an MFA. It is now sold nationally through Amazon and other online outlets.

• Flexible programming that allows students to work in more than one genre and to combine genres.

• Students may work at Fairfield's Bellarmine Museum, and have an exhibition of their work. Working with the Museum director, interested students may work on ekphrastic poetry or prose inspired by the visual art works on display in the museum. This has been a very successful addition and we celebrated our third exhibit last September.

• Third-semester students may gain valuable editing experience working as an intern on a magazine or at a publishing house with six of our current faculty who run or are associated with a press or literary magazine.

• 5th semester, post-grad options to continue to work with a faculty mentor to polish a manuscript for submission.

• Our students have published or had accepted for publication a total of 19 books, in addition to hundreds of essays, articles, poems, and stories. Attached is a partial list of student publications.

3. **Assessment/accomplishments**

   We have graduated 124 students. Currently 45 students are enrolled. In an attempt to not only assess what students are able to demonstrate at the end of the MFA, but also to assess what students have learned as a result of the MFA, an ongoing assessment project has been put into place, starting in spring 2012, which is designed to compare the quality of a student’s writing before they have started and after they have completed the program. This is possible because a portfolio of student writing is required as part of the application process. By using comparable rubrics for scoring both applications and final thesis submissions, the program is able to measure both the quality of its graduates’ writing as well as the growth of each students writing skills over time.

   Application Rubric—common among all genres:

1. **Command of language**
2. **Authenticity/originality of idea**
3. **Character development**
4. **Development of craft elements**
5. **Development of dramatic material**
6. **Mechanical correctness**
7. **Overall skill as a writer**
### MFA Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiction</th>
<th>Non-Fiction</th>
<th>Poetry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The writing is technically</td>
<td>The writing displays a knowledge and control of</td>
<td>Demonstrates an awareness of how form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polished</td>
<td>grammar, syntax, punctuation, and other</td>
<td>facilitates content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mechanical elements of accomplished writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The writing conveys a</td>
<td>The writing exhibits a structural expertise which</td>
<td>Freshness and originality of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong voice</td>
<td>can assure the reader that the author is</td>
<td>language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comfortable with the conventions of the genre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The story is compelling and</td>
<td>The writing makes use of literary devices we</td>
<td>Effective use of imagery and metaphor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original</td>
<td>usually associate with fiction (such as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dramatic description of people and places, or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>effective dialogue).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characters are complex and</td>
<td>The writing hooks us with a compelling opening.</td>
<td>Development of dramatic material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>layered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical craft elements</td>
<td>The writing engages us intellectually and</td>
<td>Effective use of sound and rhythm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incl setting, point of view,</td>
<td>emotionally.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tense and dialogue, are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handled effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The plot and pacing of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>story is effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of fall 2013, only one cohort of graduates has been assessed, so it will not be until summer 2015 that the pre- and post-measurements can be used to assess learning; however, in the initial assessment project it was determined that graduates in all three genres demonstrates “above average” skill in all of our learning objectives. Fiction, the most popular genre, also had the most differentiation of scores. Results of this project, especially the areas with the relatively lowest scores, have been discussed at regular faculty meetings with an eye towards focusing on target areas most explicitly.

4. **Impact on our students and on the University:** Our retention rate of over 94% clearly indicates that students find a supportive home in our program. Out of over 160 students enrolled for at least one semester only 6 have dropped out, while the rest have, thus far, stayed to graduate. And as for student success, in the past three years students have published some 19 books, as well as hundreds of articles, essays, stories, and poems. David Fitzpatrick, a graduate of the MFA program, was recently featured in *USA Today* for his
brilliant memoir, *Sharp*, while Deborah Henry had her book selected by Oprah’s *O Magazine* as a summer read. Poet Annabelle Moseley’s “Still Life” was nominated for a 2012 Pushcart Prize. For more information see our “MFA Alumni Publications” page. We have recently updated our webpage to reflect these student successes. To my knowledge no University program has felt a negative impact from our program or its success.

5. **Administrative Structure:** There have been no administrative changes in our program since its beginning. Dr Michael White continues to be the Director and Elizabeth Hastings the Managing Director.

6. **Resources:** Enders Island

   Enders Island is a small island (11 acres) off the coast of Mystic, Connecticut. It was selected because of its serenity and privacy, as well as its ability to inspire writers. Enders Island and its staff provide for the program’s every need, including three dining rooms, a full kitchen staff that serve three meals a day (with various food requirements of student and faculty), over 45 rooms accommodating over 60 faculty and students, as well as workshop rooms, classrooms and lecture halls, and an evening reading venue. The island has WiFi in almost every room for students and faculty to use their lap-tops, as well as several University printers and computers. The lecture and workshops rooms are more than adequately provided with overhead projectors and other necessary technologies. In short, Enders Island provides for all the necessary educational items that would be needed by MFA students.

**Student Services**

Students are provided with a Fairfield University ID, entitling them to all of the services for which any Fairfield student would be provided. This would include use of the library (either in person or on-line), interlibrary loans and the graduate services department.
Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee Meeting of 11/12/13
Minutes Approved at December 10, 2013 meeting

Members in attendance: Dean Robbin Crabtree, Assoc. Dean Manyul Im, Profs. Johanna Garvey, Anita Fernandez, Terry—Ann Jones, John Miecznikowski (chair), Kathy Nantz, Michael Pagano, Doug Peduti, Vincent Rosivach, Glenn Sauer, Chris Staecker.

EXCERPT OF ASCC MINUTES

MFA five year program review (invited guest Prof. Michael White)
Prof. White gave an overview of the program review findings. It has been five years since our residency program first began. We've had 8 classes graduating, one every 6 months. It's a low--residency program for 9 days in the summer, 9 days in the winter. The students work one---on---one with a faculty mentor, and this has become a standard format nationally. When our program started there were 25 programs nationally, now there are about 70. We have 14 faculty teaching in the program, including 2 new hires with a core of 7 or 8 who have been there since the start. We have added a third term project on "socially conscious" topics, also added options in Galway and working on an option in Florence. We have started a post---grad teacher training program run by Prof. C. Gannett, and 4 of our graduates are now adjuncting at Fairfield U. We have the Fairfield book prize, Bellarmine museum poetry prize, students working on our literary journal Mason's Road, and we are publishing an MFA post---grad survival guide. We have started a formal assessment of the students with Prof. A. Perkus, and are about 1 year into this---collecting writing samples from when students enter and when they leave. Any questions?

Prof. Rosivach asked if there were written objectives for the program. The document describes assessment, but not objectives. Prof White agreed---there are objectives but they aren't clearly articulated in the document. Prof Crabtree added that there were learning objectives in the program's original proposal, which could be copied into the present document. Prof. Rosivach emphasized that all programs should have broader objectives, not just short---term learning objectives, and Prof White agreed.

Prof. Nantz asked if the teaching workshop led by Prof Gannett awards a formal certificate. Prof White responded that there is not a formal certificate, which would require state approval, but there is an informal one, which the graduates can reference on their resumes.

Prof Nantz asked about fees and credits awarded for the 5th semester. Prof White responded that some students do the 5th semester because they have fallen behind and need another semester. Those students pay the usual fees and get the usual credits. There is also an optional modified 5th semester with a reduced fee and structured mentoring rather than traditional courses.

Prof Rosivach asked about the programs resources. The document includes projections for the future, but no report on the current use of resources. How has this shaken out over the 5 years? Prof Crabtree replied that the data exists but was not included in this document. The program's total revenue was about $4 million over the 5 years. This data should be appended to the present document. The revenue has been strong apart from one disappointing residency (5 students vs
a target of 15) when competitor programs were starting and our tuition was the highest in the country. But revenues from the teaching seminar and 5th semester made up for this.

Prof Rosivach asked if this revenue stays in the academic division and in the CAS. Dean Crabtree replied that the English department gets a budget augmentation of about $4--5 thousand. In general there isn't a revenue sharing model at Fairfield U, which is a problem.

Prof Rosivach recalled that part of the original impetus for starting this program was that the revenue would stay in the department and the college, because we didn't want to dilute the undergrad experience— we would add new (undergrad--focused) faculty lines in English using the revenue. Dean Crabtree replied that there has been a new line added in English, not repurposed from pieces of other lines, but a real new position. Prof Rosivach said that this should set a precedent that if a grad program brings revenue, it should fund new lines in its department. The money should not go to a new lacrosse stadium.

Prof Rosivach moved to endorse the review and send it along to the relevant committees. The motion was seconded by Prof Sauer. Prof Rosivach emphasized again that the document should include additional financial information. The motion passed unanimously.

Educational Planning Committee
March 20, 2014 Meeting
Minutes
CNS 8

Present: Cathy Giapponi, Evelyn Bilias Lolis, Olivia Harriott, Nancy Manister, Angela Biselli, Mark Scalese, Qin Zhang (late at 4:00 p.m.)

Absent: Peter Bayers, Paul Fitzgerald, Robbin Crabtree, Lynn Babington, Cinthia Gannet

Sabbatical: Diana Mager

Prof. Giapponi called the meeting to order at 3:38.

----------EXCERPT OF EPC MINUTES----------

Agenda Item 2: Master of Fine Arts Five Year Review

Guest: Michael White

Prof. Giapponi invited Prof. White to join the meeting and provide an overview of the Master of Fine Arts (MFA) self-study.

Prof. White discussed the history of the program he helped develop. The first class of students entered the program in 2008. He indicated that it has been successful as a low residency program. The students work with professional mentors. Although assigned a designated mentor, it is a collaborative program in terms of the exchange of ideas between students, faculty and mentors. The required thesis is book length, in a single genre.
Prof. White noted that the program has had as many as 75 students, with current enrollment at 45 students.

Prof. White outlined some of the changes to the program since its inception. The MFA offers two oversees residency options, one in Galway and another in Florence. Students are offered opportunities to gain editorial experience through a national online literary magazine. The Fairfield Book Prize, a book competition for MFA students and MFA alums, has run twice and the second book was given book contract (will be published through New Rivers Press). The MFA published the Post-Graduate MFA Guide, a book of essays on how to survive and progress in their careers post-MFA. In addition, a post-graduation teacher training option has been developed, with formal training by Cinthia Gannett. With two cohorts completed, a third is to come. This program contributes to a pool of trained, excited adjunct professors.

Thus far, sixteen graduates have published books.

Prof. Giapponi asked about the average length of time to complete the MFA.

Prof. White indicated that it takes approximately 2 to 2.5 years. The average student age is 35 years old. There are four 9-day residencies on Enders Island over the two years.

Prof. Giapponi asked how many students come in each year.

Prof. White indicated that approximately twenty enter the program in the summer and four in winter. He noted that it is an expensive program. To stay competitive, they cut tuition from $8,500 to $7,975 and the room and board on the island is an additional $1,150. Faculty took a pay cut, with student mentoring reduced from $2500 to $2250.

Prof. Blias Lolis asked about the portfolio review process.

Prof. White indicated that the applications contain portfolios of student writing that are scored and provide student benchmarks with rankings 1-5. Upon completion of the program, the final thesis submissions are scored using a similar rubric and compared to the application portfolio scores. The process includes two readers (1 primary; 1 secondary reader). Improvement is assessed. There are also written midterm evaluations and published work is another mode of assessment.

Prof. Harriott asked how the program compares to others.

Prof. White indicated that it compares favorably to other programs. The MFA offers the book prize, with one publication contract through New Rivers Press. Students can take the publishing/editing track in addition to regular curriculum. Every residency brings out editors from New York or from Yale, so they gain exposure to real working professionals. As with other programs, the MFA offers overseas programs. The postgraduate teachers program, in addition to the low-residency program, distinguishes Fairfield’s MFA program from others. The publication record has been strong and students get help through editor contacts. Fairfield’s MFA has very good faculty who are caring, and distinguished in their own right.

In response to Prof. White’s note that there is a spiritual writing segment/track, Prof. Harriott asked about the spiritual writing focus and whether it is unique to Fairfield.
Prof. White indicated that he was initially opposed to it, but then became convinced. It’s become popular and successful. Topics include grappling with death, among others. It is integrated into multi-genre workshops (poetry, prose, essays, memoirs, etc.). He noted that there is one other program at a religious school that offers something similar.

Given the success of the MFA students, Prof. Giapponi asked if our University’s Marketing Division was helping to get the word out and publicize the program.

Prof. White indicated that he takes an active role himself to promote the program. The three fulltime faculty write letters to CT libraries and do short writing programs as a way to promote the MFA program. The Post-Graduate Guide is now available on Amazon, which will also help promote the program. The program website is the most crucial thing. MFAs read at Fairfield bookstore - as students and alums. Alumni Day at the Island has also been helpful.

Prof. Bilias Lolis asked about tuition assistance or scholarships, as in other graduate programs.

Prof. White noted that they are trying to keep tuition down. There are a couple forms of financial aid available, including loans and a 1-time $5000 merit-based award - usually split between 2 people. In addition, tone day has been cut from the residency experience, from ten to nine days, and faculty are being paid less.

Prof. Bilias Lolis suggested that the office of service learning might have opportunities for grants.

Prof. White noted that some of the graduates of the MFA have given money back to program.

Prof. Harriott inquired as to the difference between self-publishing on Amazon and the publishing done by the MFA students.

Prof. White explained that the experience our students are offered and the type of publishing our students do is not the same as self-publication through Amazon. The students from the MFA program are published through vetted publishers.

Prof. Giapponi asked about the submission of the report to Academic Council. She suggested that information related to the costs of the program, as well as revenues, might be included in the report. For example, students pay for their own room and board and so it is self-sufficient in terms of funding. Also, she suggested that he might want to include information on enrollment trends over the past few years.

Prof. White indicated that some of this information was included in a revised report but he forgot to forward it to the committee.

Prof. Harriott asked if current faculty go through the program.

Prof. White responded that Fairfield faculty members, including Ben Fine, have gone through the program. Members of the faculty get half off the tuition.

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

Prof. Harriott made a motion to endorse the MFA five-year review.
Prof. Manister seconded the motion.
The committee agreed that the report should include a chart showing overall trends in enrollment in the program, including a breakdown of summer and winter enrollment data.

Prof. Bilias Lolis noted the high cost of tuition. She suggested the need to work on coming up with cost-savings ideas or fundraising to help defray tuition costs. Prof. Harriott that they could emphasize the outreach programs to local libraries and wondered how they select the libraries they visit.

Prof. Manister wondered if the new person in Writing Center was from this program suggested placing MFA students in Writing Center.

Prof. Harriott noted that a service component was missing in the program and wondered about providing service to the underserved or to constituencies in the university.

The motion was unanimously approved.

<><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><><>
Date: October 15, 2014  
To: Academic Council  
From: Committee on Committees  
Re: Dissolving the Committee on University College

On November 4, 2013, the Academic Council passed a motion to dissolve the Committee on University College, followed by a motion directed to the Committee on Committees: Given the vote to dissolve the Committee on University College, that the Committee on Committees bring to the Academic Council language for the Handbook and the Journal of Record to implement the dissolution.

What follows are all relevant texts from the Faculty Handbook and Journal of Record. Each is followed by the Committee on Committees' recommendations regarding its disposition.

**Faculty Handbook (11th Edition, amended)**

1. **University College Committee**  
   **Membership**
   Six members elected from the faculty for three-year overlapping terms as follows: three from the College of Arts and Sciences to include one each from the areas of Humanities, Natural Sciences, Mathematics and Engineering, Behavioral and Social Sciences; one from the School of Business; one from the School of Nursing; and one from the Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions. The Dean of University College or the Dean’s delegate shall be a voting member.

   **General Purpose**
   To act as a formal communications link between the faculty and the undergraduate and graduate components of University College on matters of educational and administrative policies.

   **Specific Duties**
   i. to study and make recommendations on academic policies for the undergraduate and graduate programs.

   ii. to maintain liaison with the standing committees on Undergraduate Curriculum, Educational Planning and Student Life.

   iii. to advise the Administration on policies.

We recommend deletion of this committee and renumbering of the committee that follows.
2. **Educational Technologies Committee**

**Membership**

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 shall be *ex officio* members.

A proposal from ETC to restructure their membership, removing reference to University College, is working its way through the approval process. Note that the other committees with University College representation (Undergraduate Curriculum and Faculty Development and Evaluation) have already amended their Handbook membership descriptions.

---

**Journal of Record**

3. **Committee on Continuing Education/University College Committee:**

The name of the Committee on Continuing Education is changed to University College Committee. AC: 12/9/02

This entry should be deleted.

4. **Portfolio Assessment in University College:**

Because the Portfolio Assessment Process has been a valuable tool in fostering self-understanding and informed academic planning in learners enrolled in the Bachelor of General Studies, the option should be made available to learners in all degree programs offered through University College. AC: 05/15/1989

As there are no longer "degree programs offered through University College," this entry should be deleted.
Independent Studies:
The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee recognizes that it can be a valuable educational experience when a conscientious student pursues in depth a personal interest, and is led to a new level of knowledge under the tutelage of a dedicated faculty member. To ensure the academic quality of such guided study, the Committee has established the following set of requirements:
1. Students may pursue independent study projects
   a. during their junior and/or senior years, or, in the case of University College students, after having completed 45 credits; and...
2. Students, other than those in University College, should apply to the professor under whose direction they wish to study no later than the normal registration time of the preceding semester, or, in the case of University College students during their normal registration period. The professor's decision to accept a student for independent study will be based on such criteria as the student's academic maturity and performance record, the professor's specialty within the discipline, and his or her teaching load...

In light of the JOR policy that, "With regard to registration, to the greatest extent possible, part-time students will be treated the same as full-time students," we recommend amending this entry as follows (new text in bold, deleted text struck through). We have sent this recommendation to the UCC for their approval.

Independent Studies:
The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee recognizes that it can be a valuable educational experience when a conscientious student pursues in depth a personal interest, and is led to a new level of knowledge under the tutelage of a dedicated faculty member. To ensure the academic quality of such guided study, the Committee has established the following set of requirements:
1. Students may pursue independent study projects
   a. during their junior and/or senior years, or, in the case of University College students, after having completed 45 credits; and...
2. Students, other than those in University College, should apply to the professor under whose direction they wish to study no later than the normal registration time of the preceding semester, or, in the case of University College students during their normal registration period. The professor's decision to accept a student for independent study will be based on such criteria as the student's academic maturity and performance record, the professor's specialty within the discipline, and his or her teaching load...
6. Assignment of Course Credit in FU Study Abroad Programs:
All Study Abroad programs that award Fairfield University grades for courses must assign credit for those courses according to the following policy.

a. The University College (working with the program director, if a Fairfield academic program is closely linked to the study abroad site) will sift through the catalog and compile an initial list of courses that correspond to offerings in our current departments and schools.

b. University College will send the corresponding courses to the relevant dean, department chair or program director. The dean/chair/director, in consultation with the department/advisory board, will decide whether a study abroad course 1) should qualify for Fairfield credit; 2) meets departmental/program requirements for the major or minor; and 3) meets core requirements in the department’s or school’s area.

c. Fairfield students also would have the opportunity to seek Fairfield credit for study abroad courses that do not correspond to Fairfield departments and schools. Students would seek approval from the Dean of University College to use such courses as electives. Students also could try to have such elective courses count toward core requirements; such petitions would be heard by the SVPAA’s office since core issues go beyond the jurisdiction of a single department or dean.

The process set forth in a., b., and c. shall be initiated by University College and repeated every three years.

AC: 03/11/2002 Adapted AC: 03/03/2003

After consultation with the Director of International Programs, we recommend the following changes to this entry (new text in bold, deleted text struck through). The process described by the amended text is the process currently followed.

Assignment of Course Credit in FU Study Abroad Programs:
All Study Abroad programs that award Fairfield University grades for courses must assign credit for those courses according to the following policy.

a. The Office of International Programs University College (working with the program director, if a Fairfield academic program is closely linked to the study abroad site) will sift through the catalog and compile an initial list of courses that correspond to offerings in our current departments and schools.

b. The Office of International Programs University College will send the corresponding courses to the relevant dean, department chair or program director. The dean/chair/director, in consultation with the department/advisory board, will decide whether a study abroad course 1) should qualify for Fairfield credit; 2) meets departmental/program requirements for the major or minor; and 3) meets core requirements in the department’s or school’s area.

c. Fairfield students also would have the opportunity to seek Fairfield credit for study abroad courses that do not correspond to Fairfield departments and schools. Students would seek approval from the Director of the Office of International Programs Dean of
University College to use such courses as electives. Students also could try to have such elective courses count toward core requirements; such petitions would be heard by the SVPAA’s office since core issues go beyond the jurisdiction of a single department or dean. The process set forth in a., b., and c. shall be initiated by the Office of International Programs University College and repeated every three years.

AC: 03/11/2002 Adapted AC: 03/03/2003

7. Teaching Load:
   A normal teaching load for tenured and tenure-track faculty is nine hours per week. University faculty teaching in University College should be either credited toward their regular teaching load or receive appropriate remuneration for extra service.
   AC: 02/12/1973 AC: 02/07/2011 AC: 05/08/2013

In order to preserve language guaranteeing remuneration for overload teaching, while recognizing that some full-time faculty are contractually obligated to teach more than nine hours per week, we recommend replacing the second sentence with the following:

Full-time faculty members teaching beyond the normal or contracted teaching load shall be compensated as detailed in the Memo of Understanding.

AC: 02/12/1973 AC: 02/07/2011 AC: 05/08/2013

8. Under listing of approved programs:

   University College:
   Bachelor Degree in Professional Studies (UCC: 1982; formerly Bachelor Degree in General Studies AC: 05/17/2000)
   Associate Degree in General Studies (AC: 02/03/1986)
   Certificate of Advanced Studies in Literacy (AC: 04/07/2008)

While Academic Council approval is required for the creation or elimination of programs, the listing of approved and eliminated programs does not require Council votes. To maintain the accuracy of the listings, the Faculty Secretary will make the following changes:

• Eliminate the University College heading.
• Move the BPS (in the process of being changed to BLS) under the College with a note added about its administration being moved to the College and the date of that change (3/23/2012).
• The "Associate Degree in General Studies" is the Associate of Arts Degree that was eliminated in 2010 and is appropriately listed with eliminated programs. "Associate Degree in General Studies" will be deleted and the date of its approval (2/3/1986) will be added to the listing for the elimination of the Associate of Arts degree.
• Move the literacy certificate to GSEAP where it belongs.
Under listing of eliminated programs:

University College (GF: 03/02/2012; formerly School of Continuing Education)

This entry will remain as the last record in a 'living document' of the school.

10. Appendix 16: Policies for the School of Continuing Education

Continuing Education Programs:
The School of Continuing Education is an academic community of Fairfield University designed to provide opportunities for lifetime learning to adults with diverse educational needs. Its commitment is to a curriculum that enhances personal growth and career development, and to a schedule which allows adults with job and civic responsibilities to pursue higher education part-time.

Academic Standards and Policies for the School of Continuing Education:
1. Admissions Policy:
a. The undergraduate degree programs of the School are designed to serve:
i. high school graduates who wish to combine gainful employment and the pursuit of a college degree;
ii. persons who desire to resume an interrupted college program on a part-time basis;
iii. persons preparing for a new career or for advanced graduate studies.
b. Non-matriculated students
i. Prospective students interested in courses for academic credit but not intending to work for a degree may register as Special Students.
ii. Prospective students not concerned with academic credit may enroll in courses as Auditors. Auditors attend class but receive no academic credit or grade.
iii. Prospective students who are unsure as to their academic plans may initially register for credit as Special Students.
c. Matriculation for degree program
After having completed 12 credit hours with at least a C average at the School, the student will be reviewed by the School for matriculation into a degree program.
i. Prospective degree students must complete an application form and submit a copy of their secondary school diploma or equivalency certificate. If the applicant has attended a post-secondary school or college, an official transcript must be sent from each institution.
ii. Although evidence of secondary school graduation or its equivalent is required, other academic entrance requirements are flexible. Criteria for admission are the applicant's seriousness of purpose and the quality of his/her academic record at Fairfield.
d. All grants of transfer credit are made on a provisional basis to applicants and become final after the student has matriculated.
i. Course credits may be awarded to applicants on the basis of standardized tests and evaluations from such groups as the American Council on Education (see further below under "Other Curricular Policies").
ii. On the evidence of transcripts submitted at the time of application, course credits will be given to students who have pursued studies in accredited colleges if these studies are equivalent in quality and content to corresponding courses offered at the University, and if the student has received a grade of at least C. Students transferring into a Bachelor's degree must complete a minimum of 60 credits at Fairfield; those transferring into the Associate's degree must complete a minimum of 30 credits at Fairfield. Credits more than 10 years old may have to be re-evaluated.
e. After matriculation, students must consult with the Dean if they wish to obtain credit four
courses to be taken at another university.

2. **Grades and examinations**
   a. The grading system for the School will be the same as that for the undergraduate schools.
   b. To remain in good standing, a degree student must maintain a cumulative average of C. If his/her cumulative average falls below C in a given semester, he/she will be placed on probation during the following semester; probation will be removed if the student can raise his/her cumulative average back to a C, or 2.0, in that semester. If not, the student is liable to dismissal at the discretion of the Dean.
   c. Final examinations are required in all courses. A copy must be filed with the Dean's office. Alternatives to the traditional written exam must be approved; a memorandum explaining the alternative method of evaluation must be filed with the Dean.

3. **Completion of degree program**
   To graduate from the School of Continuing Education the student must attain a minimum of 120 credits for a Bachelor's degree and 60 credits for the Associate of Arts, but no simple accumulation of credits is prescribed nor considered to qualify for a degree at Fairfield. Rather, the student is expected to have completed with success all the assigned courses, which constitute the curriculum of his/her choice. A Quality Point Average of 2.0 for courses taken at Fairfield University and in the major is required for graduation.

4. **Other curricular policies**
   A. The curricula of degree-granting programs in the School of Continuing Education shall be subject to the approval of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.
   B. Major programs in the School of Continuing Education shall be supervised by existing departments of the undergraduate faculty.
   C. Nonmatriculated Students in Daytime Courses:
      All special nonmatriculated students who wish to attend daytime undergraduate courses will enroll through the School of Continuing Education. These students are limited to a maximum of 3 courses per semester from the daytime schedule.
   D. Translating Continuing Education Units (CEU) into College Credit:
      The CEU is a nationally recognized standard of measurement used to document the type, quality and duration of non-credit course work. One CEU is equivalent to 10 class hours of participation in a qualified program. CEUs are not directly convertible to college credits. Translations of CEUs into college credit may be accomplished by the portfolio method of assessment.
   E. Awarding College Credit by Outside Evaluation:
      The recommendations of the American Council of Education and the Program of Noncollegiate Sponsored Instruction of the University of the State of New York are acceptable for the awarding of credit in areas compatible with the Fairfield University curriculum. The credits awarded are treated as transfer credits.
   F. Awarding College Credit by Examination:
      College credits may be awarded for the Subject Examinations of the College Level Examination Program if the achievement level is at or above the 50th percentile. A second acceptable examinations battery is from the American College Testing Proficiency Examination Program provided the scores are 50 and over. The examinations must be in areas compatible with the Fairfield University curriculum. Credits awarded are treated as transfer credits.
   G. Responsibility of the School of Continuing Education:
      The School of Continuing Education has authority and responsibility for institution-wide program development and delivery for adult part-time undergraduate and non-credit students. Its dean has the responsibility of insuring that creditable standards are maintained.
   H. Selection and Retention of Faculty:
      Faculty qualifications are determined by the appropriate departments and schools of the University.
The Dean of the School of Continuing Education has the authority to select among qualified faculty. The Dean also has responsibility for retention of faculty.

I. Curriculum:
Course proposals are approved by the appropriate curriculum area and/or school committee. Approval of interdisciplinary courses involve all concerned curriculum areas and school committees. Changes of academic requirements, alternations of curriculum and other academic matters are processed through the normal faculty committees. The Dean of the School of Continuing Education takes part in the deliberation of these committees.

5. Other policy clarifications
A student with an A.A. or an A.S. degree in a "transfer curriculum" from an accredited college may be accepted with 60 credits (exclusive of remedial courses and basic skills) in transfer. Those who have acquired a considerable body of knowledge in an area can demonstrate their competency by taking an equivalency examination or other form of assessment given or supervised by the Department or curriculum area.

The general goals of the University Core Curriculum should be preserved, but the Dean and his/her advisors should not be held to itemized requirements; each case should be interpreted and some flexibility allowed in view of the background of the student and the spirit of the Core.

The core for Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science degree in the School of Continuing Education is as follows:

**Humanities:** Students will take 12 courses, 36 credits:
- Classics (optional)

**English:** 2 courses required:
- 1 in Composition
- 1 in Literature Fine Arts

**History:** 2 courses required, of which one is in Western Civilization

**Modern Language:** 2 courses required

**Philosophy:** 1 course required

**Religious Studies:** 1 course required

**Philosophy, Religious Studies, or Applied Ethics:** 1 course required

**Social Sciences:** Students will take 4 courses, 12 credits; at least 2 disciplines will be represented. The social sciences include:
- Economics
- Politics
- Psychology
- Sociology

**Natural Sciences and Mathematics:** Students will take 4 courses, 12 credits; at least 1 science and 1 math will be represented. The subjects include:
- Biology
- Chemistry
- Physics
- Mathematics

CR: 9/22/86 amended AC: 2/6/89 amended AC: 12/7/92 amended AC: 05/19/2010

We recommend deleting this appendix and renumbering as appropriate. Part of the argument for eliminating UC was that part-time students should face the same standards and requirements as full time students. There is a new appendix (17) with Policies for Part-Time Students.
Appendix 17: Policies for Part-Time Students

8. Only BPS students will have the modified core defined in the Journal of Record.

This appendix, written as part of the dissolution of UC, contains no reference to UC. However, item 8 is referring to the UC core described above in appendix 16. In light of the recommended elimination of appendix 16, we recommend replacing item 8 with the following:

Part-time students are required to complete the same core curriculum as full-time students.

The only exception is students in the BLS program who have a modified core as follows:

Humanities: Students will take 12 courses, 36 credits:
- Classics (optional)
- English: 2 courses required: 1 in Composition and 1 in Literature
- Visual and Performing Arts: 2 courses required
- History: 2 courses required, of which one is in Western Civilization
- Modern Language (optional)
- Philosophy: 1 course required
- Religious Studies: 1 course required
- Philosophy, Religious Studies, or Applied Ethics: 1 course required

Social and Behavioral Sciences: Students will take 4 courses, 12 credits, with at least 2 disciplines represented.

Natural Sciences and Mathematics: Students will take 4 courses, 12 credits with at least 1 science and 1 math represented.
DATE: September 29, 2014

Faculty Representatives to Committees of the Board of Trustees:
Ron Salafia, Ed. Tech. Committee
Joe Dennin, Univ. Budget Committee
Carl Scheraga, Ed. Planning Committee
John Slotemaker, Student Life Committee
Shah Etemad, Admissions & Scholarship Committee
Mike Serazio, Public Lectures & Events Committee
TBD, University Advancement Committee

FROM: Mark C. Reed
Senior Vice President for Administration and Chief of Staff

RE: Information for Faculty Representatives

I write to provide you with information regarding your participation as faculty representatives to committees of the Board of Trustees.

Logistics and Attendance

All non-Trustees who attend meetings of the Board of Trustees or its committees do so at the sole discretion and invitation of the Board of Trustees. The President of Fairfield University is the only employee of the University who serves, ex officio, as a member of the Board. Accordingly, only Trustees are members of Board committees.

Board committees rarely conduct formal votes, and if they do, only Trustees may vote. Generally, committees which make recommendations to the full Board do so based on consensus of committee members.

Each Board committee has an administrative liaison who staffs the committee. As faculty representative, this staff member will be your primary contact concerning your respective Board committee. He/she will reach out this week to share with you more specific information about the committee whose meetings you will attend. Additionally, prior to each meeting, you will receive directly from the administrative liaison the agenda and any information to review in advance of the committee meeting. A list of administrative liaisons is below.

Faculty representatives are encouraged to participate in discussions that take place during committee meetings. Each committee agenda will have an executive session listed, and most,
if not all, committees will go into executive session near the end of their meetings. All non-Trustees are excused during executive sessions, and the Trustees may or may not ask the administrative liaison to remain for part or all of the executive session.

**Administrative Liaisons to Board Committees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Affairs Committee:</th>
<th>Dr. Lynn Babington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Audit Committee:</td>
<td>Michael Trafecante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Life Committee:</td>
<td>Dr. Thomas C. Pellegrino University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement Committee:</td>
<td>Wally Halas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep School Committee:</td>
<td>Rev. John J. Hanwell, S.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Committee:</td>
<td>Dr. Mark C. Reed, David Frassinelli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Committee:</td>
<td>Paige Francis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment &amp; Marketing Committee:</td>
<td>Karen Pellegrino, Jennifer Anderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Confidentiality**

All information presented and discussions that take place during meetings of the Board of Trustees or its committees are considered confidential. You will notice that all committee materials contain the following notice on agendas or related materials:

*Please note that the information and attachments in this document are intended for the exclusive use of members of the Board of Trustees of Fairfield University and authorized staff only. All information contained herein is confidential or privileged. If you are not authorized to access this information, please do not read, distribute, copy or print any of the information. If you are aware of any unauthorized access to or use of this information, please notify the Office of the President, Fairfield University, 1073 North Benson Road, Fairfield, CT, 06824, 203-254-4000, ext. 2256.*

*Thank you.*

All participants and attendees at meetings of the Board of Trustees or its committees are asked and expected to uphold confidentiality. If there is something you believe is not confidential and wish to discuss it with someone outside of the committee meeting, please discuss it first with the administrative liaison to your committee.

Thank you for serving as faculty representatives this year. If you have any questions, please contact Kristine Carroll, Director of Board Relations, or me anytime.

**CC:** President
Vice Presidents
Administrative Liaisons to Board Committees
Kristine Carroll
From: Rakowitz, Susan  
Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2014 11:24 PM  
To: Reed, Mark  
Cc: Lomonaco, Martha; von Arx, Jeffrey, S.J.; Mulvey, Irene; Babington, Lynn; Dennin, Joseph; Etemad, Shahrokh; Salafia, Ronald; Scheraga, Carl; Serazio, Michael; Slotemaker, John
Subject: Faculty Liaisons to Committees of the Board of Trustees

To: Mark Reed, Senior VP for Administration and Chief of Staff  
From: Susan Rakowitz, General Faculty Secretary  
Date: September 30, 2014  
Re: Faculty Liaisons to Committees of the Board of Trustees

CC: Faculty Liaisons*; Marti LoMonaco, Chair, Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees; President Jeffrey von Arx, S.J.; Irene Mulvey, AC Executive Secretary; Lynn Babington, SVPAA

Earlier today, I received a copy of the attached memo, dated 9/29/14, from you to the faculty elected to serve as liaisons from their committees to committees of the Board. As Secretary of the General Faculty, I find some of its content quite troubling.

First, the statement that, "All non-Trustees who attend meetings of the Board of Trustees or its committees do so at the sole discretion and invitation of the Board of Trustees" implies that the Board might withdraw its invitation to faculty liaisons at any time. That implication is contrary to the spirit of the agreement made several years ago when the Board and the Faculty agreed to amend the Faculty Handbook to formalize the Board's standing invitation for faculty liaisons.

Even more problematic is the memo's unilateral requirement that the faculty liaisons maintain confidentiality regarding the meetings in which they participate. Clearly the liaisons should be reporting back to the committees that elected them. Furthermore, the Handbook's charge to the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees describes communication among that committee, the liaisons, and the Academic Council about "developments on the Board committees".

I'm therefore copying the liaisons who received your memo, and urging them to follow past procedures regarding attending and participating in Board meetings. I'm also copying members of the AC Executive Committee, asking that they consider taking up this issue at the 10/6 AC meeting as a Petition for Immediate Hearing or an agenda item.

*Joe Dennin, Shah Etemad, Ron Salafia, Carl Scheraga, Michael Serazio, John Slotemaker

---

On Oct 2, 2014, at 3:10 PM, Reed, Mark <mcreed@fairfield.edu> wrote:

Dear Sue:

I recognize that the situation of the Committee on Conference is different. They come with an agenda from the Academic Council and report back to them and are there for their part of the Academic Affairs Committee meeting.

Faculty representatives to the board committees are invited by the Board and nominated by you, and it is the faculty's business how they are selected. It's appropriate that they should come from cognate Handbook Committees for their expertise, but they do not, in the view of the administration, represent those committees. Faculty representatives on board committees do not represent particular interests or constituencies any more than anyone else on the committee does. They are present to contribute faculty expertise and point of view, but we presume that like
everyone else at these meetings, they speak with the best interests of the university as a whole at heart.

Discussions at board committee meetings are fairly unstructured, open-ended and, as I have indicated, not always conclusive and not determinative until the full board makes a decision. Faculty input is solicited and welcome, but board members in particular need to feel that opinions, debate and discussion are not going to be reported outside of the committee discussions; and I would point out that faculty are used to keeping confidentiality in regard to searches, rank and tenure decisions and discussions of the Budget Committee. In the end, of course, faculty representatives can and will do whatever they want to when it comes to talking about committee discussions outside of the meetings, and we are not in a position to enforce confidentiality. But if reasonable and appropriate confidentiality is not observed on board committees, board members will be less likely to participate in open discussion and will save substantive matters for executive session, and this will defeat the purpose of having faculty representatives on board committees. And by the way, the same request for confidentiality is made of representatives of the Alumni Association invited to attend board committee meetings, so the faculty are not being singled out.

I think it will be good for you to raise this issue with your colleagues, but I hope the discussion will address the issue of what is reasonable and appropriate confidentiality on the part of faculty representatives on board committees should be. It's really your decision.

Mark

---

**From:** <Rakowitz>, Susan Rakowitz <srakowitz@fairfield.edu>
**Date:** Thursday, October 2, 2014 4:27 PM
**To:** "Reed, Mark" <mcreed@fairfield.edu>
**Subject:** Re: Faculty Liaisons to Committees of the Board of Trustees

Mark,

Thanks for getting back to me so quickly. I think it makes sense for the Academic Council to discuss these issues. I'll alert the Council on Monday and suggest a full agenda item for November. That way we can have a clear articulation of the Faculty's position before the December BOT meeting.

Susan

---
Confidentiality and Faculty Representation in Academic Governance

(June 2013)

The statement that follows was prepared by a subcommittee of the Association’s Committee on College and University Governance and approved for publication by the parent committee.

In recent years, the Association has received an increasing number of complaints from faculty members whose service on a variety of institutional governance bodies has been conditioned on their agreeing to confidentiality—sometimes including secrecy before, during, and after deliberations—although they serve on those bodies as designated representatives of the faculty. In some cases, faculty members have been required to sign formal confidentiality agreements.1

The present statement argues that, except in personnel matters, imposing a precondition of confidentiality on faculty representatives serving on institutional governance bodies is incompatible with AAU P-supported governance standards and that those who would seek to impose various degrees of confidentiality in decision-making processes should be required to justify their position.2

The AAU P’s Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities identifies decision-making areas in which the faculty should have primary responsibility, such as matters of curriculum and faculty status, and areas in which the faculty does not have primary responsibility but nevertheless should participate jointly and meaningfully with the governing board and the administration. In major areas of decision making, regardless of whether the faculty’s responsibility is primary, the Statement on Government calls for the establishment of “[a]gencies for faculty participation in the government of the college or university,” such as a “faculty-elected senate or council,” for which “[f]aculty representatives should be selected by the faculty according to procedures determined by the faculty.” The Association’s statements on The Role of the Faculty in Budgetary and Salary Matters and Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Administrators elaborate on the principles set forth in the Statement on Government and speak specifically of the role of faculty representatives.

Confidentiality requirements are more likely to be imposed in certain areas where the faculty does not have primary responsibility: budgeting in the broadest sense, including the development of salary and benefit policies; administrative searches; and long-range planning, also conceived broadly. Administrations, rather than faculty senates, have tended to appoint ad hoc groups to make decisions in these areas, despite the admonition of the Statement on Government that the faculty

---

1 At Idaho State University, faculty members participating in a task force reviewing institutional governance policies and procedures were required to sign the following agreement: “I acknowledge that my participation in the meetings of the Advisory Group on Faculty Governance Committee is done under conditions of strict confidentiality and that I will not share or discuss the discussions had, presentations made, or any material presented or distributed with anyone not on this commit tee” (“College and University Governance: Idaho State University,” Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 97 [2011]: 72, note 10). At Carleton College, those faculty members who met with finalists in the 2010 presidential search report having been required to sign confidentiality agreements. See http://apps.carleton.edu/campus/president/search/updates/?story_id=621762.

should select its own representatives. A central feature of these three kinds of governance activities is the extent to which the results of the deliberations have ramifications for the faculty collectively. For example, deliberations over faculty salary policies involve significant collective consequences, as do decisions about the appointments of provosts or other senior academic administrators.

Whenever the work of a decision-making body entails such consequences, the faculty members on the body should consult periodically with the colleagues whom they represent by keeping them informed of the body’s discussions and by soliciting their views regarding the matters under consideration.

The decision-making areas cited above differ from those of faculty committees dealing with such matters as appointments, reappointments, tenure, promotions, grievances, or internal grants. In these decision-making areas, faculty members are elected, selected, or appointed not so much to represent their faculty colleagues as to exercise their own professional judgment in interpreting and applying relevant faculty-established criteria. This distinction—as well as the need to protect individuals’ privacy—is critical to understanding why one but not another kind of governance activity should appropriately be conducted with an expectation of the highest degree of confidentiality, to which exceptions (for example, discovery processes at law) would be rare.

Lesser degrees of confidentiality may be invoked in other circumstances, but each claim of confidentiality must be justified discretely. Discrete justification means, for example, that a committee member might offer privileged information conditioned on its remaining confidential to a committee; a faculty representative might nevertheless then inform constituents, without revealing the content, that a pending decision has been strongly influenced by privileged information. The enumeration of exceptions to confidentiality would normally include a representative’s ability to consult with persons whose expertise is critical.

Representation, like confidentiality, admits of degrees and modes. Except in the smallest colleges, direct democracy is impossible, and even in those institutions, committees may deliberate and offer advice before the faculty as a whole casts its vote. When such committees are elected rather than appointed, the opinions expressed by representatives can reasonably be expected to mirror the views of their constituents, implying a high level of consultation. At large universities at the opposite end of the spectrum, the so-called broker system of representation is widespread: constituents, having elected their representatives to a body, resist attempts at consultation, often for the good reasons that the matter under discussion is far outside their own areas of expertise or that they have other governance issues about which to deliberate and provide advice at the department, school, or university level. In the modern university, it is common for a faculty member to occupy a position across several units, each of which may view participation in governance as an expected form of service to the institution. Equally common is a system in which a faculty senate or similar body is elected, but virtually all other faculty participants in governance are then selected by the senate or by the senate in cooperation with the administration; in such cases, representatives may report to and consult with the senate. Institutions should have policies on the nature of representation in various circumstances that reflect the best aspects of their cultures of governance.

Budget discussions. The Association’s statement on The Role of the Faculty in Budgetary and Salary Matters provides that an “elected representative committee of the faculty [should participate] in deciding on the overall allocation of institutional resources and the proportion to be devoted directly to the academic program” and that such a committee will be of “critical importance in representing faculty interests and interpreting the needs of the faculty to the governing board and president.”

Imposing a blanket requirement of confidentiality on committees that advise the administration on budgetary matters is inconsistent with this basic AAUP-recommended governance standard.

Searches for higher administrative officers. unless mandated to be open by state law, many such searches have an initial, confidential screening stage conducted by a search committee that includes faculty members. The next stage is normally one in which finalists are interviewed. At this point in

---

4 Ibid., 149–50.
the process, the names of finalists should be made public to the campus community so that the community at large, faculty committees, or at least selected faculty members have an opportunity to interview the finalists and forward their views to the search committee or to a consulting firm employed by the college or university.

Recent years have witnessed an increased tendency to keep searches confidential, with little or no faculty involvement. Two primary reasons seem to account for the trend: candidates for positions are usually administrative officers elsewhere and do not want it known on their home campuses that they are seeking other employment, and search-consultant firms engaged by colleges or universities have sought to take on (and thus be compensated for) ever-greater responsibility in searches, including functioning as evaluators of candidates. These firms may lack appreciation for the ways in which the mission of an institution of higher education differs from that of a corporation or from some other types of nonprofit organizations. Faculty members should be aware of this possibility when searches are in prospect.

The following principles on confidentiality in faculty searches, set forth in the statement on The Ethics of Recruitment and Faculty Appointments, demonstrate the Association’s support for the right of a candidate to withdraw from the search at the time finalists are publicly announced, and these principles are clearly applicable to administrative searches as well: “Institutions should respect the confidentiality of candidates for faculty positions. The institution may contact references, including persons who are not identified by the candidate, but it should exercise discretion when doing so. An institution should not make public the names of candidates without having given the candidates the opportunity to withdraw from the search.”

AAUP-recommended standards call for faculty participation in searches for administrators commensurate with “the primacy of faculty concern” in the particular position. Searches with an open (usually final) stage are thus preferred when the administrative role is expected to involve extensive interaction with faculty members. Even a confidential search should involve representatives from as many of the institution’s applicable faculty constituencies as possible. If this objective would be impracticable to accomplish with the search committee itself, then it should be accomplished through the interview process.

Long-range planning. The Statement on Government asserts that “[t]he framing and execution of long-range plans” is “one of the most important aspects of institutional responsibility” and “should be a central and continuing concern in the academic community.” Long-range planning projects—which can entail major decisions related to budget, institutional organization, academic programs, majors, and faculty personnel—often are undertaken by appointed institutional task forces in which faculty members may constitute a minority. Regardless of their numbers or minority status, faculty members who participate in such projects under the constraint of complete confidentiality would represent the faculty only in the minimal sense of serving as the agents of the faculty, in many cases undermining the type of joint decision making that characterizes the best of shared academic governance. In any event, some level of consultation should be expected.

A scenario in which confidentiality of all deliberations is a condition of participation in a particular governance activity denies faculty representatives the opportunity to ascertain the views of their constituents and speak on their behalf. In cases where a direct form of representation is desirable, a confidentiality requirement with respect to a committee’s deliberations isolates representatives from those whom they represent and diminishes the weight accorded their statements. By contrast, administrative officers serving on governance

---

5 Ibid., 179–80.
6 The Statement on Government indicates that the selection of a president should “follow upon a cooperative search by the governing board and the faculty” and that the “selection of academic deans and other chief academic officers should be the responsibility of the president with the advice of, and in consultation with, the appropriate faculty” (Ibid., 137). The derivative Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Administrators refers to the “primary role” of the faculty and governing board in the search for a president and identifies the role of the faculty in searches for administrators other than the president as reflecting “the extent of legitimate faculty interest in the position.” It further identifies academic administrators such as “the dean of a college” as “directly dependent upon faculty support,” and it concludes by noting that “sound academic practice dictates that the president not choose a person over the reasoned opposition of the faculty” (Ibid., 145).

Ibid., 136.
bodies in many cases represent the administration directly; they are not obliged to keep
information confidential from those administrative officers to whom they report. Depriving
faculty representatives of the opportunity to speak on behalf of their constituents thus
amplifies the already significant asymmetry of power. In areas such as budgeting,
administrative searches, and long-range planning, where the faculty does not exercise
primary responsibility, the ability of faculty representatives to convey the views of their
constituents should lend more authority to their statements. Imposing complete
confidentiality as a prerequisite for participation in governance bodies reduces the extent to
which the views of the broader faculty will be brought to bear on the issues at hand and
thus frustrates one of the chief purposes of shared academic governance.

In its 2009 report Protecting an Independent Faculty Voice: Academic Freedom after
Garcetti v. Ceballos, Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure recommended that
colleges and universities include speech on institutional matters under hand-book or
collective bargaining agreement definitions of activities protected by academic freedom.
This recommendation was based on the AAuP’s conception of academic freedom as
including “the freedom . . . to address any matter of institutional policy or action” as a
participant in institutional governance.8 By limiting the faculty’s ability to address such
issues, confidentiality agreements effectively curtail academic freedom.

When faced with unreasonable confidentiality requirements, faculty members may find
themselves in a dilemma. If they refuse to submit to them and therefore decline to serve,
the faculty’s role in that particular governance body, activity, or decision is thereby
diminished or eliminated entirely. The administration may charge recusant faculty
members, because of an unacceptable requirement, with being uncooperative or uncollegial
and even with declining generally to participate in governance service. On the other hand,
if faculty members choose to participate under such conditions, the faculty role will be
compromised, and the outcome may be at odds with the will of the faculty. In an attempt to
legitimize the undertaking, an administration will be able to state that faculty members did
participate. Apart from personnel matters, therefore, the faculty must insist that advocates
of confidentiality be required, in each particular instance, to demonstrate that the need for
secrecy outweighs the need for transparency. A senate or similar representative faculty
body can create these favorable conditions for the work of faculty representatives by
establishing standards of conduct and recommending their incorporation into the faculty
handbook or collective bargaining agreement.9 The expectation of consultation is an
essential element of shared governance.

Recommendations

1. Because requiring a pledge of confidentiality as a precondition for participation in
any governance activities, other than serving on committees that deal with
personnel matters, is incompatible with widely accepted standards of shared
governance, faculty members should not agree to preemptive confidentiality man-
dates or agreements.

2. Confidentiality expectations appropriate to various modes of participation in
governance should be specified, and faculty representatives should be mindful of
their responsibility to keep their constituents informed and to seek their opinions.

3. Searches for presidents and other chief academic officers should have an open phase
that allows individual faculty members as well as faculty bodies to review the
credentials of finalists, ask questions, and share opinions before a final decision is
made.

---


9 At the University of Memphis, the faculty senate asks faculty representatives to sign a “Faculty Representative Agreement” that states, “As an
appointed faculty representative, you are to represent the opinions and interests of the faculty as a whole, not just your own opinions and
interests.” It includes the following expectation: “After each committee meeting, e-mail a brief summary report of the meeting to the office of the
Faculty Senate so that all faculty can be informed of committee activities via the senate’s web site.”
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Hello Irene,

I have been charged by the EPC to get clarification from the Academic Council as to whether the EPC can use an administrative assistant supplied by the SVPAA to take committee minutes. Please note the excerpt from the handbook below supplied by Vin Rosivach.

\textbf{10. Committee Records}

All committees, through their chairpersons or secretaries, shall record and keep on file their minutes and other data relevant to their business. These records shall contain minority as well as majority opinions.

\textbf{Academic Council and the Interpretation of Governance Documents:}

When there is a conflict among faculty, or within a school, academic department, or curriculum area about the proper meaning of the Faculty Handbook or a school’s Governance Document, the relevant parties should seek a resolution by petitioning the Academic Council for its interpretation of the disputed text.
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Carl A. Scheraga
Chair, Department of Management
Dolan School of Business
Fairfield University
Phone: 203-254-4000 ext. 2419
e-mail: cscheraga@fairfield.edu