ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, April 27, 2015 from 3:30 to 5:00 PM
CNS 200

1. Presidential courtesy
2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty
3. Report from the Executive Secretary
   a. Approval of minutes of AC meetings
      i. Minutes of meeting on March 2, 2015 (attached)
      ii. Minutes of meeting on March 30, 2015 (attached)
   b. Correspondence
   c. Oral Reports
      i. Proposed (Emergency) Summer Meeting dates: Wednesday 5/27 & Monday 7/13
4. Council Subcommittee Reports
   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
5. Petitions for immediate hearing
6. Old Business
   a. Request for clarification of Faculty Handbook from EPC (materials in 3/30/15 packet on page 81; discussion took place on 3/2/15; AC needs to decide what action, if any, to take)
   b. Proposed revisions to JoR from the Academic Planning Committee on Withdrawal Policy, Change of Major, Transfer Credit, and First-Year Midterm Estimates (materials with 3/30/15 packet on pages 82-83; presentation of material took place on 3/30/15; AC needs to decide what action, if any, to take)
   c. Proposed revisions to JoR from the Academic Planning Committee on Academic Probation, Academic Advancement, Academic Dismissal (materials with 3/30/15 packet on pages 84-88; presentation of material took place on 3/30/15; AC needs to decide what action, if any, to take)
   d. SVPAA rejection of AC-approved language for distribution of funds under merit pay (attachment)
7. New business
   a. Approval of slate of candidates for Committee on Committee; Approval of slate of candidates for Secretary of the General Faculty (attachment)
   b. Conference Committee (report on last meeting; prepare for June meeting)
   c. UCC-proposed revisions to the JoR on how courses not offered in SBS departments are approved for SBS core (attachments)
   d. AC consideration of the need for a policy on cancelled classes

Lists of Attachments, Pending Items, and Ongoing Items are on page 2
List of Attachments and other materials:
For item 3.a.i. Draft minutes of meeting on March 2, 2015 (pages 3-11)
For item 4.a. Draft minutes of meeting on March 30, 2015 (pages 12-21)
For item 6.a. See 3/30/2015 packet, page 81
For item 6.b. See 3/30/2015 packet, pages 82-83
For item 6.c. See 3/30/2015 packet, pages 84-88
For item 6.d. Memo from FSC to SVPAA dated 3/14/2015 (pages 22-31)
For item 7.a. Slate of all nominees for GFS and for C on C (page 32)
For item 7.c. Memo from UCC Chair (page 33-35); Excerpts of relevant UCC minutes (pages 36-37)

Pending Items:
A. Faculty Data Committee (AC 12/3/07).
B. AC revisits the accessibility of teaching evaluation data, Due spring 2012. (AC 4/19/10)
C. AC review of Merit Appeals Policy, once one or more have been adjudicated. (AC 11/1/10 & 5/13/14)
D. AC three year review of Intellectual Properties Policy, spring 2014. (AC 3/7/11)
E. MPA, five year review in 2017-2018 (AC 9/10/12)
G. Revisit report from ACSC on Mission Statement re non-tenure track faculty in fall 2014 (AC 9/8/14)
H. Review and evaluate the Pass/Fail option in fall 2020 (AC 12/1/2014)
I. Three-Year Review of C.A.S. Reading and Language Development program (AC 2/2/2015)

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
Tuesday, March 2, 2015
CNS 200
Draft Minutes of Meeting

Faculty Members Present: Professors Mousumi Bhattacharya, Mike Cavanaugh, Joe Dennin, Donald Greenberg, Shannon Harding, Alison Kris, Irene Mulvey (Executive Secretary), Martin Nguyen, Elizabeth Petrino, Rona Preli (Chair), Susan Rakowitz (Secretary of the General Faculty), Emily Smith, Kraig Steffen, John Thiel, Jo Yarrington
Administrators: SVPAA Lynn Babington, Deans Bruce Berdanier, Don Gibson, Bob Hannafin, Meredith Kazer, James Simon
Student Observer: Jason Abate

Regrets: Dave Crawford
Invited Presenters: Marti LoMonaco (7.a), Eileen O’Shea (7.c), Shelley Phelan (7.c), Brian Walker (7.c)

1. Presidential courtesy
SVPAA Babington reported that graduate application numbers are up. She announced the results of the FUSA elections. Incoming FUSA President for 2015-16 is Anif McDonald and Vice-President is Olivia Tourgee. SVPAA Babington informed the Council that the Psychology Department has suspended their search. The rest of the faculty searches are continuing or concluded. She mentioned that the University administration is in the middle of the Budget process.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty
Prof. Rakowitz reported that President Von Arx agreed to the most recent version of language for the Handbook amendment on non-tenure track faculty as approved by the Academic Council.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
   a. Approval of minutes of AC meetings: Minutes of February 2, 2015

      MOTION. [Harding/Cavanaugh]: to approve the minutes of the meeting on February 2, 2015.

      Prof. Dennin corrected his statement towards the bottom of pg. 5 as “Prof. Dennin asked if there were other programs in the state.”

      MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. (15-0-0).

   b. Correspondence

      i. Prof. Mulvey explained e-mail correspondence with the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) Chair regarding the approval process for interdisciplinary courses (page 9 of packet). UCC Chair sent the executive committee (EC) information from subcommittee with recommendations on how to approve interdisciplinary courses. The EC felt that it makes sense to accept the UCC’s recommendation to pilot the procedure for three years. After that it either has to go on Journal of Record, or be dropped.
ii. Prof. Mulvey pointed out the email from the Athletics Committee Chair regarding Faculty Fellows Program (pages 10-11). They had asked the EC to bring this matter to the attention of the AC. No action needed.

c. Oral Reports

i. Prof. Mulvey informed the Council of appointments to Fairfield 2020 Strategic Planning Steering Committee by President Von Arx, based on Academic Council recommendations. These are Glen Sauer, Terry-Ann Jones, Elizabeth Petrino.

ii. Prof. Mulvey explained the Status of JOR language regarding distribution of funds in the Appendix on Merit Review, as follows:

Two years ago, agreement was reached on a 2% raise when the increase to CPI was 1.7%. That would have triggered additional merit, but because salaries the year before had been frozen (0% increase) when CPI was 3.0% COL, the administration proposed and the faculty agreed at a GF meeting to override the JOR for the 2013-14 MOU in order to distribute the increase as standard merit.

The following fall, the AC authorized the Faculty Salary Committee (FSC) to re-visit the language, and the FSC brought back revised language to the AC which was approved unanimously in May 2014 and sent to SVPAA Fitzgerald for approval.

Meanwhile, the JOR was overridden again, by mutual agreement in the 2014-15 MOU.

SVPAA Fitzgerald rejected the language for the JOR because Father Von Arx wanted the matter discussed in the 2014-15 collegial discussions. In the collegial discussions, VP Reed said the administration’s position is that this matter belongs to the SVPAA. And, so now the language is with SVPAA Babington.

SVPAA Babington said that the Board of Trustees want merit for faculty and that President Von Arx feels that we should not change this without a conversation with the Board. It can be discussed collegially, however doing away with merit is not something the Board will look upon favorably.

Prof. Rakowitz noted that Merit Pay was introduced in 2001. This particular item was a controversial governance issue around that time. She was the FSC chair during the governance troubles of 2008-2010 and is aware of the history. We had had a number of years of raises at or above CPI, but the Board kept insisting on making standard merit below CPI. That meant that many faculty were getting below CPI while some faculty were getting merit above CPI. This is unfair. So when we created the formula as a central part of the governance negotiations, and by mutual agreement, it was intended that faculty qualifying for standard merit will get above CPI before additional merit kicks in. The policy addressed one year at a time because we didn't anticipate having a number of years with raises below CPI, as we've had since that time.

Prof. Dennin said that there is merit. We have standard merit which not everyone gets automatically, they have to apply for it. So there is already what the Board wants. Merit is never funded; the amount of Merit that is paid is very low. Prof. Thiel said that this was a long and arduous negotiation. Extra merit came out of standard merit for faculty prior to this
agreement. So we got away from this immoral system, giving up benefits in exchange for an agreement that merit pay will be paid after CPI for all. The Board themselves agreed to it a few years ago. We made a deal and we worked hard. The FSC's proposal is a logical extension of the agreement, necessary because raises have been below CPI. That is something that should be adhered to. This is part of the grand deal.

Prof. Mulvey expressed frustration. Having worked on this for two years, she is frustrated at what appears to be a run-around. The President says it belongs in the collegial discussions. VP Reed says it does not belong in the collegial discussions. The FSC and AC think the change in language is a sensible way to resolve the issue along the lines of our mutual agreement over the last two years.

SVPAA Babington said that she was not there during the negotiations. It is my understanding that the Salary Committee came up with the changed language. It is not written in the JOR who made that decision. They came up with the formula where there was no support for extraordinary merit and it erodes the merit system. Prof. Mulvey asked why it erodes the merit system. SVPAA replied that if you are taking .7% over COL and spreading it over five years nothing will be left for extra merit. Prof. Thiel said that the current language is consistent with the grand deal of 2008-10 and that's why the administration suggested superseding the JOR language before. Prof. Mulvey noted that the average is 0.5 over CPI over five years. Prof. Yarrington asked SVPAA whether it will be helpful to know who was in that committee which made the deal, because most of them are sitting in the room – Profs. Thiel, Rakowitz, Greenberg, and me. These members are living history.

SVPAA said that she will be prepared to respond on it in writing within the 30 day window.

4. Council Subcommittee Reports: None

5. Petitions for immediate hearing
None

6. Old Business

   a. Report from Committee on Committees regarding language for Journal of Record and Handbook to implement the dissolution of University College (Pending G; materials in November AC packet)

Prof. Rakowitz reported that University College closed two years ago. At that time Committee on Committees was charged to suggest revision of language of the Journal of Record and faculty Handbook removing University College. The Committee on Committees has now recommended these changes, as given on page 16 of the November 2014 Academic Council Meeting packet. The Proposal is to clean up the language after closing University College.

   Motion 1(Rakowitz/Greenberg): Move to approve deletion of language for University College Committee in the Faculty Handbook

   Motion passed unanimously (15-0-0)
Motion 2 (Rakowitz/Greenberg): to approve the following changes to Journal of Record

Delete:

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

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

Appendix 16: Policies for the School of Continuing Education Continuing Education Programs

Amend (deletions struck through, additions in bold):

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 part-time 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…

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

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. 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

Appendix 17: Policies for Part-Time Students
….8. Only BPS students will have the modified core defined in the Journal of Record.
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.
Motion passed unanimously (15-0-0)

b. JOR language for AC approved policies from the AC Executive Committee
   (attachment)

Prof. Rakowitz noted that this is on page 12 of the current package. The JOR provides for the ACEC to rewrite motions passed by the Council into policy language appropriate to the JOR. That’s what these 2 proposals are. One revises language regarding IDEA that was approved by the AC on 11/3/14. The other is a new entry on pass/fail grades, initially approved by the AC on 12/1/14.

Motion (Rakowitz/Smith): to amend the existing JOR section on Student Evaluation of Teaching as follows (insertion in bold):
Every faculty member in every class shall administer the IDEA teaching evaluation form. **IDEA evaluations will be done online, with individual faculty members given a unique URL for each course section to distribute to their students.** All faculty have the option of using the long form or the short form. For individuals who do not specify which form they wish to use in a class, tenured Full Professors and part-time faculty will default to the short form and all other faculty members will default to the long form….

Prof. Mulvey noted that she did not get the usual response rate for online, it was lower.

Motion passes, 14 in favor, 1 opposed.

Motion (Rakowitz/Dennin): that the following text be inserted after the section defining academic grades

Pass/Fail Option:
Some courses (e.g., many internships) do not lend themselves to to the multiple distinctions made by traditional letter grades. In these cases, a Pass/Fail grade may be used, provided the following criteria are met:
• All students in the course receive a grade of either Pass or Fail.
• The requirements for a Pass grade have been specified in the course syllabus.
• The decision to designate a course Pass/Fail has been approved by the department within which the course is taught and by the curriculum committee of that school.
Furthermore,
• A Pass/Fail course counts as a regular course toward graduation, determining full-time status, etc.
• The grade in a Pass/Fail course is not included in calculating a student’s grade point average but appears in all cases on the student’s transcript.

Passed unanimously (15-0-0).

7. New business
a. Committee on Conference with the Board: report on last meeting, prepare for March meeting

Prof. LoMonaco (guest) from Committee on Conference reported that the committee met on Dec 4 with the Academic Affairs committee of Board of Trustees. It was truncated because the Board was having an Academic Portfolio review with Deans. They had only twenty minutes. The major item was to read and approve the Handbook amendments. It was done quickly. The rest was 2020 initiative. At that time the Committee did not have the reports. They were interested particularly in the 2020 initiatives related to academics. SVPAA Babington said she will forward to them reports generated by 2020 committees.

Prof. Preli asked if there were any directions for the March meeting. Prof. Greenberg suggested asking what they think about unionization of faculty, in view of the recent faculty discussions and legal rulings. SVPAA said that the Academic Affairs Committee wants to be involved with academics. So she recommended that this issue go to the Finance Committee. Prof. Mulvey noted that this is the only committee that faculty meets. Maybe we can meet with the whole Board to discuss this issue. Prof. Greenberg said that this is pertinent because it affects Academics. Prof. Steffen said that the Core revision possibility seem to be very nebulous, nothing concrete. I feel it is the time to bring it to Academic Affairs Committee. Prof. Thiel agreed that it would result in a substantive discussion. Prof. Dennin asked what input does faculty have in the 2020 process and where the money will be spent. Who is going to decide how recommendations are prioritized? Prof. Smith said this maybe a good opportunity to think about non-traditional students and other initiatives. What are these reports on where we are and where we need to go?

Prof. LoMonaco asked whether she will receive written directives. Prof. Preli said these discussions are the directives and minutes will be on the website. She revisited the directives as follows:

- Prof. Greenberg: Faculty unionization efforts
- Prof. Steffen: Difficult to change core and to generate consensus.
- Prof. Dennin: How the money for 2020 will be spent. Who will have authority?

Prof. LoMonaco: In the past I have received more direction. We need to prioritize. Prof. Greenberg put his issue on the backburner. Prof. LoMonaco mentioned that there are other faculty liaisons sitting in on other Board committees.

b. Confidentiality and liaisons/faculty reps to Board Committees (materials in November AC packet)

Prof. Rakowitz pointed this out in page 61 of Nov packet. It was brought up to her by a faculty liaison to another Board committee. Correspondence from VP Mark Reed says that everything in the Board is confidential and we need permission to discuss any issue raised in a Board meeting. So she is asking AC what a reasonable level of confidentiality is. Prof. Mulvey pointed out the AAUP Statement, “Confidentiality and Faculty Representation in Academic Governance”, provided in the packet. She supports Prof. Rakowitz in that we want to adopt what we have always done. Prof. Rakowitz asked whether we need to get AC vetting the policy. Prof. Steffen said that the letter squashes the spirit of faculty. He proposed that the AC endorses the AAUP language.
Motion (Mulvey/Steffen): The AC endorses the AAUP Statement on Confidentiality and Faculty Representation in Academic Governance

SVPAA Babington noted that the language is specific to the faculty. Can we make it more general to include everyone? Prof. Preli asked SVPAA if she wants to make a motion. Prof. Rakowitz said that the language is the actual title of the statement. Prof. Mulvey said that confidentiality requirements for non-faculty is not our charge.

The motion was approved with 13 in favor, 2 abstentions.

c. Proposal for a minor in Health Studies
Profs. Phelan and O’Shea (guests) gave a brief overview of the minor. The impetus is the growing demand for health professionals. Target is any student interested, especially in pre-medical, health related careers (pharmaceuticals). The list of electives that was accidentally omitted from the packet was circulated. Prof. Harding asked how they got the syllabi to assess possible electives. Prof. Phelan replied that they looked at the courses in the catalogue and asked Arts and Science Chairs. Prof. Harding asked how the new courses will be developed. Prof. Phelan said that there are lots of new courses being developed, so lots of interest. Prof. Rakowitz noted that she didn’t see any survey of current students. Prof. Phelan responded that there is anecdotal data from pre-health students and alumni surveys. Many students get into these professions. Prof. Dennin asked whether they have surveyed any other programs. Prof. O’Shea said that a few Universities such as Georgetown have such programs, but no data for success. Prof. Harding asked about double counting and Prof. O’Shea explained. Prof. Dennin asked what is a pre-health student? Prof. Phelan replied that those are already in a program. Prof. Dennin noted that he has concerns about the budget. Many items are not here and it looks unrealistic. Prof. Phelan noted that they modeled this on some of the interdisciplinary programs that are already there have.

Student observer Jason Abate said he liked the proposal from the student perspective. It introduces students to many professional schools.

Prof. Preli requested a motion.

Motion(Kris/Petrino): To approve the minor in Health Studies

Prof. Dennin: I am hesitant on the proposal because of the way it is written. The main reason is not strong enough. The list of courses was not provided. The budget is inadequate. Two things we look for are will students be interested and what will it cost us. There is no evidence, no survey, no data. The reference on page 30 to potential benefit is not focused enough. I find the proposal to be highly inadequate.

Dean Simon: I understand the concern but we should not undermine the work of other faculty committees. The EPC, UCC, Arts & Sciences have endorsed it. Prof. Petrino agreed with Dean Simon. Students need social issues perspectives.

The motion was approved with 13 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention.

d. Motion from Rank & Tenure Committee re SOE representation
Moved to next meeting, as presenter needed to leave.
e. Request for clarification of *Faculty Handbook* from EPC (materials in November AC packet).

Prof. Mulvey: It is in page 69 of Nov packet. Prof. Scheraga from EPC has asked whether somebody else can take minutes. Handbook says “all committees, through their chairpersons or secretaries, shall record…minutes”. So what they want is outside the purview. SVPAA Babington said that she made the offer for a staff person to take minutes. UCC has taken our offer. I offered the same to EPC. Prof. Dennin said it is not a sound practice. I have been to committees where staff members took minutes; but due to lack of experience their minutes lack depth. Prof. Thiel said that when junior faculty take minutes, they get exposed to the depth of discussion.

Prof Greenberg asked whether the staff are compensated, is it part of their job description. SVPAA replied yes. Prof. Mulvey said that she thinks they are asking about the interpretation of the Handbook language, whether the recording secretary should be a member of the committees. Prof. Thiel agreed. Prof. Rakowitz said that she finds the Handbook language quite ambiguous. Prof. Kris agreed as the language says ‘through’ not ‘by’. Dean Kazer agreed about the ambiguity. Prof. Thiel said that we need to interpret this in the light of best practices. Prof. Yarrington suggested that maybe committees which are more challenged can come forward and say so. Prof. Steffen said that the language is ambiguous. We cannot clearly say that it does not preclude staff. Dean Simon said that junior faculty get distracted when taking minutes, Prof. Cavanaugh agreed.

**Motion:** Anyone can take minutes for a committee as long as the resulting minutes are vetted through the committee chair.

**Motion failed: 2-9-3**

Prof. Preli mentioned that it is 5:02 pm. So can we revisit this for the next meeting? Motion to adjourn passes unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Mousumi Bhattacharya
Academic Council
Monday, March 30, 2015
CNS 200
Draft Minutes

In attendance:
Faculty: Professors Mike Cavanaugh, Joe Dennin, Donald Greenberg, Shannon Harding, Alison Kris, Irene Mulvey (Executive Secretary), Elizabeth Petrinio, Rona Preli, Susan Rakowitz (Secretary of the General Faculty), Amalia Rusu, Debra Strauss, Emily Smith, L. Kraig Steffen, John Thiel, Jo Yarrington.
Administrators: Deans Bruce Berdanier, Don Gibson, Bob Hannafin, Meredith Kazer, Jim Simon.
Student Observer: Jason Abate
Absent with regrets: Lynn Babington, Mousumi Bhattacharya, Martin Nguyen.
Invited Presenters: Professors Bill Abbott, David Gudelunas, Yohuru Williams, Tommy Xie, and Heather Petraglia

Prof. Preli called the meeting to order at 3:35.
1. Presidential courtesy: SVPAA Babington not in attendance today.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

   Prof. Rakowitz: Nothing to report.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary

   Concerning item 3.a. (minutes) we did not receive the minutes from the last meeting so approval is postponed until the next AC meeting. No correspondence for 3.b. I want to remind the AC about the March 14th Salary Committee memo sent to you Saturday about an item accidentally left off the agenda by the Executive Secretary. It should be on the agenda today, but I suggest we take it up if we have time after all other new business has been completed.

4. Council Committee Reports: none

5. Petition for Immediate Hearing: none

6. Old Business: none

7. New Business

   a. Motion from R&T Committee re SOE representation

   The Rank and Tenure Committee would like us to consider three motions affecting representation on the R & T Committee (see pages 3-5 of the packet).

   Prof. Abbott: On January 12 the R & T Committee voted to ask the AC to approve three changes in the composition of the R & T Committee. One, that the AC consider increasing the number and composition of the R & T Committee from 7 to 9 members. Two, this increase would consist of one additional member from the School of Engineering and the other from Arts and Sciences. The School of Engineering has grown significantly in student
enrollment and is currently the only school without a designated position. The addition for Arts and Sciences would keep the R & T Committee at an uneven, tie breaking number (9) and better represent the larger proportion of faculty from that school. The last motion is that if the Committee membership is increased to 9 that the number of full professors be increased from 4 to 5 to continue to insure a majority of full professors. I’ve sent the Committee’s arguments for and against these changes to the AC.

Prof. Abbott added that while it’s easy to schedule Committee meetings over the holiday break in January, trying to schedule time to process appeals in March is another story. It’s very difficult to schedule a convenient time for 7 members to meet. Nine will make it more difficult yet.

Prof. Thiel: A question about the 4 to 3 vote at the R&T Committee on this matter. Did the chair vote in order to break the tie?

Prof. Abbott: The chair always votes because of the Committee’s odd number (7).

Prof. Smith: Point of information: how many full-time faculty are in the School of Engineering?

Dean Berdanier: We currently have 9 full-time faculty and adding two more in the fall. We have two full professors and three tenured faculty.

Prof. Mulvey: Are any of those professors of practice?

Dean Berdanier: Just one.

Prof. Mulvey: Professors of practice cannot serve on the R & T committee.

Prof. Rakowitz: My understanding is that there are 12 full-time faculty, including administrators with faculty status, in the School of Engineering, three of whom are not tenure track. There are 5 people eligible to serve on R & T.

Prof. Smith: If an Engineering faculty is added to the Committee, that person is not allowed to vote in Engineering cases, correct?

Prof. Abbott: They have a vote, but no one is present at the discussions on people in their department. They can leave a statement for discussion for all the other members of the Committee, and they leave their sealed ballot with the chair and that ballot is counted.

Prof. Dennin: If a candidate is from the same school and department, the affiliated R & T member must recuse him/herself. Engineering has departments unlike the School of Nursing.

Prof. Smith: Regarding schedule, why can’t the R & T Committee do what other Committees do and hold members to a specific meeting day to make scheduling easier?

Prof. Abbott: We could do that, but it would drastically reduce the number of people able and willing to run for the Committee.

Prof. Harding: Why does the last, ninth person have to come from CAS rather than at large. The argument that the CAS has more faculty doesn’t hold water.

Prof. Abbott: I don’t have an answer for that.

Dean Gibson: The professional schools have more students than the CAS and a large chunk of faculty. We should be consistent one way or the other on the question of representation. In support of Emily’s suggestion, I think the last seat should be at large.
Prof. Mulvey: An at large seat would require a problematic Handbook change. If I have my numbers right, there are five members of the School of Engineering currently eligible to serve in this one slot. How many are available from other schools, CAS, for example?

Prof. Rakowitz: I don’t have the full answer to your question. I do have the numbers of tenure track faculty in these other schools. The College has 174, DSB 46, GSEAP 29, Engineering 12, and School of Nursing 24. That’s tenure track faculty including tenured administrators.

Prof. Preli: Do we want to vote on these motions?

Prof. Smith: Are we in a position to ask the R&T Committee to go back and reconsider?

Prof. Preli: There are many different ways to pursue this, including not to pursue this.

Prof. Thiel: They have put a lot of work into this, so I want us to consider their first motion on page 4 of the packet.

MOTION [Thiel/Yarrington] that the AC approve the amendment to the Handbook as shown on page 4 of the packet, to expand the Rank and Tenure Committee by adding a member from the School of Engineering and another member from the College of Arts & Sciences.

Dean: Berdanier: I speak in favor of the motion. Perspectives on scholarship and teaching are expanding around the university and the R & T Committee should reflect these changes. Engineering has grown from 300 to 500 students. We may add another 100 students by the fall, certainly by next fall. We are moving toward 14 full time teaching faculty plus three administrators by the fall of 2017. I think we offer a unique perspective to add and would love to have this opportunity for a seat on the R & T Committee.

Prof. Greenberg: I think this is premature. The Engineering School has not been around long enough. I’m concerned that there are not enough committee-qualified faculty to fairly represent the school.

Prof. Thiel: I speak against the motion. There are not enough electable faculty to justify a seat at this time. Professors from the School of Engineering are currently eligible to be elected to this committee. Someone has to stand for election who is electable. I’m concerned that due to Engineering’s small faculty numbers the same person will run over and again. A school half the size of the English department having their own seat on R & T strikes me as disproportionate.

Prof. Smith: I think that Engineering should have a slot, but that the ninth slot should not go to CAS by default simply because they’re bigger. I’m not sure where I come down on this. I just don’t think the elections are truly democratic here. I don’t think the best person is always elected due to a variety of factors that go on during elections stemming from a divide among schools, etc.

Prof. Mulvey: I’m against the motion. I’m in agreement with every point John Thiel made. I want to reiterate that faculty members of the School of Engineering can serve on the R & T Committee. I think there are many who would be elected if they ran. This motion guarantees a seat for the School of Engineering. The problem in a small school like Engineering, not unlike the School of Nursing, is that the school puts up one person and this person is elected
by acclamation. I don’t think that’s appropriate because it doesn’t give the General Faculty any choice. There’s just not enough faculty in the school yet to conduct a fair election.

Dean Kazer: Do we have any data going back to see how large a school has to be to win recognition? Thirteen years ago the School of Nursing with 24 full-time faculty was half of what it is today. As long as I can remember we’ve always had our own spot on R & T. If we have some data that says a faculty of a certain size should get a certain size representation that’s one thing. But, what is the right number? I don’t think we should make a decision without knowing this. It would seem that from a historical perspective 12 is the right number.

Prof. Dennin: I’m strongly opposed to this motion on two grounds: I was on the R & T committee this year, and in the three week widow for the appeals process we could not find a time when we were all available. Moreover, if a candidate’s from your department you can’t be there for discussion. Going to 9 is going to create even more scheduling problems. And there is no way of getting around the fact that appeals have to be done in a very small and inconvenient window of time. I believe that this is not a representative position like the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee where different disciplines have their say. It’s probably not unreasonable to consider at-large from both the college and the professional schools. But, if we opt for the at-large choice, I think professional schools should worry about having even less people on the R & T committee. Assuming the candidate has a well-prepared dossier with reasonably informative inside and outside letters it’s not a huge problem to make a decision about people from other disciplines.

Prof. Rakowitz: I’d like to speak against the motion on the grounds of prematurity. In recent years when we’ve had a vacancy on R & T, it has been really difficult to find an acceptable candidate willing to come forward. This applies to both small and large schools. So, going to 9 people and 5 full professors is not going to improve this situation. And in the case of the School of Engineering only 5 people are eligible to run, only 2 of whom are full professors. In some years, depending on who just left the committee, the slot may have to be filled by a full professor. In that case, you’re creating a seat open to exactly two individuals. It’s premature no matter how many people are being represented.

Prof. Smith: the FDEC just added a slot for the School of Engineering so there’s a precedent for this. Scheduling should not determine how we decide a big situation like this. We can find an answer. We are the Academic Council. We prioritize it. If we are going to go with Joe’s argument about judging a dossier, then we have to treat all schools equally. Either there are designations for all, or there are none. I’d rather think positively than worse-case scenario. I would not like to be the School of Engineering and never have representation guaranteed.

Prof. Yarrington: I agree with Emily. I’m listening to all sides. But scheduling should not be a problem, but something to be done well in advance. I also think that this position should be an at-large position. I think it’s time to give people opportunity across the schools. Meredith makes a good case. If the School of Nursing had a faculty of 12 and a designated spot, then why not Engineering?

Dean Kazer: A point of clarification, we only have 6 people eligible for Rank & Tenure and 2 full professors, so we really aren’t that different from Engineering. We should not deny people representation because people can’t fit it into their schedule. Giving the School of Engineering representation is a big statement about the values of the university.
Prof. Mulvey: Meredith is making exactly my point. The General Faculty should be making the decision on representation for the School of Nursing, but the School of Nursing has not given the General Faculty any choice for many years. And I think it would be the same thing for the School of Engineering. We could amend the motion to have all positions at large. I worry that this might mean that R & T would be only represented by the CAS. But, for purposes of discussion, I suggest that the R & T have no designated slots and all members be at-large.

Prof. Preli: I was on R & T so I’m passionate about these issues. I’m in favor of the motion for two reasons: faculty on R & T serve an invaluable mentor function when they return to their schools, i.e., a data base for junior faculty. This is true for CAS and the professional schools. Also, like the Academic Council, R & T is one of the really important governance committees. It’s important that we not marginalize Engineering. Professional schools have struggled over the years to have a say in governance. For the larger body of CAS to presume to understand the unique differences in the various professional schools I think marginalizes the professional schools. Their perspectives are critical for maintaining an appreciation for the distinctive contributions each school brings to the Fairfield University community. There’s great diversity here. If we are to move forward in a meaningful inclusive way we have to represent all of the schools on these important governance bodies.

Prof. Greenberg: We made a mistake with Nursing. It’s too small a faculty. Nobody is guaranteed a seat on Rank & Tenure - no discipline, no department, no individual. It’s always up for contestation. And members of the School of Engineering can run and be elected. Faculties from any discipline are capable of making a decision about any other discipline if provided the appropriate data. In fact, we keep members of the candidate’s discipline/department out of the discussion in order to arrive at a more objective decision. Whether someone should be elected at-large is not relevant to this discussion nor is the question whether the committee should be expanded to 9 members.

Prof. Preli: Further discussion? No?

**MOTION FAILED: 0 in favor, 9 against, 4 abstentions**

b. Proposal for a Major and Minor in Digital Journalism

Prof. Preli: Proposal for a Major and Minor in Digital Journalism (page 6 of the packet).

Prof. Petrino: We would like to talk today about the English Department’s proposal for a new major and minor in Digital Journalism. We in the Department started to discuss this when it became clear to us that journalism was undergoing a sea change, moving away from modes of print so familiar to us. We want to change the journalism concentration into a major and minor more relevant to students and more visible to them - given that it will become a stand-alone major. It is still grounded in a strong foundation of reading and interpreting literature. There are three literature courses required in the major. But it also takes into account the fact that digital journalism is a reality. We are expanding what we are currently doing to make our program more timely.

We had three department meetings to discuss these new offerings. We met with the Dean multiple times to define the major and minor and make it something everyone could support. The history of this process began in 1997. The major in English has traditionally been one of our most popular majors. We have six tracks in English - 229 students in English and 66 of
those in Journalism. We see Journalism as an interdisciplinary study linking English, Communication, and more media-related fields as a unified program. Indeed, we have opted to keep Journalism within English to present a more unified way of presenting Journalism. We are deepening our commitment to Journalism as well as establishing a broader commitment to the digital humanities and the English Department in general.

This has been a very collaborative process. We reached out to Communications, FTM, to Ethics and the School of Engineering. I refer to pages 22-23 in the packet, Appendix 1, where you can see what the 12 course requirement entails. Ten courses is the traditional load for a major, but we found that on average English students take 12 courses anyway. By offering this we expand student knowledge in Journalism, provide training in news writing and digital journalism, and offer a course in big data story-telling, graphic and statistical analytical tools, and a menu of other courses (see page 22) including a course in Ethics in the Media reflecting the University’s Jesuit tradition. And, finally, students will take a capstone experience consisting of an internship or an opportunity to team up with other students working for The Mirror, or work with a professor on a series of articles in investigative journalism. The minor is an abbreviated version of this.

It’s important to acknowledge that we have extensive experience working with adjuncts who have training in the field including people who write for The Hartford Courant and The New York Times. So, a program like this would require one additional full-time person. If the offering proves to be successful with students drawn to the major and minor – we are projecting 100-150 students – then perhaps we would hire a full-time professor of practice to offer courses and advise students.

Prof. Xie: This has been a collaborative effort within the English Department. We have incorporated courses from a variety of disciplines. But, we also came up with a name that appeals to students. In fact, students are already inquiring about the Digital Journalism program.

Prof. Simon: One, our current program doesn’t serve students very well. You can pursue a major in English/Journalism taking as few as two Journalism classes. The current program is frankly an embarrassment underscoring the need for this new program. Two, as Dean I’ve been trying to develop more ways of attracting freshmen to the College of Arts and Sciences. Admissions informed us that the two majors students want most and we don’t offer are Journalism and Public Relations. This was part of the motivation for going in this direction.

We’ve tried to be humble with regard to student projections. Earlier, I was told that Journalism might appeal to middle-age males interested in switching careers, but when I arrived the first day of class my room was entirely women looking for their first job, none over 25 years of age. That makes you humble in terms of student projections. Right now the range runs from 55 to as high as 400 Journalism students if all the variables align themselves. So we used the number of 150 as a reasonable number which matches Admissions estimate of 50 students that this program may attract each year.

Two more points: you’ll see a note in our packet from Lynn Babington promising resources will be provided. I’ll find out on Tuesday whether a tenure-track faculty slot in English and Digital Writing will win approval. This person will spend half their time in Journalism and half devoted to other department needs. We also project a need for a Professor of the Practice next Spring and administrators have also been very supportive of that.
Finally, from a personal point of view, I’m upset with the administration’s complaint that there are too many faculty committee hoops for new proposals to jump through, taking too much time. Well, this package was proposed exactly sixty days ago to the English Department. It’s been approved by a string of committees, and sits today before the Academic Council. I can’t imagine any serious proposal going through our process faster than that. This underscores the fact that our current system works extremely well. The committee votes have been 49 to nothing showing strong faculty support for this initiative.

Prof. Harding: Looking at the materials, I notice that many other schools have this type of program housed in Communications, but we do not require a Comm course. How come?

Prof. Petrino: We made two electives out of a list of courses that includes a number of Comm courses. But our feeling was that with good advising students would take those courses. In fact, a related minor or major in related fields is recommended. It’s not required because we wanted students to take a more Comm-centric study, say, or media-related investigation. They could select two courses from Comm, or pair this with a Comm minor. We hope to give students the opportunity to pair journalism in English with another field making for a more interdisciplinary study.

Prof. Harding: Are there other programs that don’t require Communications in this major? How was this course list put together? Did you look at what we offer and construct a major from that or check out other programs with similar courses to build a program similar to those offered by other institutions?

Prof. Petrino: We reached out to people in every related department, all of whom suggested appropriate courses. We also had to consider how frequently those courses would be offered and how good a fit they were. It had more to do with related courses found in Appendix 3. We looked at the number of related and required courses for those majors at each of these institutions (see Appendix 3) to remain competitive.

Prof. Greenberg: I have no problem with a major in Journalism. But, I’m really having a problem with your calling it Digital Journalism. There’s not one course here that is sui generis ‘digital’. What’s your rationale for calling it Digital Journalism at this point.

Dean Simon: We’ve gotten away from the idea of separate platforms for print, for broadcasts, for internet. What these platforms share in common is their digital nature. The modern journalist must be able to disseminate information using a variety of platforms.

Prof. Greenberg: That was also true in 1900. You beg the question. Journalism is journalism including digital. Is there something that makes Digital Journalism special? Will a student coming from this program have a leg up from someone coming from another Journalism program? I don’t see it.

Prof. Simon: They were not doing podcasts, shooting videos, or the many other things digital makes possible in 1900. This course arose out of the Digital Journalism course taught by Prof. Xie for eight years now. This course is designed to be the opposite of print-oriented courses. The Big Data course is solely based on spreadsheets and university crime records, and digitalizing these things for using our Excel analytical tools and the more complicated analytics Prof. Xie uses in his classes.

Prof. Greenberg: You have a 12 course major with only one course making the proposed program ‘digital’. I’m still having trouble justifying this program ‘digital’.
Prof. Rakowitz: I have a different problem with the title. I’m convinced that digital content is here. In fact, any journalism program in the year 2015 would have a ton of digital content. But, this makes me feel that what’s cutting edge today will in a short time be dated. Why not just call it ‘Journalism’.

Prof. Petrino: We went through a variety of titles, ‘media-writing and journalism’, ‘journalism in the digital age’, for instance. We had to find something that would bring journalism into a period where most of this work is being done on-line. It’s not as if Digital Journalism doesn’t exist. Google other universities and it can be found elsewhere. So, the consensus was that this title would suffice to express what we are about here.

Prof. Simon: Sue, your instincts are right. This was in part a marketing decision. We had an alumni group that helped us throughout this process. They urged us not to call it ‘Journalism’ which would only sound like what we already offer. We are trying to reinvent this. The most common title is Media Journalism, but that suggests print and broadcast hinting that we plan to offer a multiple number of mediums. We are trying to get away from different tracks, which is totally outdated. In five years we might perhaps drop the ‘Digital’ when it becomes more the norm. But our alumni tell us that ‘Digital’ is the right way to identify it. Moreover, other institutions use ‘Digital’ as well.

Prof. Dennin: I ask my trademark question: on pages 18 and 19 you talk about a Professor of the Practice and searching for a tenure-track hire and yet none of that is reflected in your budget.

Prof. Simon: I refer you to page 21 where you will find a tenure-track hire for the Fall, 2015.

Prof. Dennin: I don’t want words, I want numbers.

Prof. Petrino: You’ll notice the hire is in Digital Writing with an open sub-specialty.

Prof. Dennin: So, this person would be teaching only 1/3 in Digital Journalism and the other 2/3’s in English?

Prof. Petrino: We hope to do more work within digital technology in our other writing courses. This person would be teaching journalism but with the opportunity to teach other courses in digital media as well. She/he would not only be teaching Journalism students, but students from other concentrations.

Prof. Dennin: You’re requiring a capstone experience consisting of an actual hands-on experience. Are these kinds of experiences available in the outside community?

Prof. Simon: We have a faculty member who gets a course release in the Fall and Spring to supervise internships. There is an overwhelming number of opportunities for capstone experiences in the Fairfield area.

Prof. Dennin: On page 29 we find a memo about a new division. Can you explain?

Prof. Simon: Back in July I met with senior members of the college to kick around the idea of a division between communication and emerging media. But we moved away from this idea. There is no discussion going on about a new division at this time.

MOTION [Steffen/Smith] to approve the Program in Digital Journalism.
MOTION TO AMEND [Rakowitz/Smith] to add a program review after five years.
Prof. Petrino: We propose a departmental review in three years to see what the student count is and if we have sufficient resources to serve them. But, like any new program this should have a formal fifth year review.

**MOTION TO AMEND PASSED: 14 in favor, none opposed or abstaining**

**MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstaining**

**MOTION [Rakowitz/Mulvey] to approve the minor in Digital Journalism**

**MOTION PASSED: 13 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstaining**

c. Proposal for a Major in Public Relations

Prof. Gudelunas: I’ll keep this very brief. The major in Public Relations is a stand-alone major in the Department of Communications. It comes out of a growing demand from students for such a major. We have long told students that we do Public Relations and here are the sequence of courses you need to take in what would be essentially a major in this field. We’ve decided to codify and concretize what had been informally advised over the years. The intention is to make Public Relations more visible for interested students and students looking at the university. No new courses. We are using existing courses, including courses from other programs and departments as well.

Mr. Abate: I just want to emphasize that this idea has a lot of student support, particularly in light of the forthcoming political elections. From an admissions perspective, it distinguishes Fairfield for offering such a program.

Prof. Dennin: On page 59 you talk of enrollment of 100 students. Then on page 60 you anticipate about 60 students per year. Could you clarify?

Prof. Gudelunas: Our best guess is 25 to 50 students per class. Much depends on how many switch over from a Communications major or double major. More sophomores than juniors or seniors might make this shift. Final enrollments will depend on the health of the economy and students from other departments.

Prof. Dennin: On page 62 you mention that most of the Jesuit institutions that offer Public Relations offer this in their own department. Are those departments mostly in the Arts and Sciences?

Prof. Gudelunas: With a couple of exceptions, the vast majority are in the College of Arts and Sciences.

Prof. Harding: I like this idea. My concern is how did you come up with the list of required courses? Did you look at other schools? Do other schools offer a curriculum like this?

Prof. Gudelunas: Can’t recall the total list. But, our search included the University of Chicago and Quinnipiac as a neighboring institution. We relied on Prof. Arendt in the Department of Communications who brings an extensive background in this area. She reached out to her colleagues at other institutions with Public Relations programs regarding required coursework. Faculty who teach these courses were canvassed as well. There was a prolonged discussion within the department about required coursework also.
Prof. Thiel: If a student chose to double major, could a student be a Communications and a Public Relations major?

Prof. Gudelunas: On page 58 we make it clear that double counting is not acceptable.

Prof. Thiel: If a lot of these courses are from courses that we already offer in Communications wouldn’t that lead to a lot of double counting?

Prof. Gudelunas: We are not double counting. We have the eleven courses specified in this proposal, plus the eight additional CO courses. And the two other required CO courses, 100 and 200, are specifically outlined. And it’s specified that Communications courses cannot be repeated. It’s a total of 57 credits to get the double major. We don’t anticipate anyone taking that many courses to get the double major. We do anticipate some students majoring in Public Relations and minoring in Communications.

MOTION [Kris/Steffen] To approve the major and minor in Public Relations with a five year review.

Prof. Dennin: Who does the reviews?

Prof. Mulvey: The procedure for the five year with routing procedure is in The Journal of Record.

MOTION: To accept the major and minor in Public Relations with an amendment for a five year review.

MOTION PASSED: 11 in favor, none opposed, 3 abstaining

7.e and 7.f Proposed revisions to the JoR from the Academic Planning Committee on Withdrawal Policy, Change of Major, Transfer Credit, First-Year Midterm Estimates, Academic Probation, Academic Advancement, Academic Dismissal

Heather Petraglia, Director for Academic Support and Retention, and Yohuru Williams, Associate VP for Academic Affairs, gave an informational presentation on the material in the packet. As the time was late, the AC decided to put off action on these items until the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5 pm.

God Bless, Mike Cavanaugh
MEMORANDUM
Faculty Salary Committee
Fairfield University

TO: Academic Council
FROM: Irene Mulvey, Faculty Salary Committee, Chair
DATE: March 14, 2015
RE: Proposed changes to JoR on Distribution of Funds in Appendix on Merit

This memo concerns proposed revisions to Appendix 12 (Guidelines for Faculty Annual Self-Evaluation and Merit Review pages 79-85) in our Journal of Record; specifically the language on Distribution of Funds.

Background.
The current language was approved by the faculty in October 2009. It is our understanding that this language was worked out by the Faculty Salary Committee and the administration with two goals in mind:

• The administration’s goal, as reiterated by SVPAA Babington in her 3/5/2015 memo rejecting the new language (included here in Appendix C) was “to provide a process whereby faculty salary increases would include both standard merit for all faculty meeting the criteria and additional compensation for faculty who have demonstrated extraordinary performance.”

• What was essential for the Faculty Salary Committee and, by extension, the General Faculty was that no faculty member should receive further merit unless faculty members qualifying for standard merit are keeping up with and staying a bit ahead of the increase in CPI.

The current language (shown below) clearly meets these goals and, in fact, prioritizes distribution of funds toward the FSC’s goal in that no funds are earmarked for further merit unless the salary pool is over the increase in CPI.

Journal Of Record
Appendix on Merit Review
CURRENT LANGUAGE

If the increase in the salary pool is at or below the increase in the cost of living (CPI-U), the entire increase in the pool will go to Standard Merit. If the increase in the salary pool is above the increase in the cost of living, then the percent
going to Standard Merit will be cost of living plus one quarter of the remainder of the increase in the pool.

Standard Merit will be distributed to recipients as a percent of salary or of the mean of the rank, whichever is greater. Additional and Extraordinary Merit will be distributed in such a way that each faculty member who receives Extraordinary Merit in a given year will receive the same dollar amount, and it will be twice the amount awarded to each recipient of Additional Merit.

Between the time this language was approved by the faculty and administration in Fall 2009 and academic year 2012-13, when the FSC proposed revisions, salary increases were always below the increase in CPI. Because salary increases were so low, there has been no further merit since this language was approved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CPI</th>
<th>Salary Pool Increase</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>+0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>+0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For comparison purposes, here is the data on salary pool increase versus increase in CPI that the FSC and administration were looking at when the current language was drafted - salary increases almost always over the increase in CPI (and over by 0.725, on average, over the most recent four years).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CPI</th>
<th>Salary Pool Increase</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>+0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>+1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>+0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>+0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>+0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overriding the current language by mutual agreement.
For the 2013-2014 MOU, the administration’s first proposal was “a salary increase of 2% distributed all as standard merit”. It was pointed out to the administration by the FSC that this
would violate the Journal of Record. Both administration and FSC wanted to distribute the 2% salary increase all as standard merit that year, so the FSC recommended that the General Faculty override the Journal of Record text, and the administration agreed.

The minutes of the General Faculty meeting on May 16 2013 at which the 2013-14 MOU was approved state:

According to the Journal of Record (JOR), because CPI is 1.7%, part of the amount over CPI should go to further merit. Given that salaries were frozen last year when CPI was 3%, the administration and FSC agreed that the entire salary increase should go to standard merit. It is the understanding of the FSC that if the General Faculty approves the MOU, that is authorization to override the JOR for this year. The FSC will ask the Academic Council next year to re-examine the JOR policy regarding standard versus further merit.

The saga of the revised language once again before the AC
As planned, the FSC brought the matter to the attention of the Academic Council. It appears on the agenda of the November 4, 2013 meeting accompanied by a memo of explanation from the FSC (included here as Appendix A). At this meeting, the Council followed the statement mentioned above in the GF minutes and endorsed the idea of the FSC working on the JoR language. The FSC brought revised language back to the AC for its April 28, 2014 meeting, and the new language was passed by the AC when the 4/28 meeting reconvened on May 13, 2014; relevant minutes are attached in Appendix B. The 2014-15 MOU - approved by the General Faculty on 5/27/2014 - distributed a 2% salary increase all as standard merit by mutual agreement between the faculty and administration, overriding the JoR a second time.

Journal Of Record
Appendix on Merit Review
REVISED LANGUAGE - APPROVED BY THE AC ON 5/16/2014

On May 16, 2014, if in any year, (1) if the percent increase in the salary pool is at or below the percent increase in the cost of living (CPI-U) plus 0.7, the entire increase in the pool will go to Standard Merit. If the increase in the salary pool is above the increase in the cost of living plus 0.7, then the average over the last five years of the difference in the increase in salary pool over the increase in CPI-U is calculated. If the average is not more than 0.5, then the entire increase in the pool for that year will go to standard merit. If this average is more than 0.5, then the percent going to Standard Merit will be cost of living plus one quarter of the remainder of the increase in the pool.

Standard Merit will be distributed to recipients as a percent of salary or of the mean of the rank, whichever is greater. The pool for Additional and Extraordinary Merit will be the remaining funds in the pool.
Extraordinary Merit will be distributed in such a way that each faculty member who receives Extraordinary Merit in a given year will receive the same dollar amount, and it will be twice the amount awarded to each recipient of Additional Merit.

In May 2014, this AC-approved language was sent to SVPAA Fitzgerald for approval. He rejected the language, writing, “Father von Arx would like the Faculty Salary Committee to discuss this in the context of next year’s collegial discussions with the administration team.”

Accordingly, the FSC put this on the agenda for the collegial discussions in 2014-15. When it was first taken up in a substantive way in February 2015, VP Mark Reed said that the administration’s position is that this issue does not fall under the purview of our collegial discussions, and that we should bring it to the attention of SVPAA Babington.

Wearily, the AC Executive Secretary/FSC Chair wrote to SVPAA Babington briefly explaining the situation as it was currently understood. On March 5, SVPAA Babington sent the FSC Chair an email rejecting the language, which was forwarded to the AC Executive Committee and is attached here as Appendix C.

On the actual revisions to the current JoR language.
Some of the changes (all in the second paragraph) are non-substantive clarifications. There are two independent but related substantive changes in paragraph 1. They are intended to address this fundamental principle, which has been a consistent position of the GF and the FSC in all its conversations with the administration:

Merit pay is not fair unless faculty members who qualify for standard merit are keeping up with and staying a bit ahead of the increase in CPI.

The changes address this principle in two (independent but related) ways:

(1) In order for further merit to be funded, the increase to the salary pool must be, on average in a five-year window, more than 0.5 above the increase in CPI. This is to deal with the reality of salary increases that fall below the increase in CPI one year and above the CPI the next. When faculty qualifying for standard merit fall behind CPI in one year, the faculty assert that it is fair to catch these faculty up in subsequent years before further merit is funded.

(2) In order for further merit to be funded, the increase to the salary pool in the given year must be at least 0.7 more than the increase to CPI. This is to deal with the problem of salary increases that fall barely over the increase to CPI. If, for example, the salary increase is only 0.1 over the increase to CPI, then the further merit pool would be on the order of $9,000 for all faculty who qualify for either additional merit or
extraordinary merit. It seemed counterproductive to the FSC to ratchet up all the merit machinery for raises that we predict could be well under $3/paycheck.

We are open to discussing tweaks to the AC-approved language. But, without these changes, or changes along these lines, further merit is being funded out of the pockets of faculty members qualifying for standard merit.

Aside

As an aside, faculty members who were here in 2008-09 will recall that faculty approved changes to remove key benefit provisions from the Faculty Handbook (health care at no cost to the employee and the amount 10% for the University’s contribution to retirement) in exchange for this language guaranteeing a “fair” merit system. (This agreement was based on an assumption that turned out to be incorrect, that salary increases in the future would be above the increase to CPI as they had been prior to 2008-09). That agreement was understood but not written down. At this point, having this verbal agreement with the administration disregarded would strike a critical blow to faculty morale. We have brought this forward because it expresses a noncontroversial solution to a contentious issue on campus; having this enacted allowed for a win for both sides: it allows for the administration to keep merit in place while including a regulatory element. As it has been discussed by the GF, endorsed by the AC, the FSC and the previous AVP, the only element that is blocking this is a lack of clarity about where the decision is made in the administration.

At the end of last year, the Academic Council-approved language was sent to the SVPAA for approval. The SVPAA responded that “Father von Arx would like the Faculty Salary Committee to discuss this in the context of next year’s collegial discussions with the administration team.” This year, during the collegial discussions, the FSC was told “[The administration’s] position [is] that the proposal, as a matter of process, does not require the administrative team’s approval or concurrence.” and that, as JoR language, it should go to the SVPAA for approval. The language was sent – for a second time - to the SVPAA, and the SVPAA rejected the AC-approved language. We are not entirely clear on VP Babington’s reasons for rejecting the language (see Appendix C), but a rejection of AC-approved language goes back to the Academic Council.

We hope that the history of the measure and its thorough discussions throughout the governance bodies on campus over a number of years will provide the necessary background to allow this language to be approved for the JoR.
MEMORANDUM
Faculty Salary Committee
Fairfield University

TO: Academic Council

FROM: Faculty Salary Committee

DATE: October 28, 2013

RE: Journal of Record language re standard versus further merit

The guidelines for Faculty Annual Merit Review and Self-Evaluation are in Appendix 12 in the Journal of Record. The section on Distribution of Funds articulates how much of a salary pool that is above the increase in the cost-of-living will be distributed as Standard Merit and how much of that pool goes to Further Merit:

If the increase in the salary pool is at or below the increase in the cost of living (CPI-U), the entire increase in the pool will go to Standard Merit. If the increase in the salary pool is above the increase in the cost of living, then the percent going to Standard Merit will be cost of living plus one quarter of the remainder of the increase in the pool.

Last year, the increase the increase in CPI was 1.7% and the salary pool was 2%. According to the Journal of Record formula, we should have had Standard Merit at 1.775% and Further Merit at 0.225%.

Since, in the previous year, cost-of-living was 3% and salaries were frozen (0% increase), the Faculty Salary Committee and administration agreed to distribute the 2% all as standard merit. The General Faculty approved this override of the Journal of Record when the MOU was approved on May 8, 2013. The FSC would like to propose revising the JoR language to ensure that raises keep pace with the increase in cost-of-living not just over one year, but over many years, and we ask the AC to endorse the FSC working on this matter.
Appendix B

Academic Council Meeting
May 13, 2014
Excerpt of Minutes

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

Administrators: SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, S.J., Deans Lynn Babington, Bruce Berdanier, Robbin Crabtree, Don Gibson

7.h. JOR language from FSC regarding standard merit.

Although we have a JOR policy about how merit funds would be distributed, the writers of the merit review committee did not consider how the process would unfold. They did not anticipate that salaries would be flat for a number of years, followed by a year of extraordinary merit.

The proposed change in JOR language would ensure that standard merit increases keep pace with the actual cost of living (more than .7% above cost of living increase). Only in that case would distribution of extraordinary merit be considered.

Chair Rafalski asks for questions.

MOTION (Mulvey/Greenberg): to recommend the AC make the following changes to the Journal of Record entry on Merit Pay:

Current Language.

Distribution of Funds

If the increase in the salary pool is at or below the increase in the cost of living (CPI-U), the entire increase in the pool will go to Standard Merit. If the increase in the salary pool is above the increase in the cost of living, then the percent going to Standard Merit will be cost of living plus one quarter of the remainder of the increase in the pool.

Standard Merit will be distributed to recipients as a percent of salary or of the mean of the rank, whichever is greater.

Additional and Extraordinary Merit will be distributed in such a way that each faculty member who receives Extraordinary Merit in a given year will receive the same dollar amount, and it will be twice the amount awarded to each recipient of Additional Merit.

GF: 10/23/2009
Amended AC: 02/25/2013
Proposed Language with changes shown.

Distribution of Funds

If In any year, (1) if the percent increase in the salary pool is at or below the percent increase in the cost of living (CPI-U) plus 0.7, the entire increase in the pool will go to Standard Merit. If the increase in the salary pool is above the increase in the cost of living plus 0.7, then the average over the last five years of the difference in the increase in salary pool over the increase in CPI-U is calculated. If the average is not more than 0.5, then the entire increase in the pool for that year will go to standard merit. If this average is more than 0.5, then the percent going to Standard Merit will be cost of living plus one quarter of the remainder of the increase in the pool.

Standard Merit will be distributed to recipients as a percent of salary or of the mean of the rank, whichever is greater. The pool for Additional and Extraordinary Merit will be the remaining funds in the pool. Additional and Extraordinary Merit will be distributed in such a way that each faculty member who receives Extraordinary Merit in a given year will receive the same dollar amount, and it will be twice the amount awarded to each recipient of Additional Merit.

GF: 10/23/2009
Amended AC: 02/25/2013
Amended AC: 5/13/14

Prof. Thiel spoke in favor of the motion. Now that the merit review system has been imposed, we will be required to review the money available on a yearly basis, unless this proposal is passed.

Prof. Dennin asked if the SVPAA is in agreement with the proposed change.

Prof. Mulvey noted that he has already said he approved this idea.

**MOTION PASSED:** 16 in favor, none opposed or abstaining.
Dear Irene,

I do not approve the proposed JoR language change regarding *Distribution of Funds in Appendix on Merit Review* for the following reasons:

1. The original language currently in the JoR regarding *Distribution of Funds in Appendix on Merit Review* was developed jointly by the Faculty Salary Committee and administration to provide a process whereby faculty salary increases would include both standard merit for all faculty meeting the criteria and additional compensation for faculty who have demonstrated extraordinary performance.

2. The proposed language decreases the amount of money available for distribution to faculty who demonstrate extraordinary performance.
   *Current language* - cost of living plus one quarter of the remainder of the increase in the pool
   *Proposed language* - cost of living CPI-U plus 0.7

3. The proposed language decreases the amount of money available for distribution to faculty who demonstrate extraordinary performance by requiring a five year average calculation.
   Proposed new language (if the increase in the salary pool is above the increase in the cost of living plus 0.7, then the average over the last five years of the difference in the increase in salary pool over the increase in CPI-U is calculated. If the average is not more than 0.5, then the entire increase in the pool for that year will go to standard merit.)
Current JoR Language Distribution of Funds in Appendix on Merit Review as shown. (summer 2014, pg 85)

If the increase in the salary pool is at or below the increase in the cost of living (CPI-U), the entire increase in the pool will go to Standard Merit. If the increase in the salary pool is above the increase in the cost of living, then the percent going to Standard Merit will be cost of living plus one quarter of the remainder of the increase in the pool. Standard Merit will be distributed to recipients as a percent of salary or of the mean of the rank, whichever is greater. Additional and Extraordinary Merit will be distributed in such a way that each faculty member who receives Extraordinary Merit in a given year will receive the same dollar amount, and it will be twice the amount awarded to each recipient of Additional Merit.

GF: 10/23/2009
Amended AC: 02/25/2013

Amend Language for Distribution of Funds in Appendix on Merit Review as shown.

If In any year, (1) if the percent increase in the salary pool is at or below the percent increase in the cost of living (CPI-U) plus 0.7, the entire increase in the pool will go to Standard Merit; if if the increase in the salary pool is above the increase in the cost of living plus 0.7, then the average over the last five years of the difference in the increase in salary pool over the increase in CPI-U is calculated. If the average is not more than 0.5, then the entire increase in the pool for that year will go to standard merit. If this average is more than 0.5, then the percent going to Standard Merit will be cost of living plus one quarter of the remainder of the increase in the pool.

Standard Merit will be distributed to recipients as a percent of salary or of the mean of the rank, whichever is greater. The pool for Additional and Extraordinary Merit will be the remaining funds in the pool. Additional and Extraordinary Merit will be distributed in such a way that each faculty member who receives Extraordinary Merit in a given year will receive the same dollar amount, and it will be twice the amount awarded to each recipient of Additional Merit.
The Faculty Handbook specifies that the Academic Council sets the ballot for the Secretary of the General Faculty and for the Committee on Committees. Below are all nominations submitted for these openings.

**Secretary of the General Faculty**

Susan Rakowitz

**Committee on Committees**

Restrictions: Must have completed at least 2 years of service at Fairfield

Openings:
- 1 Behavioral and Social Science/Dolan School of Business
  - Cathy Giapponi
  - Marcie Patton
- 1 at large
  - Evelyn Lolis
  - Chris Staecker
To: Academic Council Executive Committee  
From: John Miecznikowski, Chair Undergraduate Curriculum Committee  
CC: Kathryn Nantz, Margaret McClure, Michael Pagano, Marcie Patton, Terry-Ann Jones, Brian Walker  
Date: April 19, 2015  
Re: UCC Subcommittee Final Report from the Social and Behavioral Sciences

Dear Executive Committee,

The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is requesting that the Academic Council consider a recommendation to revise language in the Journal of Record regarding how courses from departments or interdisciplinary programs not in the Social and Behavioral Sciences will count for Social and Behavioral Science core credit.

This matter was first discussed in the November 4, 2014 meeting of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. At this November 2014 meeting, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee passed the following motion: that “The UCC convene a subcommittee whose charge is to establish criteria for social science core credit, following on the model provided by the Core Science Steering Committee with an interim report by February 2015. A further charge of the subcommittee is to reconsider the definition of the existing JOR subcommittee on social science core and make recommendations.”

The following faculty members served on the UCC Social and Behavioral Sciences Subcommittee: Kathryn Nantz, Margaret McClure, Michael Pagano, Marcie Patton, Terry-Ann Jones, Brian Walker, and John Miecznikowski (Chair). The Subcommittee developed the following report, which was approved by the UCC on February 2015.

---

Report to Undergraduate Curriculum Committee – Approved by the UCC, February 3, 2015  
Subcommittee on Core Social Sciences  
Members: Terry Ann Jones, Margaret McClure, John Miecznikowski, Kathy Nantz, Michael Pagano, Marcie Patton, Brian Walker (Associate Dean)  
Charge: to determine the process by which a course is designated to have social and behavioral science core credit.

The group met twice. We shared student learning outcomes from each of the departments in the social and behavioral sciences (SBS): Communication, Economics, Politics, Psychology, and Sociology / Anthropology. As a result of our conversations, we make the following recommendations:

1. The SBS should not reorganize core courses using the model of the natural sciences.

Rationale: The SBS are organized in a way that is fundamentally different from the natural sciences. The natural science departments offer core science courses that do not also count for students who are majors in their programs. Hence, the core science committee has a responsibility to consider the relatively small group of core science courses that each department offers outside the rest of the departmental offerings. In the
SBS, many courses that are offered in the majors are also courses that students can take for core credit. This means that there are many more courses in the SBS that students can take for core credit, and these courses are overseen regularly, and most often taught, by full-time faculty in the departments.

2. **Each SBS department has the responsibility of determining which courses offered by the department will count for core credit.**

   **Rationale:** The expertise in the disciplines typically resides within the departmental faculty. They are the group that knows best the disciplinary norms and the best practices that are recommended by their professional organizations. For new courses, the ASCC does have the oversight responsibility over all aspects of courses that come forward for approval, including whether or not the course will satisfy undergraduate core credit.

3. **Each SBS department will submit its list of courses that are approved for core credit by March 1, 2015.**

   **Rationale:** The UCC should ask that each SBS department review its list of courses that it has approved for core so that the University catalog and registrar reflect accurate information.

4. **For courses from departments or interdisciplinary programs not in the SBS (not Communication, Economics, Politics, Psychology, or Sociology/Anthropology) that are put forward for core SBS credit:**
   
   a. The course must satisfy the social science student learning outcomes (see attached outcomes, which were approved by the UCC).

   b. **An ad hoc committee composed of the chairs of the SBS departments (or their representatives) will vet the course with their department colleagues. After review of the content and skills reflected in the syllabus, each department will have one vote for or against including the course for SBS core credit. Courses that get at least 3 positive votes from the SBS departments will be designated as core SBS courses. This review process shall be completed within two weeks.**

   **Rationale:** This process addresses the case when a faculty member presents a course from outside the SBS departments for SBS core credit.

The subcommittee for Social and Behavioral Sciences proposes to replace the existing Journal of Record (JOR) (2012) text with the text in the above report.

**Existing text:** The Social Science Core Reviewing UCC Subcommittee makes recommendations to the UCC regarding which courses from outside a social science department should be designated for social science core credit. This UCC Subcommittee consists of one faculty member from each of the social science departments (Politics, Economics, Psychology, Sociology and Anthropology, and Communication) and one faculty
member from outside these departments. Each social science department nominates at least one of their faculty members to serve, and members are elected to three-year terms by the UCC each year. Members may serve consecutive terms.

**Proposed text:**

1. The SBS should not reorganize core courses using the model of the natural sciences.
2. Each SBS department has the responsibility of determining which courses offered by the department will count for core credit.
3. Each SBS department will submit its list of courses that are approved for core credit by March 1, 2015.
4. For courses from departments or interdisciplinary programs not in the SBS (not Communication, Economics, Politics, Psychology, or Sociology/Anthropology) that are put forward for core SBS credit: a. The course must satisfy the social science student learning outcomes (see attached outcomes, which were approved by the UCC). B. An ad hoc committee composed of the chairs of the SBS departments (or their representatives) will vet the course with their department colleagues. After review of the content and skills reflected in the syllabus, each department will have one vote for or against including the SBS core credit. Courses that get at least 3 positive votes from the SBS departments will be designated as core SBS courses. This review process shall be completed within two weeks.

The only matter I am recommending to change in the Journal of Record is item four in the proposed text in the previous paragraph. The rational was described earlier in the subcommittee report.

I am attaching minutes from the November 4, 2014 meeting of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, minutes from the February 4 and March 3, 2015 meetings from the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, Social and Behavioral Science Learning Goals, and the UCC Subcommittee final report from the Social and Behavioral Sciences.

Thank you for considering this matter.
Excerpt of UCC minutes: Meeting on November 4, 2014

8. Other businesses and announcements - Michael Pagano requests that two courses on Health Communication he is teaching in the Spring be approved to count as social science Core credit. Discussion continued how courses are approved to count for the Core. This varies across disciplines. Dr. McFadden stated that any course that is requesting to meet Core requirements must follow specific guidelines, but that the social sciences do not have any guidelines.
Dr. Tromley recommended that we approve these two courses as meeting the social science Core requirement for the Spring semester. Dr. Nash made the following motion “the UCC convene a subcommittee whose charge is to establish criteria for social science Core credit, following on the model provided by the Core Science Steering Committee with an interim report by February 2015. A further charge of the subcommittee is to reconsider the definition of the existing JOR subcommittee on social science Core and make recommendations”.
Motion was approved unanimously.

Dr. McFadden recommended populating a subcommittee for to take up this task. Members will include Dr. Nantz, Dr. Jones, Dr. McClure, Dr. Miecznikowski (as UCC Chair) and Dr. Pagano. The UCC Chair will email Dr. Boryczka for a representative from her department.

Excerpt of UCC minutes: Meeting on February 3, 2015

2. Core Social and Behavioral Science (SBS) Subcommittee report
K. Nantz provided an overview of the report (see attached) from the subcommittee, whose charge was “to determine the process by which a course is designated to have social and behavioral science core credit.” S. Bayne asked for a clarification of point 4; what if there is an interdisciplinary course across two SBS departments. This point was clarified as attached. G. Sauer asked if there could be a number system designating all courses that count for core. The committee agreed that this would be too difficult, given the wide variety of courses that some departments count for core and major requirements. J. Simon pointed out that DegreeWorks could easily manage to track courses that receive core credit. He also asked how courses would be determined to count for core and major credit? The committee agreed that it is department and program business to determine which courses should be included as requirements for majors and/or minors.
MOTION: That the UCC approve the subcommittee recommendations as amended. (K. Nantz/ seconded by T. Jones.) The motion was approved unanimously.

Excerpt of UCC minutes: Meeting on March 3, 2015
The subcommittee for Social and Behavioral Sciences propose to replace the existing Journal of Record (JOR) (2012) text with the text in the attached report, Existing Text: The Social Science Core Reviewing UCC Subcommittee makes recommendations to the UCC regarding which courses from outside a social science department should be designated for social science core credit. This UCC Subcommittee consists of one faculty member from each of the social science departments (Politics, Economics, Psychology, Sociology and Anthropology, and Communication) and one faculty member from outside these departments. Each social science department nominates at least one of their faculty members to serve, and members are elected to three-year terms by the UCC each year. Members may serve consecutive terms. Proposed text: 1. The SBS should not reorganize core courses using the model of the natural sciences. 2. Each SBS department has the responsibility of determining which courses offered by the department will count for core credit. 3. Each SBS department will submit its list of courses that are approved for core credit by March 1, 2015. 4. For courses from departments or interdisciplinary programs not in the SNS (not Communication, Economics, Politics, Psychology, or Sociology/Anthropology) that are put forward for core SBS credit: a. The course must satisfy the social science student learning outcomes (see attached outcomes, which were approved by the UCC.) B. An ad hoc committee composed of the chairs of the SBS departments (or their representatives) will vet the course with their department colleagues. After review of the content and skills reflected in the syllabus, each department will have one vote for or against including the SBS core credit. Courses that get at least 3 positive votes from the SBS departments will be designated as core SBS courses. This review process shall be completed within two weeks.