ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, September 8, 2014 from 3:30 to 5:00 PM
CNS 200

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

1. Presidential courtesy

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
   a. Approval of minutes of AC meetings
      i. Minutes of Meeting on April 28, 2014 (attached)
      ii. Minutes of 4/28/2014 meeting reconvened on May 13, 2014 (attached)
      iii. Minutes of Meeting on July 14, 2014 (attached)
      iv. Minutes of Meeting on July 31, 2014 (attached)
   b. Correspondence - (all attached)
      i. Memo from AC Executive Secretary to AC dated 9/3/14 re 2013-14 Journal of Record items
      ii. Memo from GFS to President re AC recommendations to amend the Handbook
      iii. Memo from Faculty Salary Committee Chair to Conference Committee Chair dated 6/2/2014 Re Reports to the trustees
      iv. Memo from GFS to AC dated 9/1/2014 RE Re: Academic Council Meetings and Roster
      v. Notes on Taking Minutes of Academic Council Meetings
   c. Oral Reports

4. Council Subcommittee Reports – Only (e) will be reporting at this meeting.
   a. Subcommittee on broader academic freedom language for governance documents (AC 2/27/12)
   b. Subcommittee to consider proposing IDEA form for administrators (AC 4/4/11)
   c. Subcommittee on grievance procedures (AC 5/8/13)
   d. Subcommittee on time codes (AC 5/8/13)
   e. Subcommittee on Mission Statement re non-tenure track faculty (AC 9/9/13) - attachment

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

6. Old Business

7. New business
   a. Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees – report on June meeting, prepare for October
   b. Proposal to amend the Faculty Handbook from Educational Technologies Committee (attachment)
   c. Proposal to change name of the Bachelor Degree in Professional Studies (attachment)
   d. Elect the AC Calendar Subcommittee for 2014-15 (Ongoing item 3)

Lists of Attachments, Pending, and Ongoing Items are on page 2
List of Attachments:
For item 3.a.i. Draft minutes of 4/28/2014 AC meeting (pages 3-8)
For item 3.a.ii. Draft minutes of 5/13/2014 AC meeting (pages 9-18)
For item 3.a.iii. Draft minutes of 7/14/2014 AC meeting (page 19)
For item 3.a.iv. Draft minutes of 7/31/2014 AC meeting (page 20)
For item 3.b.i. Memo from AC Executive Secretary re JoR items (page 21)
For item 3.b.ii. Memo from GFS to President (pages 22-24)
For item 3.b.iii. Memo from FSC Chair to Conference Committee Chair (pages 25-27)
For item 3.b.iv. Memo from GFS to AC (page 28)
For item 3.b.v. Notes on taking Minutes of Academic Council Meetings (page 29)
For item 4.e. Guiding Principles for a Faculty Mission Statement dated 6/12/2014 (page 30)
For item 7.b. Memo from ETC Chair dated 4/24/2104 re Restructuring of ex officio membership in Faculty Handbook (pages 31-34)
For item 7.c. Information re changing name of BPS program (page 35-36); 2/19/2014 minutes of BPS Steering Committee (page 36-37)

Pending Items:
A. Faculty Data Committee (AC 12/3/07).
B. MFA in Creative Writing, Five-Year-Review due in 12/2012 (AC 12/3/07).
C. AC revisits the accessibility of teaching evaluation data, Due spring 2012. (AC 4/19/10)
D. AC review of Merit Appeals Policy, once one or more have been adjudicated. (AC 11/1/10)
E. AC three year review of Intellectual Properties Policy, spring 2014. (AC 3/7/11)
F. MPA, five year review in 2017-2018 (AC 9/10/12)

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 Meeting  
Monday, April 28, 2014  
CNS 200  
Draft Minutes of Meeting

Members Present: Professors Joe Dennin, David Downie, Donald Greenberg, Shannon Harding, James He, 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: Dean Don Gibson, SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, S.J.

Student Representative: Sarah Woods

Regrets: Professors Chris Huntley, Ginny Kelly, Nikki Lee-Wingate; Deans Lynn Babington, Bruce Berdanier, Robbin Crabtree

Invited Presenters: David Sapp, Heather Petraglia, Mike Pagano

1. Presidential Courtesy

SVPAA Fitzgerald provides an update on the incoming freshmen class. We budgeted for a freshmen class of 975 and, as of Friday, we are 10% ahead of last year. With respect to Engineering Masters students, we have jumped from 50 international applicants to 500 applicants. We are also presently in the middle of an accreditation review by NCATE (The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education), which will end at noon of April 29th, 2014.

Prof Kris asks about the numbers for the School of Nursing.

SVPAA Fitzgerald responds that we are 11-12% over target. We are over 100% over last year’s numbers for the School of Engineering, 11% for the School of Business, while CAS is slightly down. The engineering population will likely double next year.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

Professor Rakowitz related that the election slate is out and that any outstanding feedback from the SVPAA interviews needs to be submitted immediately.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary

Professor Mulvey presented the draft minutes from April 7, 2014.

MOTION [Harding/Steffen] to approve
MOTION PASSED 13-0-1

Professor Mulvey reported that the Executive Council suggests the summer dates of May 21 and July 31 for emergency Academic Council meetings (per the Journal of Record), and possibly during senior week (May 12-16) to reconvene today’s meeting, if needed.

For the Executive Committee, Professor Mulvey suggests postponing discussion of agenda item 4g. until the next meeting and moving agenda item 7c. to the end of today’s agenda. No objections to either change.

4. Council Subcommittee Reports

4d. Subcommittee on Maternity Leave
SVPAA Fitzgerald presents the recommendations drafted by the subcommittee, which consisted of Professors Patricia Behre, Ryan Drake, Dina Franceschi, and himself (see memo on pp. 10-11 of packet)
The changes propose allowing a mother to decide if a return year will count or not towards tenure clock. If not counted, this would amount to one academic year of clock stoppage. SVPAA notes the suggestion to consider paternity leave in the future.

Professor Dennin asks for clarification on the clock stoppage.

SVPAA Fitzgerald clarifies the timing of declaration.

Professor Mulvey moves to approve the memo (p. 12 of the packet) from the Executive Committee concerning the language on Maternity Leave in the Journal of Record.

MOTION. [Mulvey/Greenberg] to recommend that the General Faculty approve amending the Faculty Handbook [II.A.3.c] as shown on page 12 of the packet for today’s meeting [new language underlined and bold; items following insertion to be renumbered]:

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

SVPAA Fitzgerald speaks in favor, noting that the language of “declaration” removes the possibility of denial.

MOTION PASSES 15-0-0

Professor Mulvey states that there is a need for the language to be consistent and that while the recommendation for the Journal of Record is good, the Executive Committee notes that everything is already in the Faculty Handbook. She suggests that the redundant language be removed from the Journal of Record.

MOTION [Mulvey/Thiel] to remove the entry on Maternity Policy from the Journal of Record
MOTION PASSES 14-0-1

MOTION [Mulvey/Downie] that the Faculty Handbook language on page 29 be amended to match the committee recommendation made for the change to the Journal of Record. I.e., amend the HB with the changes proposed for the JoR shown on page 10 of the packet for today’s meeting.

SVPAA Fitzgerald speaks in favor, noting that the language reflects not simply a release from teaching but from service as well.

Professor Rakowitz speaks against, stating that the Faculty Handbook language does not reflect the current University policy and that the language needs to be more fully revised. She expresses reluctance to amend only a part while not addressing the larger whole.

Professor Mulvey speaks against, agreeing with Prof. Rakowitz, but notes that such a revision is not presently possible and expresses a desire to withdraw the current motion.

Professor Thiel suggests amending the JOR language now and revising the Handbook language later.

It is suggested that the appropriate plan would be to withdraw the pending motion and rescind the motion deleting the entry on Maternity Policy from the Journal of Record. The pending motion is withdrawn.

MOTION [Downie/Yarrington] to rescind, for procedural reasons, the motion on removing the entry on Maternity Policy from the Journal of Record.
MOTION PASSES 14-0-1

MOTION [Mulvey/Yarrington] to table the topic until the next meeting.
MOTION PASSES 15-0-0

6. Old Business

6a. JoR language for Council-approved default options for IDEA evaluations
Professor Rakowitz explains that there is a need to solidify the official language with respect to the IDEA form. She refers to the memo from the Executive Committee (p. 13 of packet)

MOTION [Rakowitz/Dennin] to approve the language for the Journal of Record shown on page 13 of the packet for today’s meeting for the previously approved Council action on defaults for IDEA [new language underlined and bold]:
Student Evaluation of Teaching:
Every faculty member in every class shall administer the IDEA teaching evaluation form. 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.

SVpAA Fitzgerald speaks in favor noting that this will allow students to give better attention to the IDEA evaluations if appropriate distinctions are made between the short and long forms.

MOTION PASSES 15-0-0

6b. Response from Academic Planning Committee to AC action taken 4/7/14 on credit for courses taken in high school.
Professor Sapp and Ms. Petraglia report that the Academic Planning Committee revisited their proposal. Ms. Petraglia states that it was not mentioned at the first meeting that students are coming in with core requirements already completed, especially in the Social Sciences, Foreign Languages, and Mathematics. Recalling that UConn’s program was mentioned as a possible exception, she nevertheless notes that the comparable programs at UConn, LIU and Syracuse all demonstrate inconsistencies within disciplines across all the programs. While there is an anecdotal report of careful certification, syllabi approval, and heavy oversight, this is not consistent within all programs. Ms. Petraglia further argues that many peer institutions have already moved to a more rigorous and restrictive policy. While some good courses might be missed, the University runs the risk of accepting credit for inappropriate courses. As a result, Prof. Sapp and Ms. Petraglia would like to resubmit the original proposal.

Professor Dennin suggests making limited acceptances of programs with respect to programs like that at UConn. He also notes that according to the language of the UConn program, teachers are seen as adjunct instructors. Prof. Dennin further argues that by accepting these programs the University may gain a recruiting advantage over peer institutions with more restrictive policies in place.

Ms. Petraglia states that the Academic Planning Committee did discuss this possibility before reaching the present proposal, but the challenge was the short time period in the summer when decisions had to be made. She instead emphasized the need to have a transparent policy that would be understandable to school counselors who would in turn prepare the schools. A school-by-school or discipline-by-discipline system of evaluation would be logistically difficult to do.

Professor Downie expresses support for having a uniform policy.

Professor Greenberg asks how College Professor is defined.

Ms. Petraglia responds that a student is asked to submit documentation from the university and the criteria are about being on campus.

Professor Thiel seeks clarification as to whether or not the proposed policy seeks to raise a higher standard.
Ms. Petraglia states the Academic Planning Committee indeed saw that there was a need to recommend a more restrictive policy in order to tighten up the level of courses coming in.

Ms. Petraglia leaves, Prof. Sapp stays.

**MOTION [Greenberg/Petrino] to amend the Journal of Record as recommended by the Academic Planning Committee [new text underlined, deleted text struck through]:**

**College Courses in High School:**

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

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

That dean/director will determine the appropriateness of the transfer credit for the student’s program and decide whether it has met Fairfield’s curriculum standards. **Only courses in which the student received a grade of “C” or higher will be considered.** A maximum of 15 credits of approved coursework will be awarded transfer credit. **Approved courses with a grade of “C” or higher.** The grades will not be transferred.

Professor Dennin speaks against, stating that he would like to change bullet point one to be less restrictive.

SVPAA Fitzgerald speaks in favor, stating that the core is where Fairfield University delivers a Jesuit education to its students. That experience is not just content knowledge. He also notes that 15 AP credits and 15 transfer credits would give students sophomore standing, which would be especially appealing for students interested in 5-year dual degree programs.

Professor Greenberg speaks in favor, deferring to the expertise of the Academic Planning Committee.

Professor Thiel speaks in favor, stating that the Academic Planning Committee came back with no changes because there was no way to be more specific and that it is better not to be, since that affords the University greater flexibility and judgment.

Professor He speaks in favor, agreeing with Prof. Thiel, and stating that a maximum of 15 credit hours is generous.

Professor Petrino speaks in favor stating that she feels better knowing that the deans or directors will serve as a fail-safe. She states that she believes these proposed guidelines to be appropriate.

**MOTION PASSES 13-1-1**

Professor Mulvey suggests moving to 7b. since Professor Pagano is here. No objections.

**7b. Program Review of the MA in Communication (materials distributed with the 4/7/2014 AC packet)**

Professor Pagano reports on the 5-year review of the MA program in Communications. He notes that 35 students are presently enrolled in the program with 13 graduating in May. He adds that 15 students have been added since September and that the program seems on track of hitting 60 students, which the administration would like to see.

SVPAA Fitzgerald asks if there is anything to report about the 5th year full-time option.

Professor Pagano responds that there is the accelerated option for BA students who would like to continue on for the MA. He adds however that more than an additional 5th year would be required and states that they are presently assessing interest with juniors and seniors, and that such an option is not part of the present review.
Professor Dennin notes that for the fiscal year of 2013, 80 students were proposed and that returns have gone down in the last two years. Noting the new competing programs at Sacred Heart and Bridgeport, he asks why should we be confident that numbers will be met?

Professor Pagano responds that there has not been sufficient marketing and that Sacred Heart has an unbelievable 1 year program. He states that the MA department is concerned and is looking into the accelerated option.

Professor Pagano leaves.

Professor Dennin asks what are the AC’s options with respect to the review.

SVPAA Fitzgerald states that the Educational Planning Committee will be coming up with a template for review, but that further reviews are ultimately the responsibility of the deans.

Professor Mulvey notes that the 5-year review was part of the requirement from the program’s inception.

Professor Dennin states that he has seen many programs approved, but some have fallen short of projections. He asks would it be possible to review the program again in 3 years to see if things have stabilized or turned around.

**MOTION [Dennin/Greenberg] to require another program review in 3 years**

Professor Mulvey states that she is unsure what the concern is.

Professor Dennin responds that there needs to be more oversight - that the Academic Council can’t simply leave it to the deans.

SVPAA Fitzgerald speaks against the motion. He states that the Academic Council’s role is to look at the academic objectives of a program and that it is up to the administration, meaning deans and Vice Presidents, to look at the business model. He reiterates that the EPC is coming up with a good template for the regular review of programs.

Dean Gibson emphasizes that business model questions do reside with the deans.

**MOTION FAILS 2-10-2**

7a. Revisions to Spring 2015 calendar from AC Calendar Review Committee

Professor Harding presents the proposed changes to calendar (see separate handout “Academic Calendar Changes”). She notes that the sheet summarizes the changes and how they compare. The Academic Calendar Subcommittee paid special attention to trying to make equal the number of times each weekday is a class day in the semester.

Professor Storms asks if the Tuesday that becomes an academic Monday is for both undergraduates and graduates.

Professor Harding says yes it is.

Professor Rakowtiz notes that perhaps there should be no turbos on Mondays and Fridays since each day only meets for 12 classes.

SVPAA Fitzgerald states the requirements set forth by the JoR boxes us in when inclement weather occurs, especially when there is a need for 14 or 15 weeks of instruction.

Professor Yarrington agrees and states that the limited number of instruction days on Mondays and Fridays hampers a program that builds on turbos.

Professor Harding adds that the committee mentioned the possibility of foregoing the Easter Monday holiday in order to regain a Monday, but the possibility was met with resistance from parents. The recouping of days was also the very reason the subcommittee recommended starting the semester before the MLK holiday.
Professor Dennin asks isn’t the date of graduation open?

SVPAA Fitzgerald responds that the date of graduation is not mandated, but determined by the president and staff.

Prof Kris expresses her sincere appreciation for the subcommittee. She further adds that Nursing has half semester courses (7 weeks/7 weeks) so the shorter semester is very difficult to manage. Additionally clinicals cannot accommodate academic Mondays.

Professor Harding responds that removing Easter Monday would resolve that.

Professor Mulvey points out that the JoR requirements for the academic calendar are not onerous: three reading days, and a month between semesters - needed for the work of the faculty. She elaborates that what is really pushing us is parents complaining about the semester starting before the MLK holiday. Graduation and Easter Monday are also issues, but none of this is relevant to the JoR academic calendar entry.

SVPAA Fitzgerald noted that parents complained because it placed moving day onto a work day requiring many parents to request time off. He adds that only 50% of undergraduates have a final exam.

Professor Mulvey stresses that faculty have work to do in the interim.

Professor Steffen asks why do we have a senior week? He notes that the additional half week would open up 2 full days.

Professor Mulvey asks what should we do with the Spring 2015 calendar?

Professor Steffen asks whether a half Monday would be possible?

**MOTION [Mulvey/Yarrington] to accept the Spring 2015 calendar changes.**

Professor Storms asks whether this academic calendar applies to graduate students.

**MOTION [Fitzgerald/Storms] to amend the motion to apply only to the undergraduate calendar.**

Professor Harding speaks against the amendment stating that the last day of classes and reading days would be different.

Professor Storms notes that they end differently anyway.

**MOTION to amend PASSES 10-2-2**

The motion is amended.

Professor Downie speaks against the amended motion, because the academic calendar should begin a week before the MLK holiday or the Easter Monday holiday should be eliminated.

Ms. Woods stresses that Easter Monday is very important to students who choose to celebrate Easter with family and require Monday for travel time.

**MOTION AS AMENDED PASSES 13-0-1.**

**MOTION [Fitzgerald/Yarrington] to recess this meeting and reconvene on May 13 at a time to be determined and sent to members by email.**

**MOTION PASSED unanimously.**

Meeting recessed at 5:00pm

Respectfully submitted,

Martin Nguyen
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

Invited Presenters: Elizabeth Hohl, Marti LoMonaco, Mike Andreychik, Tracy Immerso, James Simon

Meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. Chair Rafalski offered a round of thanks, especially to the Executive Secretary and the Secretary of the General Faculty.

In turn, Prof. Rakowitz congratulated the Chair for his excellent service to the Council.

Prof. Rafalski proposed reordering the agenda to take up item 4.g first since Prof. Elizabeth Hohl, a member of the reporting subcommittee, was in attendance. There were no objections to reordering the agenda.

4. g. Subcommittee to consider Faculty Handbook committee on NTT Faculty

Prof. Mulvey, chair of the subcommittee, thanked Prof. Hohl and the other members of the subcommittee for their great work on the subcommittee. She briefly reviewed the subcommittee’s three-page report, which had been included in the packet of materials, noting that the report included the subcommittee’s unanimous recommendation that a Faculty Handbook Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty be established, along with its detailed rationale for this recommendation, and other matters that came up but were considered beyond the charge of the committee. The floor was opened up for questions.

Prof. Dennin asked about the committee’s view of how the elections for the non-tenure track faculty members would be conducted.

Prof. Mulvey responded that this item was deliberately left out of the proposal. The principle is that the contingent faculty representatives should be elected by the contingent faculty members and that this should be arranged by the Secretary of the General Faculty.

Prof. Hohl noted that once Human Resources comes up with list of potential adjunct representatives, several names could be forwarded and voted on. She further noted that it is important to routinize the establishment of the members.

Prof. Rakowitz praised the process as long overdue, but asked if the committee had considered eligibility limitations for the committee members.

Prof. Mulvey said the committee did not see a need for eligibility limitations, but she did note that the committee was concerned that contingent faculty members might need to be replaced (by our usual process) if they weren’t teaching at Fairfield for their entire terms.

Prof. Hohl added that the committee members hoped there would be a self-selection process.

Dean Crabtree responded that many of Handbook committees have ex officio members and asked if this option had been considered.

SVPAA Fitzgerald supported this suggestion, explaining that, though this option was not discussed within the committee, having a mix of full-time and part-time and administrators would be a good idea.
Prof. Thiel thought that item 2 under Specific Duties needed clarification. A contingent faculty member with a problem should go to their chair and then their Dean, but given the language under Item 2, a contingent faculty member might feel that it would be appropriate to take a personnel problem to this committee.

Prof. Mulvey explained that, under other matters, the committee members were considering setting up an ombudsperson for problems that might require independent mediation. They did not anticipate this subcommittee receiving individual or personnel complaints, and intended that the chair or dean should still be the first stop for a contingent faculty member with those kinds of concerns.

Prof. Mulvey recommended that we remove the word “concerns” to make it suggestions. Prof. Crabtree explained that it is a Dean’s responsibility to tell people where they need to turn to have an issue discussed. If the word “concerns” came out, it might imbue any issue with an affective dimension.

Chair Rafalski thanked Profs. Hohl and Mulvey for the report and opened the floor to entertain motions about the proposal.

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

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

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

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

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

SVPAA Fitzgerald endorsed as a healthy suggestion the motion to include General Faculty members as well as part-time faculty members, who teach 40% of courses at the University. He offered an amendment to give the SVPAA or her designee voting privileges, since faculty and administrators often work together to solve problems and should have equal status. Although the SVPAA has veto power, he noted that it’s helpful to have an equal voice.

**MOTION TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION.** (Fitzgerald/Downie): To insert into the original motion “The SVPAA or his/her designee shall be a voting, *ex officio* member.”

**MOTION TO AMEND THE AMENDMENT.** (Mulvey/Dennin) To replace “a voting” with “an” in the motion to amend.
Prof. Steffen asked about the frequency of committees on which the SVPAA sits without voting power, since the person’s presence is designed to provide expertise.

Prof. Mulvey said that administrators being given voting privileges on committees has been haphazard and does not have any underlying principle about expertise.

Prof. Thiel spoke against amendment, since he agreed that an administrator should be allowed to vote. He noted that Deans should not have the opportunity to vote, since they and SVPAA would vote as a block. In this case, however, the administrator should have a vote.

Prof. Greenberg spoke in favor of the motion against allowing administrators to vote, pointing out that we have shared input, not shared governance. Giving the vote to administrators is not warranted. SVPAA Fitzgerald contended that faculty members make decisions about our most important issues. Prof. Greenberg referred the SVPAA to the Yeshiva case and Justice Brennan’s dissent, which points out that faculty are employees, whereas administrators in fact make more fundamental decisions about faculty welfare.

Prof. Dennin spoke in favor of not giving the administrator voting privileges. Since it is haphazard, we should probably remove the voting privilege for administrators.

**MOTION (Thiel/Fitzgerald). To call the question.**
**MOTION PASSED**

**MOTION TO AMEND THE AMENDMENT PASSED:** 12 in favor, 3 opposed, 1 abstaining

**MOTION TO AMEND (AS AMENDED). To insert into the original motion “The SVPAA or his/her designee shall be an *ex officio* member.”**

In returning to the revised amendment, Prof. Mulvey explained that the Subcommittee had omitted putting an administrator on the committee, and was in favor of allowing the SVPAA or his/her designee to serve.

**MOTION (Fitzgerald/Downie). To call the question.**
**MOTION PASSED**

**MOTION TO AMEND (AS AMENDED) PASSED:** 16 in favor, none opposed and none abstaining.

Prof. Mulvey added that she would like to remove the words “concerns, and” from the revised motion to clarify what should be brought to the committee.

**MOTION TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION. (Mulvey/Steffen) To remove the words “concerns and” from specific duties number 2.**
**MOTION PASSED 15 -1 - 0**

Prof. Downie spoke in favor of the revised motion as an example why we need to review all the committee structures in Handbook Committees.

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

5. Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty.

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

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

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

MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 16 in favor, none opposed, none abstaining.

7e. Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees.

Prof. LoMonaco was invited to present for the discussion on the upcoming meeting with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. She explained that, based on a previous arrangement with the SVPAA, the Conference Committee planned to have 45 minutes for their presentation.

SVPAA Fitzgerald said he did not recall promising that the Committee on Conference would have 45 minutes of the 90 minutes with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.

Prof. LoMonaco responded that they had talked about the need for sharing time and egalitarianism. How has the committee functioned in past? She noted that there were some years when the committee had the entire first hour and a half, but she claimed that the SVPAA explained that time was needed to present new initiatives to Board. We agreed that we would share that time. In October, the faculty had less than 10 minutes, hence our concern that we have appropriate time.

Prof. Mulvey noted that she had a concern to bring to the Committee on Conference. The Faculty Salary Committee is concerned that faculty positions are being misrepresented to the Board of Trustees. This concern is based on BOT minutes and notes which, as reported in The Mirror, are available online. As Faculty Salary Committee Chair, she spoke to the President about her concerns and he suggested that her concerns would best be put in writing.

Prof. Mulvey reported that some of the information conveyed by the administration to the Board was inaccurate, some was incomplete, and some seemed intended to pit the trustees against the faculty. The Faculty Salary Committee worked all year honestly and openly. We shared our positions with the administration in memos with detailed explanations; we tried to understand the administration’s positions in order to reach common ground. It is unfair to the FSC and by extension to the faculty for our positions to be so misrepresented. As examples, Prof. Mulvey noted that, according to the online Board documents, Executive VP Kevin Lawlor suggested the [FSC] would be “testing the resolve of the senior administration”, and in another meeting, that Lawlor “believes faculty will continue to test the senior administration over the coming weeks or months.” On March 10, Lawlor asserted that “the FSC continues their stance on resisting any healthcare plan design changes” when in reality FSC had written to Lawlor on March 7 reminding him that we had asked the General Faculty to approve and they had approved the creation of a permanent committee to address our shared goal of containing medical cost escalation and that we were prepared to convene this group immediately.

Prof. He inquired who wrote the report.
Prof. Mulvey noted that these reports are included in the Red Book provided to University trustees prior to each meeting.

Prof. LoMonaco noted that she was not surprised, since one of trustees seemed surprised to learn that faculty were concerned about something other than salary. She concluded that the meeting with the Board would be an important opportunity for faculty members to represent their views.

Prof. Greenberg concluded faculty members needed to realize that administrators would never present a disinterested voice to the Board of Trustees. For forty-five years, this has been an ongoing issue. We should also point out that decisions are being made that will impact us. Despite Dean Crabtree’s efforts to prioritize issues, he noted that Executive Vice President Lawlor would make the ultimate decision. Prof. Greenberg expressed concern that the Board of Trustees should be aware that non-academic administrators have ultimate authority about issues regarding the academic division.

Prof. Huntley noted that there was a faculty member who served on the Board of Trustees at the University of Virginia, where he attended, and he wondered whether there should be one faculty member who sits on our Board of Trustees. Then, we would be getting a copy of the Red Book and be more aware of these issues, especially if a person from FWC were to serve.

SVPAA Fitzgerald clarified that the Deans and SVPAA make decisions about hiring, and Vice President Lawlor has no input about academic decisions. On the other hand, he can authorize whether or not a position is filled. It’s important that we have a strong advocate for academic affairs in the SVPAA. SVPAA Fitzgerald explained that he used every meeting with the Committee on Conference to introduce and familiarize the Board with our quality faculty. Despite an adversarial relationship, faculty and administrators need a transparent process and mutual respect.

**Motion (Mulvey/Greenberg): That the AC directs the Committee on Conference to:**

1. Receive from the FSC a memo articulating their concerns about misrepresentation and present the matter to the Board.
2. Articulate to the Board that now is the time to have a faculty member on the Board.
3. Articulate to the Board that the EVP should not be having input into academic decisions (re having to sign off on the authorization to hire forms)

Prof. Dennin asked what would happen if Vice President Lawlor did not sign off on the authorization to hire. Doesn’t he ultimately have inappropriate influence on the academic division?

Prof. Mulvey said EVP Lawlor should not have undue influence in academic decisions.

Prof. Downie spoke in favor of the motion, since there are larger institutions that have faculty members on the Board and the motion addresses the disconnect between faculty and the Board of Trustees. He noted that Fairfield’s existence depends on its academic reputation, but it is not clear that the Board of Trustees understands the essential importance of our academic reputation, nor do the business people on Board understand the problems inherent in single-year contracts.

Prof. Dennin noted that the University has witnessed a morale issue, and this motion may represent a way to move forward. Why not support our pedagogy and research more than previously?

**MOTION PASSED 16 in favor, none opposed, 1 abstaining.**

Prof. Dennin asked how many employees go to the Board of Trustee meetings, to which SVPAA Fitzgerald responded that Vice Presidents attend, followed by an Executive session without them.

Prof. Downie offered that there should be a common set of talking points among committees, where the central concern is the academic mission.

Chair Rafalski asked if there were further suggestion about ideas for the Conference Committee.

Prof. LoMonaco thanked the Council and added that she had a clear directive to bring to the full Conference Committee. Plans are to meet with the Board of Trustees on Thursday, June 5, 2014. Prof. LoMonaco asked SVPAA Fitzgerald if he had agenda items for that meeting, as the Committee on Conference would need the entire time.
SVPAA Fitzgerald reported that the Executive Committee would be meeting to discuss budget, enhancement of revenues, and growing the graduate programs.

Chair Rafalski thanked Prof. LoMonaco for her report.

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

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

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

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

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

Chair Rafalski asked for questions.

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

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

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

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

Ms. Immerso noted that, while the IDEA form has standard questions that cannot be changed, faculty members can add questions to the end of standard form, an easier task using the online method.

Prof. Yarrington explained that students are advised not to answer questions if they do not pertain to the discipline.

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

Prof. Simon offered a suggestion of a trial period for two years.
Prof. Andreychik contended that although the Committee was in favor of online evaluations, they realized the need to work out the specifics next year.

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

Prof. Andreychik responded at the beginning of next year.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chair Rafalski thanked the visitors for their report.

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

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

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

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

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

**MOTION (Mulvey/Storms): To continue the use of qualitative evaluations.**

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

4 d. Subcommittee on maternity leave policy (AC 5/8/13).

**MOTION (Mulvey/Kris): The Council recommends that the General Faculty approve amending the Faculty Handbook [page 29] as shown [deletions in strikethrough and additions in bold and underlined]:**

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

Prof. Rakowitz suggests that the maternity leave is described in BPO and we add service, since the proposal describes the leave in a way that was no longer accurate.
Prof. Mulvey also recommended adding a reference in the BPO to the page in the Faculty Handbook where the policy appears.

Dean Crabtree asks why there is a maternity leave in the fall semester if child is born in May, June, or July.

Prof. Downie wonders why we would try to have people plan their maternity leaves planned for fall semester.

Prof. Mulvey explains that the intention when the plan was put into place in 1990 was to give any new parent a semester off from teaching.

Prof. Dennin asks if release from service is mandatory or whether a person may opt to continue to serve. It is optional.

Prof. Kelly wondered about how administrative responsibilities might impact those faculty members on maternity leave under this proposal.

SVPAA Fitzgerald explained that a person with faculty status should be governed by the faculty benefits policy; therefore, administration would be considered service.

Prof. Harding asked if there is anything in the language that prevents a faculty member from seeking outside employment.

Prof. Rakowitz noted that the leave already exists, so we are only adding information on service.

SVPAA Fitzgerald reminded the Council that faculty must seek permission to apply to consult outside the University.

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

**MOTION (Mulvey/Steffen):** The Council recommends the FSC work with the administration to revise the language in the Benefits Plan Overview as follows:

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

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

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

Chair Rafalski indicates no petitions for immediate hearing.

7.c. Dissolution of the 3/2 program in Engineering.

Dean Berdanier explained that the program allowed students to do some work at other institutions and then receive B.A. in engineering at Fairfield. He noted that Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute has no current record of our program and added that none of their faculty wish to continue this work. Although Fairfield University has developed a program with Columbia, we only have three students who are left in program, and they will graduate in 2015. Dean Berdanier noted that, while he does not advocate having a B.A. in Engineering, there is an advantage to having a combined five-year B.S. and M.A. program. Both Columbia and Fairfield offer these programs, which provide distinct advantages over the B.A. program.

Chair Rafalski asks for questions.

Prof. Huntley wonders whether, if is it possible to go to Columbia for the degree, we will promote only our 5-year program or another.
Dean Berdanier explained that he encourages good students to do a five-year conventional or research-based M.A.

**MOTION (Fitzgerald/Dennin): to dissolve the 3-2 program in Engineering**

**MOTION PASSED: 15 in favor, none opposed or abstaining.**

7.d. Proposal for B.A. in Environmental Studies:

Prof. Downie briefly explained the proposal (included with the materials for the meeting) for a B.A. in Environmental Studies, a rigorous, 13 course major; students will also be required to fulfill the requirements for a minor or major in another department or interdisciplinary program.

Prof. Dennin asked about how the anticipated increase in applications for environmental science and environmental studies was estimated.

Prof. Downie responded that developing a major is a “masthead issue,” since half the Jesuit schools have Environmental Studies. He estimates a new major will bring in 10-15 students at most, rather than 40-50 additional students.

Prof. Thiel noted he was concerned about the science requirements and the regularity of these courses being offered.

Prof. Downie explained there is a need to depend on courses that we cannot control, but he noted that Chairs indicate that they will continue to be offered with regularity.

Prof. Harding asked about the role of the Associate Director and the reason to have a course release and stipend.

Prof. Downie explained that, although this has not been defined yet, we anticipate a stipend and potential course release. We are concerned that advising may be “tricky,” since there are 40-50 minors. We have had eight interdisciplinary majors and we already have some interest in the major.

**MOTION (Steffen/Greenberg): to approve proposed B.A. in Environmental Studies**

Prof. Petrino thanked Prof. Downie for the report. She noted that many of the English courses required for the major have already been and continue to be taught, since there has been growing interest in the program.

Prof. Steffen noted that this program has been incrementally put together and will continue to strengthen.

Prof. Dennin offered that it might be helpful to remove estimates about numbers of potential majors from the final proposal.

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

7.f. Discussion of AC three-year Review of Merit Appeals Policy.

Since this item originally was to be reviewed in Fall 2013, Prof. Rakowitz explained that the Executive Committee recommended changing the pending item to an AC full review of merit appeals policy once one or more appeals have been adjudicated. There were no questions.

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.

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, then the entire increase in the pool will go to Standard Merit, (2) 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.

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.

Prof. Dennin noted that, given how “successful” merit has been, we should suggest that a subcommittee consider doing away with merit altogether or develop a more realistic system. Perhaps a bonus system might be appropriate, given that there has been no merit in many years.

Prof. Steffen offered an acclamation for Chair Rafalski’s work this semester! He made a motion to adjourn that was seconded and passed without objection.

Meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Petrino
Academic Council Meeting  
Monday, July 14, 2014  
CNS 200  
Draft Minutes of Meeting

Members Present:  
Professors Irene Mulvey (Executive Secretary), Shawn Rafalski (Chair), Susan Rakowitz (Secretary of the General Faculty), Stephanie Storms, John Thiel, Jo Yarrington  
Administrators: Senior VP for Academic Affairs Lynn Babington, Deans Meredith Kazer, Robert Hannafin.

Chair Shawn Rafalski called the meeting to order just after 2:00 PM and we moved to our one item of business.

7. a. Discussion of arranging faculty membership on the Search Committee for CAS Dean

It was noted that a quorum was not present. Members who were present discussed the composition of previous search committees for Deans. SVPAA Babington informed the AC members in attendance that the Search Committee for CAS Dean would have twelve members, seven faculty and five non-faculty. The non-faculty slots are the SVPAA, an Associate VP for Academic Affairs, 1 Dean, 1 member of the College Advisory Board, and an individual from Advancement. Discussion at the meeting suggested the following composition for the faculty slots: four faculty members from CAS, two faculty members each one from a different non-CAS school, and one faculty member at-large (from any school).

Members in attendance agreed that the Executive Secretary should ask AC members to vote by email on the question of authorizing the General Faculty Secretary to put out a call for nominations/volunteers for a Search Committee with this faculty representation. In addition, the Executive Secretary was instructed to inform members that a decision on whether to allow proxy voting would likely be made at the next meeting on 7/31.

Respectfully submitted,  
Irene Mulvey

Following the meeting, a vote by email was taken and the GFS was authorized by the AC to put out a call for nominations/volunteers for the Search Committee with the faculty representation discussed at the meeting: four faculty members from CAS, two faculty members each one from a different non-CAS school, and one faculty member at-large (from any school).
Academic Council Meeting  
Thursday, July 31, 2014  
CNS 200  
Draft Minutes of Meeting

Members Present:
Professors: Joe Dennin, David Downie, Shannon Harding, Alison Kris, Irene Mulvey (Executive Secretary), Elizabeth Petrino, Shawn Rafalski (Chair), Susan Rakowitz (Secretary of General Faculty), Kraig Steffen, Stephanie Storms, John Thiel.

Administrators: SVPAA Lynn Babington, Deans Bruce Berdanier, Bob Hannafin, Meredith Kazer

Regrets: Professors Martin Nguyen; Dean Jim Simon

Proxy: Irene Mulvey for Jo Yarrington

Prof. Shawn Rafalski, AC Chair, called the meeting called to order at 2:05 PM and we moved straight to our one substantive item of business.

7. New Business

   a. Arranging faculty membership on the Search Committee for CAS Dean

      The AC had discussed proxy voting at the July 14 meeting and one member had sent a proxy.

      MOTION. [Rakowitz/Downie] to allow proxy voting at this meeting.  
      MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

      Senior VP for Academic Affairs Lynn Babington had informed the AC at the July 14 meeting that the search committee would consist of 12 members: the SVPAA, an Associate VP for Academic Affairs, 1 Dean, 1 member of the College Advisory Board, an individual from Advancement, and seven faculty members. The Call for Nominations authorized by the AC indicated that the faculty slots will be allotted as four faculty members from CAS, two faculty members each one from a different non-CAS school, and one faculty member at-large (from any school).

      Secretary of the General Faculty Susan Rakowitz distributed a ballot with instructions. As in previous elections, individuals would require a majority to be elected to the Search Committee. On the first ballot, Professors Beth Boquet, Paul Lakeland, Carl Scheraga, Wendy Kohli, Stephanie Storms were elected. No one got a majority on the second ballot, Prof. Dennis Keenan was elected on the third ballot and Prof. Shelley Phelan was elected on the fifth ballot.

      A MOTION to adjourn was made, seconded and PASSED without objection.

The meeting adjourned at 2:28 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Irene Mulvey
Date: September 3, 2014
From: Irene Mulvey, AC Executive Secretary
To: Academic Council
Re: 2013-2014 Items for the Journal of Record

On May 21, 2014, fifteen items for the Journal of Record, that were approved by the Academic Council in 2013-14, were sent to SVPAA Fitzgerald for approval. Changes to the Journal of Record must be approved by the faculty (Academic Council or General Faculty) and by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

SVPAA Fitzgerald approved all but two items. One rejected item was the removal of the entry on Maternity Policy from the JOR. When the Executive Committee reviewed the draft minutes for the meeting at which that motion passed, we realized that the motion was rescinded later in that meeting and therefore should not have been sent on for approval.

The other motion rejected by the SVPAA was to amend the language for the distribution of funds in the Appendix on Merit Review as shown:

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.

The explanation offered by SVPAA Fitzgerald in rejecting this amendment was, "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."
To: Jeffrey von Arx, S.J., President  
From: Susan Rakowitz, General Faculty Secretary  
Re: Academic Council recommendations to amend the Faculty Handbook  
CC: Shawn Rafalski, Irene Mulvey, Lynn Babington

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

Each of the Council's recommendations is presented below, followed by a brief summary of its background. Attached to this memo are relevant subcommittee reports and excerpts of draft minutes of the Academic Council discussions and votes.

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

---

Motion 1: April 28, 2014

to recommend that the General Faculty approve amending the Faculty Handbook [II.A.3.c] as shown on page 12 of the packet for today’s meeting [new language underlined and bold; items following insertion to be renumbered]:

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

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

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

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

**Membership**

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

**General Purpose**

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

**Specific Duties**

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

In response to a recommendation of a task force exploring "the status, roles, and conditions of part-time faculty at Fairfield," a subcommittee was appointed to "consider developing a general purpose for a Faculty Handbook Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty employment, roles, and conditions." The subcommittee was also charged to "provide a membership requirement and specific duties for such a Handbook committee." The resulting report is attached along with an excerpt from the 5/13/14 AC draft minutes.
The subcommittee examining maternity leave policy in relation to tenure (see Motion 1) recommended explicitly adding release from service responsibilities to the existing release from teaching. Furthermore, the current Handbook language describing "maternity disability leave" is inconsistent with the updated maternity leave policy detailed in the Benefits Plan Overview (BPO). This proposal removes the inconsistent language while adding the recommended reference to service. Excerpts from the subcommittee report on maternity leave and the draft minutes of 5/13/14 are attached.
MEMORANDUM
Faculty Salary Committee
Fairfield University

TO: Marti LoMonaco, Chair, Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees

FROM: Irene Mulvey, Chair, Faculty Salary Committee

DATE: June 2, 2014

RE: Reports to the trustees

The University community learned in The Fairfield Mirror (Week of April 23, 2014 edition, Editor’s Note on page 4) that minutes and notes from Board of Trustees’ meetings are easily accessible online. The Faculty Salary Committee (FSC) reviewed the reports in those Board notes and minutes that concerned the work of the FSC, and we are writing to correct some factual mistakes, but more importantly to object to misleading accounts of our work which appear designed to promote an unhealthy “us versus them” mentality. We would like the Conference Committee to convey our concerns to the Board of Trustees.

The Faculty Salary Committee worked in good faith all year long – our weekly meetings were difficult but always collegial. We explained our positions and tried to understand the administration’s positions in an attempt to reach common ground. We wrote detailed memos to the administration on our positions and on the justification for our positions, we reported to the General Faculty at 4 or 5 General Faculty meetings, and the minutes of those meeting, including our handouts and our detailed reports, are accessible online to anyone who wishes to read them. We worked with honesty and openness. It was a difficult year, but we thought we made good progress building the respect and trust that is essential to shared governance. The reports made by senior administrators to the Board (which are typically not accessible to us) are not an accurate representation of our work with the administration; in some cases those reports appear to be an attempt to pit the trustees against the faculty. It is unfair to the FSC, and by extension the faculty, to misrepresent our work and our positions, and we think the trustees should be concerned about reports that are misleading. Below, we respond to the reports we read.

Excerpt of Executive Committee Meeting Notes – November 13, 2013
“Open enrollment [for the switch of health insurance carrier from Anthem to Aetna] runs the month of November. All employees were sent information to their home address and ten open enrollment meetings are being offered on campus. The change in coverage will take effect on January 1 and each employee will receive a salary increase of $1,480 at this time to cover the premium rate increase.”

Response.
The $1,480 offset into base salary had nothing to do with the switch of insurance carrier from Anthem to Aetna. The $1,480 offset into base salary was agreed to last year because faculty voted, on the recommendation of the FSC to approve more than doubling their share of health insurance premiums from 10% to 20%. Moreover, the $1,480 offset into the base did not “cover the premium rate increase” and was never intended to cover the premium rate increase. This report to the Board is factually incorrect and remarkably incomplete in that it does not give the faculty credit for the enormous sacrifice they agreed to in May 2013.
Executive Committee Meeting Notes – January 22, 2014 (conference call)

FACULTY COMPENSATION DISCUSSIONS

K. Lawlor reported that weekly meetings have been occurring over the past month with the Faculty Salary Committee (FSC) and the FSC recently provided their own proposal. Mercer, the consulting firm assisting the University with the analysis of our health care benefits, has been furnishing possible scenarios which incorporate the escalating costs and trends of healthcare. Based on these findings, a comprehensive offer will be presented to the FSC next week which will include proposed salary increases, some changes in the retirement contribution structure, and changes to the plan designs for health insurance. Following last year’s shift in the cost-share for premiums, these plan design changes will be the most dramatic changes proposed in years. We are hopeful that a three-year agreement with the faculty can be achieved that will fit within the budget and support the strategic planning process and outcomes. K. Lawlor and M. Reed recently conducted a conference call with the same ad hoc committee of Trustees that was established last year to discuss faculty compensation issues with the administration. Additional calls will take place over the coming weeks.

Executive Committee Meeting Notes – February 19, 2014 (conference call)

FACULTY COMPENSATION DISCUSSIONS

K. Lawlor reported that meetings have been held with the Faculty Salary Committee (FSC) over the past several months with proposals being shared by both sides. Mercer recently provided a refreshed healthcare benchmark which notes we are spending significantly more on health care expenses compared to comparable institutions. The University would like to implement design changes within the agreement which can be supportive throughout the coming years. Focus will be on areas where consumerism can take hold in order to bend and slow the cost growth curve. K. Lawlor believes negotiations may become more tense over the next few weeks with faculty representatives testing the resolve of the senior administration.

Response.

In fact, faculty had been offering to work together to find ways to address our shared concern about the growth in health care costs for over a year. In April 2013, at the administration’s request, we set up an ad hoc committee to work with the administration on changes to plan design, but the group was underused, to put it mildly. When plan design changes were proposed by the administration, they were proposed unilaterally by the administration’s consultant. The FSC found that the consultant’s changes did not meet even the administration’s own criteria to slow the growth in cost or change behavior. To suggest that the faculty representatives would be “testing the resolve of the senior administration” when we were working as hard as we could, and with surprising difficulty, to understand what the administration’s objectives were so that we could try to find ways to move forward together is to suggest we were disingenuous in our work. The effect of this deliberate misrepresentation by the administration to the Board unfairly undermines the faculty. To misrepresent the faculty in a setting to which the faculty do not have access is deceptive.

Executive and Finance & Audit Committees Meeting Notes – March 10, 2014

FACULTY SALARY COMMITTEE

K. Lawlor reported that discussions remain ongoing with the Faculty Salary Committee (FSC). The FSC continues their stance on resisting any healthcare plan design changes and request caps on the growth in annual contribution rates. However, the administration is determined to bend the curve on the escalation of healthcare costs. Therefore, any settlement must include design changes. Since it may take a while for the FSC to accept this shift, K. Lawlor believes faculty will continue to test the senior administration over the coming
weeks or months. Trustees noted the importance to communicate effectively and as much as possible with the full faculty.

**Response.**
It is stunning to read that on March 10, Executive Vice President Lawlor asserted that the “FSC continues their stance on resisting any healthcare plan design changes” because in a memo from the FSC to the EVP on March 7, we wrote,

> As you know, at the last General Faculty meeting on 2/21, the General Faculty unanimously passed a motion supporting the creation of the [permanent] committee that will be vitally important in allowing us to work together addressing our shared goal of containing medical cost escalation – surveying robust data and making thoughtful data-driven changes. The Faculty Salary Committee can convene this committee immediately, or as soon as the administration is prepared to meet. In addition, our presentation to the General Faculty started the important process of educating the faculty on the administration’s concerns regarding medical escalation, and we can continue to do so through this committee.

Executive Vice President Lawlor’s assertion to the trustees that “faculty will continue to test the senior administration” is a complete misrepresentation of the faculty to the Board, and one that seems intended to inculcate an “us versus them” mentality which is the antithesis of the respect that is essential for the kind of genuine shared governance that engenders academic excellence.

CC:
Jeffrey von Arx, S.J., President
Academic Council
Date: September 1, 2014
To: Academic Council
From: Susan Rakowitz, General Faculty Secretary
Re: Academic Council Meetings and Roster

**Meeting Dates for 2013-2014**

According to the *Faculty Handbook*,

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

Rather than meeting on Easter Monday, I propose moving the April meeting to April 13. Because the first meeting in May is after classes end, I propose moving the May meeting to 4/27. These changes will need to be approved by the Academic Council. With that in mind, here are the meeting dates for 2014-2015. Note that the Council always has the right to add meeting dates if necessary, and in recent years has added 2 or 3 meetings (most often by recessing and reconvening) per year. Given that recent history, it would be very helpful if members try to avoid filling up Monday afternoons later in the month, at least until we've had that month's regularly scheduled meeting.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September 8, 2014</th>
<th>February 2, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 6, 2014</td>
<td>March 2, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 3, 2014</td>
<td>April 13, 2015 (needs approval)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1, 2014</td>
<td>April 27, 2015 (needs approval)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shannon Harding: Behavioral and Social Sciences 2015
Elizabeth Petrino: Humanities 2015
Martin Nguyen: Humanities 2015
John Thiel: Humanities 2015
Irene Mulvey: Arts and Sciences at large 2015
Kraig Steffen: NaturalScience/Mathematics/Engineering 2015
Alison Kris*: School of Nursing 2015
Dolan School of Business 2015
Joe Dennin: NaturalScience/Mathematics/Engineering 2015
David Crawford: Behavioral and Social Sciences 2016
Bob Epstein**: Arts and Sciences at large 2016
Mousumi Bhattacharya: Dolan School of Business 2016
Emily Smith: Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions 2016
Amalia Rusu: Arts and Sciences at large 2016
Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions 2016
Deb Strauss: Dolan School of Business 2016
Jo Yarrington: Arts and Sciences at large 2016
Lynn Babington: Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs 2015
James Simon: Dean, College of Arts and Sciences 2015
Meredith Kazer: Dean, School of Nursing 2015
Don Gibson: Dean, Dolan School of Business 2015
Bruce Berdanier: Dean, School of Engineering 2014
Robert Hannafin: Dean, Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions 2016
Susan Rakowitz: Secretary of the General Faculty 2015

**Chair:**

**Executive Secretary:**

*Fall 2014 replaced by
**2014-2015 replaced by
Taking Minutes of Academic Council Meetings

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. The Faculty Handbook specifies that “the Recording Secretary shall be responsible for the preparation of the minutes in consultation with the Executive Secretary.” Minutes should be prepared as soon as possible after the meeting, ideally within one week. The minutes should be clearly labeled as draft minutes, and forwarded to the Council’s Executive Secretary. The Recording Secretary is not responsible for distributing the minutes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR A FACULTY MISSION STATEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Council Subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Draft -- June 12, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subcommittee membership: Steve Bayne, Gayle Bogel, Rosemary Danaher, Christine Earls, Paul Fitzgerald, S.J., Rosemarie Gorman, Faith Hunt, Laura Marciano, Kathryn Nantz (Chair), Terry Quell.

The following points define principles upon which decisions about faculty appointments of all types will be based:

1. Deploy all members of the teaching faculty judiciously with the objective of maintaining and improving upon the quality of student learning and educational experiences in alignment with Fairfield University’s institutional mission.

2. Provide stability in employment and in work life for all University faculty members, along with the possibility for upward mobility and professional advancement through various appropriate job categories or ranks.

3. Provide access to due-process protections and an appeal process for non-reappointment to all faculty. Faculty appointments will be made in a timely manner before the start of the academic semester and will clearly state the longest possible term of employment.

4. Create a bi-directional climate of clear and transparent commitment between all faculty members and the institution. The nature of this commitment may differ across faculty cohorts, but its conditions must be clearly articulated and understood by all parties.

5. As an institutional priority, cultivate a culture of respect for all faculty on campus, regardless of their contractual status.

6. As an institutional priority, share information consistently across departments, programs, and schools, to include students, faculty, appropriate staff, and administrators.

7. Compensate all faculty work fairly, based on documented and available guidelines regardless of the type of faculty position or length of contract. Contractual obligations for any faculty member will be clearly articulated, with compensation attached to these obligations. The university will strive for consistency between job descriptions and the actual teaching responsibilities.

8. Provide all faculty with access to appropriate formative assessment and summative evaluation of their work performance, as well as to mentoring of both formal and informal sorts. Such evaluations will include input from students and from peers and from administrators.

9. Provide all faculty with access to the shared governance structure.

10. Provide all faculty with access to faculty development resources appropriate to their job descriptions and teaching responsibilities. Specific training and development needs are met using on and off campus resources.


Memo

To: Academic Council
From: Mark Scalese, SJ
Educational Technologies Committee
Date: April 24, 2014
Re: Restructuring of ex officio membership in Faculty Handbook

In light of the motion from the Academic Council in May 2013 (below), the Educational Technologies Committee proposes a restructuring of its ex officio membership in the Faculty Handbook.

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

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

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

**Explanations:**
1. Because neither University College nor its Director of Distance Education no longer function at the university, that *ex officio* position has been eliminated.
2. The Director of Computing and Network Services has been replaced by the Chief Information Officer.
3. The Director of Administrative Computing has been replaced by the Director of Academic Computing.
4. The position for the University Librarian (or designee) has been retained.
5. The position for the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (or designee) has been added. This is at the request of the SVPAA’s office, because a member of that office is in charge of assessment and is the primary liaison between Academic Affairs, ITS and the Registrar’s Office -- all of which concern the ETC in some way. Thus, with the elimination of one position and the addition of another, the number of *ex officio* seats on the committee will remain the same.
Relevant Committee Minutes:

From ETC meeting on February 19, 2014

Item 3. Propose amended language for committee ex-officio membership
Chair Scalese stated that this is work from September. We need to change the language in the faculty handbook for this committee, in particular the ex-officio membership, to account for changes like Computing and Network services (CNS) reorganizing into Information Technology Services (ITS).

The current membership reads:

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

Director of Library Services:
The committee decided to replace “Director of Library Services” with “University Librarian or designee.” Joan Overfield had pointed out that the older language stemmed from the days when James Estrada was both “Vice President” and “University Librarian.”

Director of Distance Education for University College:
Aaron Perkus stated that he is currently Director of Distance Education for College of Arts & Sciences. Janice Dunn was Director of Distance Education for University College; but her position was eliminated. Aaron Perkus said that each college may want to handle their own online education. In addition, there is a role of online education for the 2020 launch. Dr. Salafia asked Aaron Perkus if there is a reason he needs to be here, in this position or his regular position as the Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Dr. Vinekar said that if an ex-officio position is created for the Director of Distance Education for the College of Arts & Sciences, then each school may want a similar ex-officio position. Aaron Perkus said that that is handled through the faculty positions on the committee. The committee decided that the faculty on the committee can represent their College and Schools, and this position needs to be eliminated.

Director of Administrative Computing:
Jay Rozgonyi said that this title is from when Administrative Computing was run separately by SunGard and Ellucian. Now it’s part of ITS; headed by Russ Batista. Jay Rozgonyi represents Academic Computing. Christine Siegel added that the registrar’s office, degree auditing, classroom scheduling, etc. is administrative computing. If there is a specific topic, we can invite Russ. It’s not good use of his time go be on all the meetings. Jay Rozgonyi stated that can answer basic questions about administrative
computing now. Christine Siegel said that Jay could point out when Russ needs to come.
Chair Scalese indicated that the titles that need to be added are Chief Information Officer (CIO) and Director of Academic Computing (DAC). Ron Salafia said we should reword this as “University Librarian or designee, Chief Information Officer, and Directors of Academic Computing and Media Center shall be ex-officio members” so that we do not repeat the word ‘director’.

**New ex-officio position for Academic Affairs:**
Christine Siegel stated that she is the primary liaison between Academic Affairs, ITS and the Registrar’s Office. Professor Scalese asked about the language for this. When Paul leaves, might there be another configuration? Christine Siegel replied that they want a representative from Academic Affairs.
Chair Scalese then asked whether the ex-officio members should have voting rights.
Joan Overfield stated that her understanding is that the ex-officio members work in tech related areas, and might have some knowledge that might be helpful to the committee in terms of academics. They are here to share what they know, not to push decisions.

**Motion:** Replace the current ex-officio membership with: “The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs or designee, the University Librarian or designee, the Chief Information Officer, and the Directors of Academic Computing and the Media Center shall be ex-officio members.”
The motion was moved by Ron Salafia, and seconded by Jackie Conelius. Motion passed unanimously

---

**From meeting on March 12, 2014**

- **Revisiting the revised membership rules in the Faculty Handbook:**
  Mark reminded us about a motion the AC had passed in May 2013, which we had not considered in our revision of membership rules for the ETC. "In light of the recent administrative restructuring of information technology services at Fairfield, we recommend that, in the Fall of 2013, the Educational Technologies Committee propose restructuring its ex officio membership. The proposal should add the newly created Chief Information Officer as an ex officio position and decrease the total number of ex officio seats." The last part of that motion: “… decrease the total number of ex officio seats" had not been taken into consideration in our deliberations during the February 19th meeting.

  After reviewing the changes we had made to update membership, it turned out that we actually had eliminated one member, the “Director of Distance Education for University College,” but had added a new ex-officio position, the “Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs or designee.” Thus the total number of ex officio members remains the same.
Description and rationale for the change  
(see attached curriculum)

The members of the Bachelor of Professional Studies Steering Committee, under the directorship of Maggie Wills and the guiding leadership of Dean Aaron Perkus, have proposed changing the name of the BPS program to the Bachelor of Liberal Studies (BLS) pending approval. Our curriculum will remain unchanged. Based on researching the title used for programs similar to ours, we determined that BLS and BPS designations are both used interchangeably for similarly configured programs of study. Considering the descriptions of both types of programs on the internet, we understand that “Liberal Studies” best aligns with the goals of our program and our University mission of whole-person education. Specifically, programs designated “Professional Studies” can be inclusive of curricula that develop trades such as “electrician” and “plumber,” or more vocational in nature. In our substantive discussion to develop a statement for the BPS program which highlights our rich humanistic core, reflective work, individualized and flexible nature, we determined the BLS designation best aligns with our mission.

Relationship of the change to approved programs

Changing the name of our program will not affect other existing programs, but it may help faculty advisors better articulate the reasons why a student might choose to pursue a Bachelor of Liberal Studies. The students who come to the BPS major are fairly evenly divided. First, there are returning students most of whom work full-time or part-time. They have previously earned college credits at other institutions and/or at Fairfield University and have the goal of completing their undergraduate degree with the greatest possibly flexibility to consider their life circumstances and honor their transferable credits in the core and elective requirements of the BPS program, as well as allowing for a flexible design in determining the major courses that best suit their career and life needs. We suggest the spirit of “Liberal Studies” speaks to greater flexibility in coursework than does the name “Professional Studies.” Second, there are individual students at Fairfield University who determine that their current program of study is one in which they cannot succeed given the particular requirements for completion and/or they have amassed credits but determined their current major and required coursework does not align with their goals. They still wish to graduate with a degree from Fairfield University, and the BPS program therefore serves as a great retention tool and means for their academic success. We believe the Bachelor of Liberal Studies designation will prove a more transparent name for faculty advisors in programs and majors outside of the BPS program, and for interested students who investigate the program and what is has to offer. Our faculty is versed in the curriculum of the recently approved “Masters of Liberal Studies” program which, though not currently active, retains State approval. With its broad humanistic core, an undergraduate program in Liberal Studies aligns well with the intention of the MLS program and its curriculum, as well as aligning with University mission of whole person education.

Background for the change (history)

In 3/2/2012, the Motion passed by the General Faculty regarding the closure of University College (UC) had policy recommendations for part-time students. Among their recommendations was that the Bachelor of Professional Studies program degree from University College be retained and offered by and housed in the College of Arts and Sciences and governed by a faculty steering committee. That faculty
steering committee was convened in the spring of 2012 at which point Dr. Maggie Wills was voted in as program director to work with the other steering committee members including Dr. Aaron Perkus, Associate Dean in the CAS and former Dean of UC, and professors Dorothea Braginsky (Ph.D., Psychology), Rose Rodrigues (Ph.D. Sociology), Roxanna Walker-Canton (Ph.D., Film, Television & Media) and David Sapp (Ph.D., English). In the second year of the steering committee work related to the BPS program, professors Canton and Sapp left the committee to assume new appointments, and Ryan Drake (Ph.D., Philosophy) and Mark Ligas (Ph.D., Marketing) joined the steering committee. As of January 2014, the BPS steering committee held a one-day workshop to take up the charge of beginning the program review process. Subsequent to a brainstorming session and substantive discussion for developing a BPS mission statement, Dean Perkus suggested taking up a consideration of the program name. At that point, the committee members began a productive initial consideration of what such a change would mean for our internal and external constituents. The item was then tabled in order to move through the rest of the day’s agenda. At our February BPS committee meeting, as part of our continued program review dialogue, we engaged in thoughtful conversation about the value of renaming the program to a Bachelor of Liberal Studies. We found good reason to move forward with the proposed name change and subsequent to our meeting and a unanimous vote to change the name of the program from the BPS to the BLS, the director sought the protocol for a name change from the dean’s office in the College. We were informed by Associate Dean Manyul Im that a program name change is largely the purview of the program and as such the rationale and minutes of approval from the program should be routed to the program, the College Curriculum Committee Chair, and with approval, pass on the notification to the Dean of the College and the AC. We did so and the College Curriculum Chair, Dr. John Miecznikowski, found that we had done due diligence. We then sent notification to the Dean who directed some concerns to the SVPAA’s office via Dr. Mary Frances Malone, Associate VP for Academic Affairs. Dr. Malone then reached out to the State, to OHE, and in dialogue with your office determined that because the requirements of the program will remain the same, the name change should be moved to the State for approval. At Dr. Malone’s directive, I then reached out to Academic Council for final approval before submitting the current document to the OHE.

BPS COMMITTEE MEETING
February 19, 2014

In attendance: Dorothea Braginsky, Ryan Drake, Mark Ligas, Aaron Perkus, Rose Rodrigues, Maggie Wills, Sandy Richardson

- Dorothea motioned to approve the name change to Bachelor of Liberal Studies; Ryan seconded the motion. Brief discussion ensued as far as the pathway to this decision:

  - The committee had begun a conversation on the merits of changing to a “Bachelor of Liberal Studies” at our January Program Review Workshop. At the workshop, we were divided with some arguing for marketing efforts, the idea of “professional” would seem attractive to working individuals seeking degree completion and that given the option to take courses in our professional programs on campus, the name seemed apropos. Others argued “liberal studies” better captures the coursework taken by BPS majors in its holistic approach to the curriculum.
Post-workshop, Maggie had circulated an email (excerpted below) to continue the conversation in advance of our next scheduled committee meeting.

From: Wills, Margaret  
Sent: Wednesday, January 22, 2014 3:09 PM  
To: Perkus, Aaron; Rodrigues, Rose; Braginsky, Dorothea; Ligas, Mark; Drake, Ryan  
Cc: Wills, Margaret  
Subject: thoughts on program name change

The more I have pondered our name, the more I align with a change to Liberal Studies. Because I’ve always thought of the name in terms of our adult learner population, the name appealed to me – working professionals getting a degree. My initial reaction to a name change was wondering why we’d change a name that seems to make sense. However, Rose’s point about the name sounding vocational, and a subsequent online search of the public understanding of a BPS degree confirmed the vocational connotation. In talking today with a colleague whose son is interested in the BPS major, I mentioned our considering a name change to Liberal Studies. She said it really made sense to her—more sense than the BPS which “sounds vocational.” Importantly, then, a name change may help those both on and off campus have a clearer sense of the nature of this particular major as well as aligning with our developing mission statement in the process of program review. As the BPS director, usually the very first question I get from colleagues who see the name plate on my office door is, “What’s the Bachelor of Prof. Studies anyway?” In seeking approval to change the program name, we can argue that the change to “Liberal Studies” will likely prove more transparent for individuals outside of the steering committee as this designation better aligns with the core curriculum and University mission.

• The consensus among the group was to approve the new name.

• Aaron suggested an email blast to notify students of the name change and to give current students the option to stay with Bachelor of Professional Studies or change to Bachelor of Liberal Studies.

• Maggie was charged with determining the next steps in proposing the official program name change.