Faculty Members Present: Professors Mousumi Bhattacharya, Mike Cavanaugh, David Crawford, Joe Dennin, Donald Greenberg, Shannon Harding, Alison Kris, Irene Mulvey (Executive Secretary), Martin Nguyen, Elizabeth Petrino, Rona Preli (Chair), Susan Rakowitz (Secretary of the General Faculty), Amalia Rusu, Emily Smith, Kraig Steffen, Debra Strauss, John Thiel, Jo Yarrington

Administrators: SVPAA Lynn Babington, Deans Bruce Berdanier, Meredith Kazer, Don Gibson, James Simon

Student Observer: Jason Abate

Regrets: Bob Hannafin, GSEAP Dean

Invited Presenters: Michael White (6a.), David Zera (7.b), Anne Campbell (7.b)

Prof. Preli as Chair called the meeting to order at 3:30 PM., and announced that this meeting had been scheduled for February 2nd when the University was closed due to inclement weather.

1. Presidential Courtesy
In her presentation for the Presidential Courtesy, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs Babington discussed the current admissions statistics and gave an overview on the status of the administrative and faculty job searches and subsequent hires. Updates from Admissions for next year included the breakdown of percentages from Admissions and the demographics. The total number of applications was 10,711, up 9.2% from last year. 20.2% were students of color, 40% were males and 60% were females. Students selecting Test Optional were 29%, up 2% from last year. Early decision were 135, up from 99 last year. Early action applications totaled 5,545, with 28% test optional.

For the University hires, most of the tenure track searches are complete. This includes the searches for Chemistry, Economics, History, Psychology, Marketing, Information Systems & Operations Management, Software Engineer and Computer Engineer). Administration hires include Peter Van Heerden as Director of the Quick Center and Dr. Linda Wolk-Simo as Director of the Bellarmine Museum of Art. The search for the next Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences is still ongoing. Three candidates were brought to campus and references are being checked. At present, there is no consensus among the various groups who met with the three candidates.

This year the number and quality of speakers and programs on campus have been exceptional. In addition the water focus for the University has been extremely successful this year, largely due to Jo Yarrington’s leadership and the collective work of the University Theme Steering committee, Co-Facilitators, Professor Pat Poli and Lori Jones, Assistant Director, Programming and Audience Development.
The budget process is now underway and is based on 975 freshmen with a 2.5% tuition increase. There are goals for moderate targeted growth in the graduate programs. These goals include increasing current use gifts (development and endowment funds) and decreasing the University contribution to both the Quick Center and Athletics (corporate sponsorship etc.).

For Fairfield 2020, the Steering Committee is vetting all of the recommendations from the various task forces and will be putting together priorities for implementation. High on the list is a program to incentivize innovation and hire on-line expertise. Also prioritized is providing support and development for faculty, IT infrastructure support and a clear process for developing new programs.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty
   No report.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
   a. Approval of minutes of AC meetings
      
      **MOVED TO APPROVE [Greenberg/Crawford]** minutes of November 10
      APPROVED 16 in favor; 0 opposed; 2 abstentions
      Corrections: pg 4, second page of minutes, halfway down, cap I, delete

      **MOVED TO APPROVE [Rusu/Steffen]** minutes of December 1
      APPROVED 15 in favor; 0 opposed; 2 abstentions
      Corrections: page 10, Petrino present

   b. Correspondence
      i. Excerpt of memo from GFS to President dated 1/6/15 regarding proposed HB amendment
      ii. Email response from President to GFS dated 1/8/2015
         Prof. Mulvey noted that this response will be discussed under item 6 b.

4. Council Subcommittee Reports
   No Subcommittee reports

5. Petition for Immediate Hearing
   None

6. Old Business
   a. **MFA in Creative Writing, Five-Year-Review**
      Prof. White, Director of the Low-Residency Writing MFA Program since 2008 (6.5 years) provided a brief overview of the five-year review included in the packet for today's meeting. Highlighted were student demographics and the challenges presented by new low-residency MFA programs such as increased competition and flattened enrollment. Also articulated were strategies to address enrollment, such as developing a good marketing plan and scholarship incentives. Also being considered were undergraduate students who could qualify the last semester of their senior year. Last summer, a summer writer’s conference was introduced which ran concurrently with Program and which, in effect, encouraged people to come to the residency. In the works are a health and healing conference, now being considered for 2016.
Prof. White is stepping down as Director and Sonya Huber and Bill Patrick, an adjunct, will be co-directors. There will be a change in the application review process (originally 1/Director to 3 on the review committee).

Prof. Preli opened the floor for informational questions.

Prof. Harding asked about enrollment and how that might be impacted by tuition increases. Prof. White responded that the number of low-residency MFA Programs nationally has tripled which has called for innovative strategies. He mentioned that they hope to reach out to contacts in China to explore that market. He noted that the enrollment peak was 77 and is now at 45.

Dean Simon mentioned during the discussion of revenue streams that the MFA Program brought in $5,000 for Programming on the undergraduate level. Prof. White acknowledged that the MFA faculty was helpful in growing the program.

Prof. Petrino mentioned that many MFA grads are currently teaching as adjuncts in the English department. Prof. White mentioned that Prof. Gannett was especially helpful in preparing the MFA faculty to address adjuncting.

Prof. Dennin asked about MFA and job access. Prof. White says honing craft, a background in theory as well as publishing, help MFAs prepare for the job market.

Dean Kazer shared her experience in Fairfield’s low-residency MFA Program and highlighted the productive intensity of the residency including the immersion with other students as well as the benefits of the continued mentoring. Prof. White says initially there was fear of not having enough oversight. However the reality was that turned out to be a strength of the Program; he highlighted exceptional community bonding and continued peer and faculty contact for many years.

Prof. Dennin asked about the revenue expense statement. In response to Prof. Dennin's question, Prof. White agreed to send budget info to the AC following the meeting.

**MOTION [Babington/Petrino]: To accept the 5 year review of the MFA program.**

Discussion: Prof. Dennin asked for the revenue/expense statement. Executive Secretary Mulvey apologized for not making sure it was included. Prof. Dennin asked if the Program was making money. SVPAA Bablington stated that it was a “solid program”. Prof. Smith asked if we are tapping our alumni. Dean Simon stated that less than 20% of students in the program are alumni. What has made it an attractive program is its proximity to prominent urban hubs.

**MOTION PASSED 18 in favor: 0 opposed; 0 abstentions (carries unanimously)**

**MOTION [Steffen/Dennin]: to reorder agenda**

**MOTION PASSED 18 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions**
b. Discussion of AC approved amendment to the Faculty Handbook for Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty Secretary Rakowitz stated that the President disagreed with the HB amendment as passed by the AC and recommended the following changes to the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty’s charge (see Correspondence in the packet for today’s meeting):

**From:** To study and make recommendations on the employment conditions of Non-Tenure Track Faculty  
**To:** To study and make recommendations on Non-Tenure Track Faculty

SVPAA Babington stated that that word “employment” limited the expansiveness of the committee. Prof. Thiel states that the language we put forward was good. SVPAA Babington stated previously that she thought the President would have little concern but seeing his suggested changes now thinks that the employment conditions as noted is very limiting. It involves all sorts of issues and concerns. Prof. Thiel stated we could not accept the President’s language because it was not grammatical. The "study and recommendations" have to target something. Prof. Thiel suggested we could do one of two things, either put our language forward and then be turned down or collaborate on appropriate language. AC Chair Preli asked if there was any further discussion. Prof. Crawford asked about making a motion concerning the language.

**MOTION [Thiel/Mulvey]:** revise the language to read: to study and make recommendations on all issues regarding non-tenure track faculty.

**MOTION [Mulvey/Steffen]:** amend the pending motion to delete the word “all”.

**Discussion on Amendment:** Prof. Dennin asked if the wording means “all issues” or just what the committee decides to take up. Executive Secretary Mulvey stated that for instance the Salary Committee approved adjunct salary increases earlier this year and she would not have wanted to be required to have this committee also approve. She said she would hate to see us move forward with something ambiguous. Prof. Thiel states the wording does not imply that the committee has to adjudicate on these issues, that it’s not necessarily a funnel. Their charge is to study an issue and make recommendations. Prof. Steffen: if we delete “all”, if we just say “on issues”, that would leave it open to any issue that might come up. It might alleviate the fuzziness. Prof. Thiel thinks the President is concerned about the wording “employment conditions” because it’s not legal language. It might be good language, but the new wording is inclusive and does not necessarily alleviate the discussion of employment. Prof. Dennin mentions that this issue would have to be studied by the committee. Prof. Greenberg states that the committee can makes recommendations to Academic Council and the body can reject any recommendations they make. It does not HAVE to go to this committee.

Chair Preli asked that the members speak for or against the current motion or vote to amend.
Executive Secretary Mulvey speaks in favor of the motion because it does not include “all”. Prof. Greenberg speaks against the amendment stating that this could give a loophole to administration trying to short circuit an appropriate faculty issues. Faculty Secretary Rakowitz speaks against the amendment because the ambiguity is there anyway. She states that the same ambiguity is in the former language. Executive Secretary Mulvey does not understand Greenberg’s objections. Prof. Crawford does not see where the discussion is going since we were originally trying to clarify the language. He states that if you are making recommendations then how could the committee be precluded from doing that. Prof. Steffen states that he feels from the initial language to the present, the language opens up. He is for the amendment. Prof. Nguyen is in favor for the motion and thinks that the language clears up the ambiguity.

**MOTION TO AMEND PASSED:** 17 in favor; 1 opposed; 0 abstentions

**MOTION (as amended) PASSED** 18 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions

7. New Business

7a. Elect faculty representatives to Fairfield 2020 Steering Committee (reordered)

The President asked the Council to send forward names to address the three openings on the 2020 Steering Committee. Current faculty members elected by the Council and appointed by the President are Profs. Lakeland, Preli, Rafalski and Williams. Prof. Greenberg asked for the number of names we should send forward. Prof. Mulvey suggested 3.

**MOTION [Dennin/Greenberg] to send the President four nominees for the three openings**

Executive Secretary Mulvey opposes the motion, on principle, because she does not think the President should have veto power here. These are faculty representatives and the faculty should choose their representatives without interference by the President. Prof. Dennin mentioned that 4 gives the president some options, but not too much. Prof. Greenberg supports the motion because this is not a democratic institution.

**MOTION PASSED** 11 in favor; 2 opposed; 4 abstentions

GFS Rakowitz provided the names of the volunteers and ran an election. The AC selected Profs. Terry-Ann Jones, Elizabeth Petrino, Amalia Rusu and Glenn Sauer.

7b. New Program Proposal: C.A.S. Reading and Language Development

Prof. Zera and Prof. Campbell provided a brief overview of the proposal that was in the material for today's meeting.

**Discussion:** Prof. Dennin had several questions such as will Prof. Zera and others (Profs. Campbell and Gillis plus adjuncts) oversee courses? He also wondered if a CAS elective
component was in the program. If so, will they get rid of electives they currently have? Prof. Dennin continued by following up on the budget. Pages 25 and 29 make projections based on candidates taking 8 courses a year, but wouldn’t they only take 6 courses a year? The presenters agreed that those numbers are wrong. The 3rd paragraph on page 29 states how the program will assess what is needed for the appropriate number of candidates. This program needs 15 to run, 10 are provided now. The fellowship money is guaranteed. This opportunity also would be open to part-time students. The ultimate goal would be 25 students. Page 23, the last paragraph gives contextual information on how collaborative partnerships will give the scope and is part of a grant initiative. Prof. Harding mentioned that the information on the courses is really, really short and where are the syllabi of the courses that will be offered? GFS Rakowitz answered that the courses are posted on the website. Prof. Crawford wondered about sunsetting if the grants don’t come through. Prof. Zera responded that the reason this is fuzzy, is they currently have 10, but will need 5 with some PT circulating through. At 3 years he states they intend to do a comprehensive evaluation and see if this program is viable. Prof. Zera also mentioned that there is new dyslexia legislation that is coming out, in part due to the Governor’s personal background. Prof. Dennin asked if there are other programs in the state with whom Fairfield will be in competition. Prof. Zera mentioned that there are 8 dyslexia Programs in the country so the Fairfield Program will definitely go for IDA recognition.

Chair Preli requests to move to approve the CAS proposal. Prof. Dennin finds the budget totally inaccurate. He notes that the programs are short about $40,000. Prof. Crawford was going to make this same comment on the MFA Program and wondered how we can truly assess the revenue and costs accurately. He wonders how do we talk about revenue? Prof. Dennin comments on what he considers the dubious market research. He questions what happens when those projected numbers do not show up. However, he continues that the program itself seems reasonable.

**MOVE TO APPROVE [Babington/Strauss]: To approve the Program with a review by AC in three years.**

**Discussion:** SVPAA Babington speaks in favor. She believes it provides us with the opportunity to link well with multiple school districts. Dean Kazer speaks in favor. She is on the EPC and was involved in multiple discussions about the Program. She believes it will give the school an opportunity for expansion with their student population. Prof. Petrino speaks in favor of the motion.

**MOTION PASSED 18 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions**

**MOTION** to adjourn **PASSED** unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jo Yarrington