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

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

Student Observer: Jason Abate

Regrets: Dave Crawford

Invited Presenters: Marti LoMonaco (7.a), Eileen O'Shea (7.c), Shelley Phelan (7.c), Brian Walker (7.c)

1. Presidential courtesy

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

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

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

3. Report from the Executive Secretary

a. Approval of minutes of AC meetings: Minutes of February 2, 2015

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

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

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

b. Correspondence

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

   c. Oral Reports

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Council Subcommittee Reports: None

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

None

6. Old Business

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

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

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

Motion passed unanimously (15-0-0)

Motion 2 (Rakowitz/Greenberg): to approve the following changes to Journal of Record

Delete:

Committee on Continuing Education/University College Committee:

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

Portfolio Assessment in University College:

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

Appendix 16: Policies for the School of Continuing Education Continuing Education Programs
Amend (deletions struck through, additions in bold):

Independent Studies:

The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee recognizes that it can be a valuable educational experience when a conscientious student pursues in depth a personal interest, and is led to a new level of knowledge under the tutelage of a dedicated faculty member.

To ensure the academic quality of such guided study, the Committee has established the following set of requirements:

1. Students may pursue independent study projects
   a. during their junior and/or senior years, or, in the case of University College part-time students, after having completed 45 credits; and...

2. Students, other than those in University College, should apply to the professor under whose direction they wish to study no later than the normal registration time of the preceding semester, or, in the case of University College students during their normal registration period. The professor’s decision to accept a student for independent study will be based on such criteria as the student’s academic maturity and performance record, the professor’s specialty within the discipline, and his or her teaching load...

Assignment of Course Credit in FU Study Abroad Programs:

All Study Abroad programs that award Fairfield University grades for courses must assign credit for those courses according to the following policy.

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

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

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

The process set forth in a., b., and c. shall be initiated by the Office of International Programs University College and repeated every three years. AC: 03/11/2002 Adapted AC: 03/03/2003

Teaching Load:

A normal teaching load for tenured and tenure-track faculty is nine hours per week.
University faculty teaching in University College should be either credited toward their regular teaching load or receive appropriate remuneration for extra service. Full-time faculty members teaching beyond the normal or contracted teaching load shall be compensated as detailed in the Memo of Understanding. AC: 02/12/1973 AC: 02/07/2011 AC: 05/08/2013

Appendix 17: Policies for Part-Time Students

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

Part-time students are required to complete the same core curriculum as full-time students. The only exception is students in the BLS program who have a modified core as follows:

Humanities: Students will take 12 courses, 36 credits:

Classics (optional)

English: 2 courses required: 1 in Composition and 1 in Literature

Visual and Performing Arts: 2 courses required

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

Modern Language (optional)

Philosophy: 1 course required

Religious Studies: 1 course required

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

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

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

Motion passed unanimously (15-0-0)

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

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

Motion (Rakowitz/Smith): to amend the existing JOR section on Student Evaluation of Teaching as follows (insertion in bold):

Every faculty member in every class shall administer the IDEA teaching evaluation form. IDEA evaluations will be done online, with individual faculty members given a unique URL for each course section to distribute to their students. All faculty have the option of using the long form or the short form. For individuals who do not specify which form they wish to use in a class, tenured Full Professors and part-time faculty will default to the short form and all other faculty members will default to the long form.

Prof. Mulvey noted that she did not get the usual response rate for online, it was lower.
Motion passes, 14 in favor, 1 opposed.

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

Pass/Fail Option:

Some courses (e.g., many internships) do not lend themselves to the multiple distinctions made by traditional letter grades. In these cases, a Pass/Fail grade may be used, provided the following criteria are met:

- All students in the course receive a grade of either Pass or Fail.
- The requirements for a Pass grade have been specified in the course syllabus.
- The decision to designate a course Pass/Fail has been approved by the department within which the course is taught and by the curriculum committee of that school.

Furthermore,

- A Pass/Fail course counts as a regular course toward graduation, determining full-time status, etc.
- The grade in a Pass/Fail course is not included in calculating a student’s grade point average but appears in all cases on the student’s transcript.

Passed unanimously (15-0-0).

7. New business

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

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

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

Prof. Greenberg: Faculty unionization efforts

Prof. Steffen: Difficult to change core and to generate consensus.

Prof. Dennin: How the money for 2020 will be spent. Who will have authority?

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

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

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

**Motion (Mulvey/Steffen): The AC endorses the AAUP Statement on Confidentiality and Faculty Representation in Academic Governance**

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

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

c. Proposal for a minor in Health Studies

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

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

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

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

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

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

d. Motion from Rank & Tenure Committee re SOE representation

Moved to next meeting, as presenter needed to leave.

e. Request for clarification of *Faculty Handbook* from EPC (materials in November AC packet).

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

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

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

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

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

Motion to adjourn passes unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Mousumi Bhattacharaya