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

Faculty Members Present: Professors Mousumi Bhattacharya, Mike Cavanaugh, Joe
dennin, Donald Greenberg, Shannon Harding, Dave Crawford, 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,
Amalia Rusu, Deb Strauss.

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

Student Observer: Jason Abate

Regrets: Dean Bruce Berdanier

Invited Presenters: Marti LoMonaco, John Miecznikowski

1. Presidential courtesy

SVVPAA Babington noted that there were many student awards this week. She asked that we
remember to celebrate and congratulate the students.
She said that Clam Jam “went incredibly well.” It was sponsored by the University, and 1500
students bought tickets. “A good time was had by all”.
She reminded faculty to be cognizant of student stress. There have been several severe mental
health issues in the last week.
Fall enrollments are running about the same as last year. There’s an uptick in students in the
College of Arts and Sciences.
We will be celebrating wonderful faculty achievements over the next two weeks, including at the
faculty retirement celebration on May 6.
The first draft of the 2020 strategic plan is being finalized and will go to senior management next
week. It will be vetted by the steering committee.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

GFS Rakowitz noted that the General Faculty approved two handbook amendments, one about a
Handbook Committee on non-tenure-track faculty and one about dissolving the University
College committee. They will go to the Board in June. She reminded the Council that we have
the election meeting on Friday and the retirement reception on May 6th, which follows the
President’s address to the faculty. Presumably we will have an update from the Salary
Committee before then.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
a. Approval of minutes
   i. Motion [Harding/Dennin] to approve the minutes from March 2, 2015
      Passed: 17 - 0 - 1
   ii. Motion [Rusu/Strauss] to approve the minutes from March 30, 2015
       Crawford inserted under regrets. Passed: 15 - 0 - 3

b. No correspondence

c. Oral reports
   i. Executive Secretary Mulvey explained that the JOR calls for us to set two dates
      for emergency summer meetings. The ACEC chose May 27th because faculty are
      still under contract then and may need to be ready to act. Monday, July 13th was
      chosen as the other date.  
      Motion [Steffen Yarrington]: to accept these meeting dates if needed. 
      Prof. Harding expressed a preference for meeting midday if we must meet. Prof. 
      Mulvey will tell us if we are employing these dates and send an agenda. 
      Motion passed: 14 - 0 - 2
   ii. Prof. Mulvey reported that she did contact subcommittees. All want to continue
      their work and get back to us in the fall. Work is continuing.


5. Petitions for immediate hearing: None

6. Old Business

   a. Request for clarification of Faculty Handbook from EPC (materials in 3/30/15 packet on page
      81; discussion took place on 3/2/15).

   This issue is whether minutes of meetings have to be taken by a committee member or can be
   done by administrative staff. Prof. Mulvey suggests that each committee decides how to take
   minutes; this should go in a standard memo already sent to the chairs of each committee at the
   beginning of each year. Mulvey: “The taking of the minutes in a committee meeting is something
   that should be decided by the committee at the beginning of the year. We should remind the chairs of that.”
     
     Motion [Babington/Yarrington]: With the letter sent by the GFS to the chairs of each
     of the Handbook committees at the beginning of the year there should be a
     couple of sentences that indicate that it is up to the individual committee to decide
     who they want to take their minutes, whether faculty or an assigned administrative
     assistant. 
     Passed: 16 - 0 - 2

   b. Proposed revisions to JoR from the Academic Planning Committee on Withdrawal Policy,
      Change of Major, Transfer Credit, and First-Year Midterm Estimates (materials with
      3/30/15 packet on pages 82-83; presentation of material took place on 3/30/15; AC needs
      to decide what action, if any, to take)
Prof. Mulvey said that the proposed withdrawal policy change in the JoR is to switch from meeting with the Dean to meeting with a representative in an Academic Dean’s office or the office of Academic Support and Retention. Our concern was that “representative of the Dean’s office” might be misused. SVPAA Babington said that Ms. Heather Petraglia sent a note wanting to keep the terminology open since staff have different titles across schools. Prof. Rakowitz asked whether we should we insert the word “authorized” before representative and there was general affirmation. Prof. Bhattacharya asked, how do the two offices work? SVPAA Babington said they work together closely.

Motion [Mulvey/Greenberg]: to amend the JOR as follows (deletions struck through, additions in bold):
Withdrawal Policy:
Students who wish to withdraw… To initiate a request to withdraw from a course, a student must complete a Course Withdrawal Form and meet with his/her academic dean an authorized representative of their academic dean’s office or the Office of Academic Support and Retention. A “W” may not be granted after final grades have been submitted except in very rare cases, during which an instructor must file a change of grade form.

Prof. Bhattacharya asked whether it still requires faculty approval on the course withdrawal form or an email approval? Prof. Rakowitz noted that it still says “in consultation with the course instructor.”

Motion passed: 18 - 0 - 0

Motion [Mulvey/Harding]: to amend the JOR as follows (deletions struck through, additions in bold):
Change of Major:
To change from one major to another in one's school requires completion of a 'change of major' form. The form must be signed by the Chairperson/Coordinator of the major in which the student is currently enrolled, the Chairperson/Coordinator of the major which the student desires and the dean of the school an authorized representative of the academic dean's office or the Office of Academic Support and Retention. The form is then forwarded to the University Registrar.

Motion passed: 18 - 0 - 0

Motion [Mulvey/Petrino]: to amend the JOR as follows (deletions struck through, additions in bold):
Transfer Credit:
All transfer credit must be approved by an undergraduate student's academic dean or an authorized representative of the Office of Academic Support and Retention.

Motion passed: 18 - 0 - 0

Motion [Mulvey/Harding]: to amend the JOR as follows (deletions struck through, additions in bold):
First-Year Midterm Estimates:
In order to identify and intervene with first--year students who are struggling in a course or several courses, it will be required that all faculty submit midterm estimates in the fall and spring semesters for their first-year students in danger of receiving a C —, D, or F to the Office of Exploratory Academic Advising Office of Academic Support and Retention. The student, along with the faculty advisor and the appropriate Dean or Director, will be notified.

Motion passed: 18 - 0 - 0

c. Proposed revisions to JoR from the Academic Planning Committee on Academic Probation, Academic Advancement, Academic Dismissal (materials with 3/30/15 packet on pages 84-88; presentation of material took place on 3/30/15)

Prof. Rakowitz noted that the recommendations offer us an option on page 86, of either changing the language on academic advancement or removing it entirely. Prof. Thiel said the revision does not make sense to me. What does “advancing in credits” mean? (Pg. 86.) Prof. Rakowitz explained that the “year” of a student is messy, so the idea is that as you earn credits different things apply. So as you gain credits, you see what applies to you in terms of academic probation. Prof. Preli noted that years are deceptive because students accrue different numbers of credits in a year. The best way to track students is credits. SVPAA Babington, citing Ms. Petraglia noted that we need a policy that works for part time students as well as full time students who are not advancing at the same rate as their peers. We need to update the language so that academic status depends on credits earned not class year. Prof. Harding said that this is confusing because some students have more credits sooner. I find it confusing and problematic to base it on credits. SVPAA Babington explained that students that have the problems are often on a multi-year plan, they might be in year three but they’ve been here seven years, so we need to track them by credits. Prof. Harding said can’t we still define sophomore status by number of credits? I guess I’m not getting it. 29 or fewer credits is the first hurdle, right? People are going to get to that hurdle at different times if they’re taking lab courses. Prof. Thiel said my problem is just with the language. Would it be clearer as “students in earning credits must meet or surpass….“ Is that what it means? Or perhaps “students in continuing to earn credits must meet or surpass….“ We earn credits; we don’t “advance” in credits. Prof. Bhattacharya said that in the earlier version there was a first tier and the bar was 1.80 now it is 29 credits, are they not going to get warnings? Prof. Rakowitz said it’s 29 or fewer credits. The idea is that everyone is treated the same in the first 59 credits, the bar is 1.9; for everyone over 59 credits the requirement is 2.0. Prof. Steffen said that often lab grades are better so if anything we don’t need to worry about Shannon’s point. We will know by 60 credits. Prof. Rakowitz said she was open to removing the section on academic advancement, and that would take care of the language issues. The relevant point is made elsewhere. Prof. Mulvey said, if we went that way, if students are not on probation and not getting dismissed, they are advancing. Dean Simon said that the key thing is in third paragraph. We need a reference for summer since the other language does not take this into account and they could fail several classes in summer. This point is elsewhere, so removing this section is fine.

Motion [Rakowitz /Greenberg]: to amend the JOR as follows (deletions struck through, additions in bold):

Academic Advancement:

For academic advancement from year to year in good standing, it is not enough that the
student pass all courses; in addition, he or she must maintain a quality standard that is computed from grade points. The number of grade points earned by each grade is explained [under Definition of Academic Grades] (e.g., A earns 4 grade points; A– earns 3.67, etc.)

To be eligible for graduation, a Fairfield student must have an overall Grade Point Average (GPA) of 2.0 or better at the conclusion of the senior year. To progress towards satisfaction of that requirement, students advancing from the first year to the sophomore year are expected to have weighted cumulative GPA of 1.80 or better. By the start of the junior year, students are expected to have a weighted cumulative GPA of 1.90 or better. Finally, in advancing to the senior year, students should have an overall cumulative GPA of 2.0 or better.

Although students who do not meet the foregoing standards will be permitted to continue their studies at Fairfield University, they will be notified that they are not advancing satisfactorily. Furthermore, they will be warned that they are in jeopardy of not graduating with their class. In addition, they are strongly encouraged to enroll in summer courses or winter intercession courses at Fairfield University in order to improve their GPA.

Students in the School of Nursing must meet University promotion policy requirements. In addition, to remain in the nursing major students must meet promotion policy requirements established by the School of Nursing. These are available in the School of Nursing Office.

Academic Probation:

Academic records will be formally reviewed at the end of the fall, spring, and summer terms. Students who do not meet the stated requirements will be placed on Academic Probation. The purpose of academic probation is to alert the student and the institution to the problems associated with the student’s academic performance and to recommend or implement strategies for improvement. The continuation of poor academic performance will result in the dismissal of the student. Faculty advisors are notified of all advisees placed on academic probation.

A student placed on academic probation will remain on academic probation until the overall GPA is at or above the requirements specified below. A student will be removed from academic probation as soon as his or her cumulative when the overall GPA is equal to or greater than the requisite GPA according to credits earned, requirement on the basis of subsequent courses completed at Fairfield during the next semester or during special January or summer sessions.

A student on academic probation is ineligible to participate in extracurricular or co-curricular activities during any semester in which the student is on probation. A student on academic probation may petition the Academic Vice President for the right to participate in extra- or co-curricular activities. The appeal must contain a valid and
compelling reason why restriction of extra- or co-curricular activities is inappropriate, and must demonstrate effectively that the activity will contribute an improvement in academic performance.

First Year Students: First semester, first-year students with a GPA below 1.90 will not be placed on academic probation for their second semester, but they will lose their rights to participate in extracurricular or co-curricular activities.

Students with 29 or fewer credits earned by the end of the student's second semester, or the first year at Fairfield, students will be placed on academic probation if the overall GPA is below 1.90.

Students with 30-59 credits earned Sophomores: Sophomores will be placed on academic probation if the overall GPA is below 1.90.

Students with 60 or more credits earned Juniors and Seniors: Juniors and seniors will be placed on academic probation if the overall GPA is below 2.00.

Academic Dismissal:

Students meeting any of the following conditions will be dismissed from the University:

- A student who, regardless of academic standing, at the end of a semester has received the grade of F in three or more 3- or 4-credit courses during the preceding 12 month period inclusive of all grades earned.
- A student who at the end of the academic year has received the grade of F in three or more courses
- A student with 29 or fewer credits earned, who regardless of incompletes, while on academic probation proceeds to earn a semester GPA below 1.90.
- A student with 30-59 credits earned, sophomore who regardless of incompletes, while on academic probation and enrolled full time (i.e., attempting a minimum of 12 credit hours), proceeds to earn a semester GPA below 1.90
- A student with 60 or more credits earned, junior or senior who regardless of incompletes, while on academic probation and enrolled full time (i.e., attempting a minimum of 12 credit hours), proceeds to earn a semester GPA below 2.00

Students who have been dismissed from the University for reason of academic failure are normally expected to remain away for at least a full semester (fall or spring) before seeking readmission. Such individuals lose all entitlement to institutionally funded financial aid.
Motion passed: 18 - 0 – 0

d. SVPAA rejection of AC-approved language for distribution of funds under merit pay

Prof. Mulvey pointed out the memo concerning this issue beginning on page 22, and noted that we talked about this last time. The memo explains the background of the situation. The chart on page 23 shows that the JoR language was developed in a particular situation; it talks about further merit only when the salary increase is over CPI. If the 2008 people could have foreseen that raises would be far below CPI for some time, they would have framed it differently. We have agreed with the administration to override the JoR language to solve the problem of multiple years below CPI and one year slightly above, but we should change the language. So we have tried to change it. The proposed change involves extending the threshold for further merit to an average over five years, but it has been rejected. So it is back to the AC. The JoR language is unfair and should be fixed. Prof. Preli asked, what do we do when AC language is rejected? What are the options? Prof. Mulvey responded that the Council can do whatever they want. The Council decides what to do with it. What do we want to do? Chair Preli, to the council said, OK, it’s all yours.

Prof. Thiel said he had trouble understanding the 3\textsuperscript{rd} reason for the rejection. SVPAA Babington said it’s the plus 0.7 versus the quarter. Mulvey said that’s not correct; the proposed language is still cost of living plus 0.25. SVPAA Babington directed the Council’s attention to page 31. Prof. Thiel offered the hypothetical that if you don’t average these things, prof. x has four years of unproductivity and one good year, then does well if merit is awarded that year. That professor wins the merit lottery. Professors should be able to show their work over a period of time. SVPAA Babington responded, that’s not the reason I objected to this. This alters the merit system that was agreed to. I don’t see a compelling reason to change it. Prof. Thiel said this was negotiated under duress, but shouldn’t we revise it to be fair? If you agree that it’s unfair, should we not revise it? Prof. Rakowitz clarified that when there is additional merit, the plan considers the intervening years since additional merit was granted, so the whole period comes into effect.

Prof. Thiel asked, so if there is extra merit this year people will have to show their work since the last time it was granted? Profs. Rakowitz and Preli concurred. Prof. Greenberg said that the merit system was imposed on us. We’re trying to make it equitable over years. The system now is unfair. Your reasoning is strained. Prof. Dennin explained this only impacts when merit is triggered. You have to have an average, not just one year. Prof. Bhattacharya said that was my question. We want to make the period that triggers it into a five year window. Prof. Crawford noted that this problem was raised when we developed the merit system. Some suggested that the administration would deliberately underfund it across years and overfund in one year to find the money for additional merit. Deliberate or not, this was not unforeseen. Prof. Steffen said we have consistently lost buying power. How does this reset history? Prof. Rakowitz said that additional merit gets triggered any time the raise is above cost of living. We have been over slightly before, but agreed to override the JoR language. Prof. Mulvey clarified that you only have to qualify for further merit in one of the years under consideration. Prof. Greenberg said if you go back in time, we have lost buying power relative to cost of living over 15 years. Giving merit in one year makes no sense under these conditions. Prof. Mulvey asked whether the SVPAA will explain the administration’s position. The current system allows people qualifying for standard merit to lose buying power relative the cost of living while their colleagues get merit. What is the rationale for not fixing that? SVPAA
Babington stated that this proposal will not be agreed to by the administration. The Board feels quite strongly that unless there is a post tenure review system, we need to have a merit system. Prof. Mulvey said that the agreement in the JoR is between the faculty and the SVPAA, so if there is someone else making the decision, they should come here and explain it to us. I don’t know who we’re talking to and why. Prof. Dennin added, who is making this decision? SVPAA Babington replied, I am part of the administrative team. I take ownership. Prof. Dennin asked, who is on the team? SVPAA Babington said, the President, the Executive Vice President, the Chief of Staff, and me. Prof. Dennin asked about the Board.

Prof. Steffen noted that we change the JoR every year. It changes. SVPAA Babington objected that the way this is written seems to dilute the possibility for further merit. Prof. Steffen did not understand how, fairness to faculty over multiple years dilutes merit? Prof. Mulvey asked, what is the rationale? Is it the 0.7 over? Would the administration accept a smaller amount over CPI? Can we work with the numbers? SVPAA Babington said, submit another proposal with other numbers. Prof. Mulvey responded, I have been working on this for two years. When the AC approved the FSC’s proposal for revising the JOR, the President said it should be discussed in our collegial discussions. At the collegial discussions, VP Reed said the President said it belongs to the AC. Now, back at the AC, the administration is rejecting a proposal for basic fairness without giving the AC a rationale. SVPAA Babington said I have given you the rationale. I can’t change that right now. I won’t agree to something that I can’t stand behind.

**Motion [Mulvey/Dennin]: AC recommends that the salary increase this year be distributed all as standard merit.**

Prof. Kris asked whether we know the increase. Prof. Mulvey said yes, 1.5%. The union (Local 30) workers have a deal that they get 1.5% or whatever the faculty get, if it’s higher than 1.5%. Cost of living is 0.8%. This should trigger further merit, but we’ve fallen way below CPI since we agreed to no raise when CPI was 3% a couple of years ago. Prof. Kris asked whether the administration proposed a distribution for standard and further. Prof. Mulvey said it’s mandated by the JoR. Prof. Kris followed up, the administration is proposing we go with the JoR? (Yes.) Prof. Steffen clarified, the motion is to suspend the JoR again? Prof. Mulvey said yes, for the third year in a row. Prof. Crawford said this will be a practical mess. I would ask that the administration run some numbers to see what will happen. It’s likely we’ll have many people qualify (since we will be reviewing each of the seven years of work since we’ve last had further merit) and they will get very little (because there is so little money and, presumably, many people). I don’t think it will accomplish what the administration team hopes to accomplish.

Prof. Yarrington asked, do we have to look at a post tenure review if we vote for this? Mulvey replied, no, that’s a proposal the administration put on the table. We’re making a motion. We’re going on record. Prof. Yarrington said, to follow up, we do reports every year. We have a post-tenure process. Prof. Mulvey agreed, we have a post tenure review system. It’s the merit system. Prof. Thiel said there is another way to think about it. Instead of a lot of people qualifying for extraordinary merit and being disappointed, imagine very few people might get extraordinary merit. Many will think they deserve it—and may deserve it— but only a small handful might get it and the rest are not going to be happy. We don’t have an administration at Fairfield that is sophisticated when it comes to compensation. We have to do this every year and it creates all these bad feelings. They can’t let it go. It’s bizarre to me. Chair Preli said we need to direct our comments at the motion. Prof. Dennin spoke in favor of the motion saying, I heard the argument that the Board wants this. But the Board has never said what they want to do, and
they put no money behind it. If the Board really wants it, put their money where their mouth is. The Board doesn’t really want extraordinary merit because they don’t support it.

**Motion passed: 17 - 0 - 1**

Prof. Rakowitz said, I am encouraged to hear that the SVPAA welcomes another proposal, but we cannot be mind readers. Who on the administration can be authorized to work with the salary committee or some body of the faculty and come up with a proposal that will be approved? SVPAA Babington said she would come back with an answer. Prof. Mulvey asked whether the Council wants the FSC to continue to work towards making the distribution of merit funds fair.

**Motion [Thiel/Strauss]: have the FSC continue to work for a fairer system for distributing merit**

**Motion passed: 18 - 0 - 0**

7. New business

a. Approval of slate of candidates for Committee on Committee; Approval of slate of candidates for Secretary of the General Faculty

Prof. Rakowitz explained that the Committee on Committees forwards all nominations for Secretary of the General Faculty and Committee on Committees to the Council, which then sets those two ballots.

**Motion: [Greenberg/Harding] to accept the slates as follows:**

- **General Faculty Secretary:** Susan Rakowitz
- **Committee on Committees**
  - Behavioral and Social Sciences/Dolan School of Business: Cathy Giapponi and Marcie Patton
  - At large: Evelyn Lolis and Chris Staecker

Prof. Dennin asked about and was assured that there can still be nominations from the floor.

**Motion passed: 16 - 0 - 1**

b. Conference Committee (report on last meeting; prepare for June meeting)

Prof. Marti LoMonaco, Chair of the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees, said that the Board met in NYC in March, which was unfortunate because most of the committee was teaching and could not attend. Five of ten Academic Affairs board members, plus Profs. Demers and LoMonaco attended. A new committee member, Robert Murphy, Administrative Vice President of ABC News, was particularly engaged. He requested four or five key points that are of most concern or greatest joy to the faculty. So we have an invitation. Can the AC help formulate this? Chair Preli asked for feedback for the committee.

Prof. Dennin said his biggest joy is dealing with students. They are more than ready to learn. Prof. Yarrington asked whether we should do a survey to the general faculty. Prof. Steffen said, I agree that students do wonderful things. Students graduate and have success short term, medium term, and long term. We can do the same thing with the faculty and convey how successful our faculty are, they are engaged and active, and work with students. Prof. LoMonaco said, I think we do that at every meeting already. The past and current SVPAAAs do this already. Prof. Smith asked whether they want just the faculty perspective. We could survey the students. Prof. LoMonaco clarified, no, this is the Academic Affairs Committee specifically. Prof.
Mulvey said that her concern with examples is that they overlook the excellent job at ordinary work that everybody does every day. We are all so devoted to this institution and we all work hard. Prof. LoMonaco said, I am ending my time on this committee but I feel that this committee has not done what it should do, serve as an effective means of communication and conversation. It’s been a challenge. We have tight schedules and little time. Prof. Greenberg said, after 44 years my major concern is that academics are not privileged here. You can see it in the budget. The academic budget is artificially inflated. Dean Hannafin asked how common it is for Board members to come to campus. Can we pull them in and engage them? Prof. LoMonaco replied that they meet quarterly on campus. SVPAA Babington said that when she was in the School of Nursing she invited the whole Board to lunch. Dean Hannafin said he didn’t know he could do that. SVPAA Babington cautioned that their schedule is really tight. Dean Hannafin asked if we can make room for it. Prof. Preli said, are they asking us to justify or validate academics? Prof. LoMonaco said that new board members want to hear our concerns. SVPAA Babington agreed, I got the sense he really wants to hear our concerns. Again, he’s a new board member. Prof. Dennin said merit is a huge concern. Prof. Yarrington asked, can we take a board member to work for a day? What are you trying to get across with merit? Everybody thinks it’s a joke, it’s not good business. It is not propelling us forward. Prof. Preli asked does the AC agree that surveying the faculty is a good idea? Consensus was yes.

c. UCC-proposed revisions to the JoR on how courses not offered in Social and Behavioral Science (SBS) departments are approved for SBS core

Prof. John Miecznikowski, Chair of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, said that in November of 2014 the UCC was asked to look at how courses outside of the Behavioral and Social Sciences might get Social Science Core Credit. Four recommendations were made. 1. SBS should not be organized like Natural Sciences, 2. Each department should decide which courses count, 3. Each SBS department will submit a list of courses that are approved, 4. For courses from departments or programs not in the SBS (i.e. not Communication, Economics, Politics, Psychology, or Sociology / Anthropology) the course must a. satisfy the learning outcomes approved by the UCC, and b. be approved by an ad hoc committee of the SBS chairs (three positive votes out of five gets approval).

Prof. Rakowitz explained that what’s in bold in item 4a and 4b on page 34 will replace what is at the bottom of the page listed as “existing text.” The primary thing is changing the committee. Prof. Steffen asked about study abroad courses. Prof. Miecznikowski said they didn’t look at that.

Motion [Greenberg/Steffen]: to amend the JOR as follows (deletions struck through, additions in bold):

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

For courses from departments or interdisciplinary programs not in the SBS (not Communication, Economics, Politics, Psychology, or Sociology/Anthropology) that are put forward for core SBS credit:

a. The course must satisfy the social science student learning outcomes (see attached outcomes, which were approved by the UCC).

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

Motion passed: 14 - 0

d. AC consideration of the need for a policy on cancelled classes
Prof. Mulvey explained that Prof. Vin Rosivach wondered if we should have a policy on making up classes. Prof. Greenberg said I do not think we need such a policy. Prof. Kris said this came up with Hurricane Sandy and we talked about how we’d make up all the missed classes. Each professor should do it on his or her own. It works well when the individuals do it.

Prof. Thiel offered an homage to Prof. Greenberg on the afternoon of Prof. Greenberg’s last Academic Council meeting. He said that the first time he served on the Council many years ago, Prof. Greenberg had been the Council chair. He emphasized what a wonderful mentor Prof. Greenberg had been for faculty serving on the Council over the years. During a warm round of applause, Prof. Greenberg received a warm embrace from Prof. Mulvey.

Motion: [Steffen/Crawford] to adjourn. Motion passed.

Respectfully submitted,

Dave Crawford