Academic Council Meeting  
Monday, September 8, 2014  
CNS 200  
Minutes of Meeting

Members Present: Professors Mousumi Bhattacharya, Dave Crawford, Joe Dennin, Shannon Harding, Irene Mulvey (Executive Secretary), Martin Nguyen, Elizabeth Petrino, Shawn Rafalski (Outgoing Chair – only for the first part of the meeting), Susan Rakowitz (Secretary of the General Faculty), Amalia Rusu, Emily R. Smith, L. Kraig Steffen, Debra Strauss, John Thiel, Jo Yarrington

Administrators: SVPAA Lynn Babington, Deans Bruce Berdanier, Robert Hannafin, Meredith Kazer, Jim Simon

Regrets: Dean Don Gibson

Invited Presenters: Kathy Nantz, Maggie Wills

Chair Rafalski calls the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

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

By drawing a name from the cup, the recording secretary for the meeting was selected to be Prof. Rusu.

Outgoing Chair Rafalski asks for nominations from the floor for AC Chair in 2014-15.

Prof. Thiel makes the observation that there are several new members of the academic council coming for the next meeting as well as some absentees and proposes to elect a chair for this meeting only.

Chair Rafalski asks if anybody wants to volunteer for the day.

Prof. Thiel is happy to volunteer for this meeting. By acclamation, Prof. Thiel is elected chair for the day and Prof. Rafalski excuses himself for the rest of the meeting.

Prof. Thiel asks for nominations for an Executive Secretary for 2014-2015.

Prof. Rakowitz nominates Prof. Mulvey. No other nominations. Prof. Mulvey is unanimously elected as the Executive Secretary for 2014-2015.

1. Presidential Courtesy

SVPAA Babington’s remarks:
Welcome back to a new year! Looking forward to working together this year.

Lots of great work to do this year and as I have said multiple times, in multiple venues, this is our time – faculty's time.

As faculty, we have the opportunity to take the leadership in creating some of the changes necessary to place us in a good position as a Jesuit University focused on excellent teaching and student mentorship with amazingly productive faculty who share their expertise with students in the classroom, though their research, and on and off campus in the many service related activities they engage in.

We are in a unique position to take leadership on initiatives that arise from the Fairfield 2020 Strategic Plan which includes over 180 faculty, staff, administrators and alumni involvement.

Enrollment Update
Undergraduates – As of 9/5 - 1076 freshman (and 49 transfer students) higher yield, stronger students (higher SAT scores, more merit scholars accepted our admission offer, lower summer melt) 37% male/63% female; average SAT = 1767  
895 soph, 732 juniors, 818 seniors = 3512 total undergraduate
14% students of color

All these things are good, but – 44% discount rate for the freshman class meaning that our students are paying 56% of our published rates – the discount is too high

Graduates – As of 9/5 (note that graduate student enrollment tends to increase through the second week of classes – 1121 (GSEAP= 430, SOE= 254, SON= 191, DSOB= 133, CAS = 118) 63% female, 37% male).

38% students of color; 24% international

Faculty- At the new faculty orientation a couple of weeks ago, we welcomed 17 tenure track and 10 visiting faculty. Please welcome them to your various departments.

Searches – Three major searches are currently underway
   Director of the Quick Center (Arts Consulting Group)
   Director and Chief Curator of University Museums
   CAS dean (Isaacson & Miller)

Academic Council – President von Arx would like to attend at least one AC meeting each semester to meet with faculty.

Prof. Smith asks if the financial aid promises are for 4 years for the undergrads. SVPAA Babington responds that they are for 4 years but can go lower based on family income.

Prof. Nantz asks if there were any surprises in the graduate education enrollment.

SVPAA Babington responds that in terms of statistics, compared to last year, the enrollment for GSEAP went lower, SOE higher, SON higher, and CAS and DSB lower.

Prof. Rakowitz asked about the appointed members of the CAS Dean's search committee. In addition to SVPAA Babington, they are: Associate VPAA Mary Frances Malone, Dean Meredith Kazer, Ms. Janet Canepa, and a member of the CAS advisory board.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

Prof. Rakowitz mentions that filling replacement openings for faculty committees is under way and reminds about the General Faculty meeting on Friday, 9/12/14.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary

3.a Approval of minutes of AC meetings

Prof. Mulvey explains that there are 4 sets of minutes to approve and asks if there are any questions or corrections before approving them. Also explains that AC could approve them all together.

Prof. Thiel clarifies his statements on distribution of funds on page 18 of the packet as follows: The proposed change extends the spirit of the agreement on merit reached between the faculty and administration in the governance discussions several years ago.

   MOTION [Mulvey/Steffen] to approve all 4 sets of minutes as amended
   MOTION PASSED 9-0-4

3.b Correspondence
Prof. Mulvey explained the memo on page 21 of the packet. Specifically, that former SVPAA Fitzgerald rejected an item passed by the AC for Journal of Record. His explanation was shown via “tracked changes” in the memo to him listing all items passed by the AC for the JoR and stated, "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.”

MOTION [Rakowitz/Crawford] the AC sends this matter back to the salary committee to discuss with administrators
MOTION PASSED 13-0-0

Prof. Mulvey expresses her disappointment about the administration’s response to this matter and supports the motion.

Prof. Mulvey draws attention to page 22 of the packet and informs the AC that this will be an item that will be back on the agenda for our next meeting and advised the AC members to read it for more reference.

Prof. Mulvey introduces the proposed meeting dates for 2014-2015 (as per page 28 of AC package). Because the first Monday in April is during Easter break for the undergrad and on the first Monday in May there are exams scheduled, the proposed alternate dates for the last 2 meetings are April 13 and April 27.

Prof. Dennin asks if last Monday in March (March 30) has been considered and proposes that date as a better alternative instead of April 13.

MOTION [Mulvey/Dennin] to approve the meeting dates as amended, with last 2 meetings being on March 30 and April 27
MOTION PASSED 14-0-0

4. Council Subcommittee Reports

4e. Subcommittee on Mission Statement re non-tenure track faculty (AC 9/9/13)

Prof. Nantz presents the report of subcommittee on non-tenure track faculty. The charge was “to develop the a long-term mission statement for the optimal employment and deployment of Non-Tenure Track faculty at Fairfield.” The subcommittee considered 3 elements as guiding principles: employment, campus climate, and compensation and resource allocation.

Prof. Rakowitz points out that item #2 of the recommendations contradicts with what we know about the Professor of the Practice position which explicitly rules out promotion.

Prof. Nantz explains that the subcommittee was thinking the other way around. That people in any position can achieve some kind of advancement and wanted to provide consistency throughout all job descriptions. There were discussions and people on the subcommittee who wanted to give more explicit job descriptions (e.g., lecturer) but at the end they were left open on purpose.

Prof. Crawford mentions that the idea is wonderful but costly. The economics are hard to beat and wondering where is this going from here.

Prof. Thiel wants to clarify that the subcommittee just suggests the guiding principles and not the actual mission statement.

SVPAA Babington suggests to start thinking of other categories than visiting and professor of practice, and then asks if the subcommittee was suggesting investigating other job descriptions.

Prof. Nantz responds that by implications we will have to consider all kind of other types.
Prof. Mulvey thanks the subcommittee for their work but has concerns. What is it that we expect faculty to do? Do we expect the same from all faculty or do we have 2 faculty tiers? See descriptions on teaching and service. There should be a statement on what faculty duties are.

Prof. Nantz responds that the institution mission states teaching, research, and service. No discussion was on 2 faculty tiers. If we come up with that as university, with different job descriptions, then there will be more discussion about it. This is the subcommittee report to AC, not correct or to a level of specificity.

Prof. Mulvey highlights that the word tenure does not appear in the subcommittee’s report.

Prof. Steffen mentions that we have large number of faculty from whom we do not have any expectations (i.e., adjuncts) and asks Prof. Nantz to elaborate on item #9, what the subcommittee envisioned by “access to shared governance”. Does that mean that they should know how our governance works? Was that part of the subcommittee discussion?

Prof. Nantz responds that we can have a committee that deals with needs of faculty and that could be anything.

Prof. Bhattacharya asks if the subcommittee considered anything specific for each school.

Prof. Nantz responds that faculty duties were not considered other than broadly. We could do that but this would have to spell out obligations that various faculty have to do (e.g., maintain license for practicing nursing, etc.). So intentionally trying not to include particularities.

Prof. Dennin asks why the subcommittee referred to faculty as teaching faculty, why is teaching in there, and also item #7 seems to relate contractual obligations only to teaching.

Prof. Rakowitz points out that there are all kind of definitions for tenure-track and then we have all these other kind of categories and what do they have in common? Could this be that teaching is common and the committee was looking only at the things in common?

Prof. Nantz responds that research was not excluded on purpose.

Prof. Mulvey points out that the way the document was written, the guideline principles seem to include both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty, but the charge for the subcommittee was for non-tenure track. So it seems that the guideline principles were discussed more broadly than the charge.

Prof. Yarrington feels like we have various categories of faculty, and one of them, the tenure track, is already well discussed somewhere else.

Prof. Mulvey agrees that we want more focus on the non-tenure track faculty rather than broadly.

Prof. Crawford expresses his appreciation for the document because it is provocative and useful to address.

Prof. Petrino asks if anything came out on how contracts affect faculty responsibilities.

Prof. Nantz responds that stability came up and consistency for more transparency was the guiding principle.

Dean Simon asks if the subcommittee looked at peer schools and gathered any data.

Prof. Nantz responds that the subcommittee looked as some data and they are yet to organize and disseminate but could do so.

Prof. Thiel suggests that this might become an imminent item on the agenda in next meetings.

**MOTION [Babington/Yarrington] to accept receiving the report from the subcommittee on non-tenure track faculty**
MOTION PASSED 14-0-0

Prof. Thiel suggests to pay more attention to the report.

Prof. Crawford recommends that in case there is another subcommittee for adjuncts then that committee should consider consulting this report.

SVPAA Babington mentions that the AC passed a motion to establish a Faculty Handbook committee on contingent faculty and the President intends to communicate with the Council on that.

The consensus of the Council was to wait for the President’s reply before further discussion or action on this matter. We will return to this matter once we hear from the President.

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

None.

6. Old Business

None.

7. New business

7a. Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees – report on June meeting, prepare for October

Prof. Mulvey mentions that the June meeting was good, the Conference Committee presented the memo (in today’s packet on pages 25-27) and it was well received. The conference Committee has not yet elected a Chair for 2014-15, but the returning members are working with SVPAA Babington to plan the October meeting with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board.

7b. Proposal to amend the Faculty Handbook from Educational Technologies Committee

As part of last year ETC, Prof. Rusu provides an overview of the charge for the ETC to restructure the ex officio membership, and the suggested way to do that was to add the new CIO as an ex officio position and decrease the number of ex officio seats overall. ETC has updated some of the ex officio positions to better reflect the current job names as well as eliminating the Director of Distance Education ex officio position. However, a new ex officio has been added for SVPAA’s office as the liaison between Academic Affairs, ITS and the Registrar’s Office, so that the number of ex officio members stayed the same. Along these changes, ETC provided new language to be included in the faculty handbook based on the proposed changes.

MOTION [Rusu/Steffen] to recommend that the General Faculty approves the changes to Faculty Handbook as proposed by ETC (deletions struck through, insertions in bold face):

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 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.

MOTION PASSED 11-0-1

7c. Proposal to change name of the Bachelor Degree in Professional Studies
Prof. Wills briefly explains the proposed name change for the bachelor degree in Professional Studies, and reminds that it is a name change not a curriculum change, to better align with the mission.

Prof. Dennin points out that it seems like there are 2 types of students for the program. Which is the breakdown?

Prof. Wills responds that it is half and half and overall about 70 students, not necessarily all active.

**MOTION [Rakowitz/Dennin] to change the name of the Bachelor of Professional Studies to the Bachelor of Liberal Studies.**

**MOTION PASSED 12-0-0**

Prof. Crawford is happy to vote but raises the point that the document does not seem to be data driven or market driven.

Prof. Dennin agrees completely. It seems reasonable though to assume that the students will come to liberal studies.

Prof. Bhattacharya suggests we grandfather the existing students.

Dean Simon conveys the idea that there is a feeling that we are underperforming with part-time students.

**7d. Elect the AC Calendar Subcommittee for 2014-15**

Prof. Rakowitz asks for volunteers for the AC Calendar Subcommittee. Prof. Harding and Prof. Yarrington volunteer for it. Prof. Harding and Prof. Yarrington are unanimously elected.

A motion to adjourn [Dennin/Crawford] **PASSED** without objection.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Amalia Rusu