ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, December 7, 2015 from 3:30 to 5:00 PM
CNS 200

1. Presidential courtesy

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
   a. Approval of minutes:
      i. Meeting of November 2, 2015 (attachment)
      ii. Meeting of November 16, 2015 (attachment)
   b. Correspondence
   c. Oral Reports

4. Council Subcommittee Reports (none expected at this meeting)
   a. Subcommittee discussing post-tenure review (AC 9/21/15)
   b. SC on broader academic freedom language for governance documents (AC 2/27/12)
   c. Subcommittee to consider proposing IDEA form for administrators (AC 4/4/11)
   d. Subcommittee on grievance procedures (AC 5/8/13)
   e. Subcommittee on time codes (AC 5/8/13)
   f. Standing Calendar Review Subcommittee

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

6. Old Business

7. New business
   a. Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees: report on December meeting
   b. Electing faculty to the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty (attachment)

Lists of Attachments, Pending Items, and Ongoing Items are on page 2
List of Attachments and other materials
For item 3.a.i.: Draft minutes of meeting on November 2, 2015 (pages 3 - 7)
For item 3.a.ii.: Draft minutes of meeting on November 16, 2015 (pages 7 - 12)
For item 7.b. Electing faculty to the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty (pages 13 - 14)

Pending Items:
A. Faculty Data Committee (AC 12/3/07).
B. AC revisits the accessibility of teaching evaluation data, Due spring 2012. (AC 4/19/10)
C. AC review of Merit Appeals Policy, once one or more have been adjudicated.
   (AC 11/1/10 & 5/13/14)
D. AC three year review of Intellectual Properties Policy, spring 2014. (AC 3/7/11)
E. MPA, five year review in 2017-2018 (AC 9/10/12)
G. Revisit report from ACSC on Mission Statement re non-tenure track faculty in fall 2014
   (AC 9/8/14)
   H. Review and evaluate the Pass/Fail option in fall 2020 (AC 12/1/2014)
I. Three-Year Review of C.A.S. Reading and Language Development program (AC 2/2/2015)

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
Draft Minutes
Monday, November 2, 2015 from 3:30 to 5:00 pm
CNS 200

Faculty Members Present: Professors Beth Boquet, Dave Crawford, Bob Epstein, Shannon Kelley, Alison Kris, Jen Klug, Phil Lane, Rona Preli, Susan Rakowitz (Secretary of the General Faculty), Jo Yarrington, Amalia Rusu (Executive Secretary), Emily Smith, Kraig Steffen, Debra Strauss (Chair), Joan Weiss

Administrators: Deans Bruce Berdanier, Bob Hannafin, Yohuru Williams, Meredith Kazer

Student Observer Present: Jason Abate

Regrets: SVPAA Lynn Babington, Dean Don Gibson, Professors Mousumi Bhattacharya, David Downie, John McDermott

Meeting Called to Order: 3:35 pm

Chair Debra Strauss welcomed Jason Abate as official student representative.

1. Presidential Courtesy
   No statement at this time.

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

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
   d. Approval of minutes:
      i. Meeting of September 21, 2015 (attachment)
         Motion [Lane/Weiss]: to approve the minutes from September 27, 2015
         Professor Kelley mentioned that her name needed an “e”.
         Unanimously approved as corrected.

      ii. Meeting of October 5, 2015 (attachment)
          Motion [Rusu/Lane]: to approve the minutes from October 5, 2015
          The minutes were approved unanimously.

   e. Correspondence: None

   f. Oral Reports: None

4. Council Subcommittee Reports (none at this meeting)

5. Petitions for immediate hearing
   Professor Rakowitz announced that Joan Overfield is retiring in February and a Search Committee is to be constructed as soon as possible. Vice President Malone is available to discuss the search committee with the Council after 4:20 pm if the Council agrees to take this issue up.
   Motion [Epstein/Boquet]: to accept the Petition for Immediate Hearing and hear it after item 7c
   Unanimously approved.
6. **Old Business:** None

7. **New business**
   
c. **Proposal for Minor in Humanitarian Action**

   A presentation was given by Prof. Leatherman, Co-Chair of the Proposal Committee. She summarized the main focus of the minor and gave a brief account of its development. She mentioned it was a result of a great deal of collaborative work on campus mainly offered due to resources made available by the Teagle grants. Through the grant, many cross-disciplinary learning communities were established which helped to provide a deep and broad scholarship base. Learning communities helped form the basic structure of the Humanities Minor. A focus on the premise of “Learn, Reflect and Act on Humanitarian Crisis” would help differentiate it from pre and post crisis setting. Also discussed was the discernment of individual and collective responsibilities which would tie in with the University Mission Statement. Another focus was ethical and moral action and the alleviation of suffering and the protection of human dignity. History, Applied Ethics and International Studies will be the main disciplines providing the coursework in support of this minor. The *Politics of Applied Ethics* course has opened the direction that the minor will follow addressing: 1) theory; 2) skills; 3) capstone.

   This minor is in league with the focus of the Fordham University Humanitarian minor which addresses action on an international basis. Partnering with Fordham to develop this minor would position us as a leader in this arena.

   Questions concerning the minor and regional need were asked by Dean Yohuru Williams, specifically in reference to recent crisis management in southern and central New Jersey. He also asked about leveraging other resources in dealing with a public health crisis. A focus also could be on local preparation for international crisis. Prof. Kris asked about the number of hours for clinical work. Prof. Leatherman said JUHAN would provide clinical basis with internship options, such as the Red Cross. The clinical basis would complement the student’s main field of study. Prof. Boquet agreed about alignment with mission and the “moment” that we find ourselves in. Even so, she has questions that some minors with a similar focus are already in play (Peace and Justice Studies and Service Learning come to mind). It has not been sufficiently explained how these programs exist side-by-side. Prof. Leatherman sees tight collaboration with these other fields of study. The Teagle grant which provided the basis for developing the JUHAN website will help develop with places like Holy Cross and John Carroll synergy around these initiatives. Prof. Boquet wondered if a JUHAN course would count for service learning? Prof. Leatherman stated that individual courses would expose human problems/human action so many would count for service learning. Through the program, students would find opportunities to explore connections.

   Prof. Epstein had questions about context and analysis collectives. Were these selected from currently available courses? Prof. Leatherman mentioned that the curricular choices come out of the Teagle Grant learning communities. Prof. Epstein wondered if as the program gets better known, there would be opportunities for contribution. He wondered about the mechanism to put forward a class for inclusion in the Program. Prof. Leatherman mentioned that there would be a Faculty Learning Community this Fall and one in the Spring to address these questions. There also will be an Advisory Board for the minor that would aid in identifying learning objectives and review curriculum to make relevant choices for further development of the minor.
Prof. Weiss asked if there needed to be a foundation course that was taken first? She also asked if field work was required? Prof. Weiss asked what the structure was for adding courses to the minor. Prof. Leatherman responded that a foundation course does not have to be taken first. Prof. Weiss asked if there was a requirement that one course would have to be an “action” course? Prof. Leatherman stated that each curriculum can provide “action”. With only six courses, it would be counterproductive to be too rigid about designation. She also mentioned that skills and methods address action. Prof. Weiss asked how the Director/Advisory Board were elected? Prof. Leatherman stated that the position of director was to report directly to the Provost. Provost Babington would approve the demographics of the board.

Prof. Klug asked that if the Director reports to the Provost then is there funding from the Provost? She also asked about the relationship between the International Studies Program and Faith and Public Life. Prof. Leatherman said that Peace and Justice is more American oriented. The Fairfield method is focused on domestic concerns as opposed to peace building. She mentioned that they would reassess the minor in 5 years. Prof. Yarrington asked that in the future would the Program integrate the university theme with the minor? Prof. Leatherman responded that this would make sense.

Jason Abate stated that expediency counts for the minor. He liked the fact that economics, politics, Arts and Sciences classes, etc. are intertwined so that there is that level of convenience. He was impressed that there is that level of interpretation. Prof. Leatherman stated that they did try to choose courses from different schools that would open it up to student involvement/entry points. Also it ties in to the Core. Prof. Rakowitz mentioned if the capstone will only have 5 – 7 students that might create a problem with funding. Prof. Leatherman said that JUHAN conducted a survey and that over half of the students stated “this would be a great minor”. Prof. Rakowitz said that it makes no sense for this not to be housed in the College. She stated that Interdisciplinary programs already exist and the model is set up. She asked if Provost Babington was the only one who mentioned that it should not be housed in the College, and whether the faculty had any objections to it being housed in the College. Prof. Leatherman said that either way there was consensus (whether it was in or out of the College). Dean Williams mentioned about resources being more available in the College. He thought that it would give the minor creativity by discussing partnering. He was not clear about what Humanitarian Global Action signified. Prof. Leatherman stated that the model was a response to national criteria in this area. More technical expertise would come from the major area.

From the research, the planning committee for the minor was getting the message that what was wanted were students with an expertise in their main areas of study but who also had a broader sense of how to work in a Humanitarian direction with an ethical grounding. Prof. Weiss stated that the minor should be directed at action and fieldwork. At this point, with the questions concluded, Prof. Leatherman left.

Motion [Lane/Crawford]: That Academic Council accepts the Humanitarian Action Minor.
Motion to amend [Rakowitz/Boquet]: That the minor be housed in the College and be reviewed in 5 years.

Prof. Klug asked if there were any other interdisciplinary programs not housed in schools? Prof. Boquet stated that that we have precedent for encumbering school resources such as Core
Writing. In fact in CAS we are now discussing what is a School within a College. This is encumbering college resources since more than 50% are College courses.

Amendment was unanimously approved.

Prof. Crawford is in favor of the motion and convinced by Prof. Boquet and Dean Williams that some of the concerns about overlap with existing CAS programs can be addressed if it’s housed in the College. Prof. Lane is nervous about the students/dollar ratio. However, he is speaking for the motion because of the Mission. Dean Hannafin mentioned that it will pay for itself if even one student comes here because of the minor. Prof. Crawford stated that many International Studies majors already double major with Politics (and other things). Many of the proposed courses count multiple places. The only cost is in staffing the capstone course, and this course may be a way for students to be more thoughtful about the range of classes they’ve taken. Costs are therefore relatively minimal, and students may like it, so I speak for it.

Prof. Weiss asked where do the HA courses reside? Prof. Epstein says we need to emphasize the questions. He mentioned that minor or major becomes your choice. Even considering the thoroughness of the proposal, there are still unknowns. What about people already doing service work…shouldn’t the capstone be built on a number of foundations? However, perhaps it is only natural to be a little more flexible with the minor. Prof. Yarrington was worried about contextualizing the minor after the fact – that without a comprehensive view of the minor’s premise when signing up for the courses, how do students understand how to bundle what they learn…or is that what the capstone would address.

Prof. Strauss asked if there was a way to approve this minor if we attach the minutes with the various questions. She asked if we might reflect on these minutes at the 5 year review. Prof. Steffen said that his sentiment toward the minor is lukewarm. It seems like a squishy minor. There are almost too many options. He believes that a capstone could involve doing something. He asked how do we get that in to what we say. Dean Williams wondered about the overlap with Peace and Justice Studies. He thought that the resource allocation did not make sense. Prof. Epstein suggested we pass it but state that we want it in the College. He thought that someone should have administrative authority over it. Prof. Kris reiterated her concerns about there not being a “hands on the ground” fieldwork experience in a Humanitarian crisis. She also mentioned that there was no requirement for an international study component. Prof. Crawford mentioned that this is a minor not a major. He thought that if the students want to take courses and package it in any way they want why not let them. He also asked what other costs are there? It’s a minor and that should not a big deal. Dean Williams worried that resources might get diffused. Dean Berdanier mentioned that they would collaborate in EG 360 suggesting that students from any school or major could take EG 360 course which is field experience and would be happy to have them participate in this course for their minor.

Motion to call the question [Epstein/Lane]:
Passed: 11-2-0

Vote on the main motion as amended:
Passed: 12-1-0

Motion to reorder the agenda [Rakowitz/Weiss] to take up the PFIH:
Motion carries unanimously.
5. **Petition for immediate hearing**

At 4:30 pm, Dr. Malone spoke about Joan Overfield’s retirement in February. Although she mentioned that “we are well poised to run for the year”, the need to immediately convene a University Search Committee was imperative. The position as now listed is: Dean of the Libraries and University Librarians. There will be a major national search based on reputation. She mentioned that she would like for the Council to send out a call for service on the Committee and mentioned that the demographic make-up could be as follows: 3 librarians, 4 administrators (1 Dean, Scott Esposito in HR, IT staff, David Frassinelli /space, function and need), 3 faculty with Dr. Malone chairing. Dr. Malone also mentioned that an Executive Search Firm might be used as well, pending the will of the Committee.

Prof. Boquet is strongly for VP of University Resources to look at an in house model. Prof. Epstein is in favor of representation from each of the Schools and College. Dr. Malone said she is ok with 4 faculty. She wants to make sure the faculty will be sensitive to the role of the Librarians on staff. Dr. Malone asked “What is the time line?” “What would you anticipate?” Prof. Rakowitz said we need to decide on the call and take this up in December. Dr. Malone mentioned she would like to call the committee before the end of this semester. Prof. Crawford asked if it would help to make the committee date first before the call. Dr. Malone does not want to start the first committee meeting without faculty in place to decide on profile. Prof. Klug asked if there was any precedent for an electronic ballot. Prof. Rakowitz said that is not out of the realm of possibilities.

**Motion [Epstein/Steffen]: to put out a call for 4 faculty from at least 3 schools to serve on the search committee.**

Prof. Rakowitz asked whether there should be a direct link to the Library Committee. The consensus was that there need not be, but it would be helpful to know which, if any, nominees had served on the Library Committee in the past 3-5 years.

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Motion [Rakowitz/Lane] to recess to November 16 passed unanimously.**

Meeting recessed at 5:03 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Recording Secretary
Jo Yarrington
Faculty Members Present: Professors Mousumi Bhattacharya, Beth Boquet, Dave Crawford, David Downie, Bob Epstein, Shannon Kelley, Jen Klug, Phil Lane, John McDermott, Rona Preli, Susan Rakowitz (Secretary of the General Faculty), Kraig Steffen, Amalia Rusu (Executive Secretary), Emily Smith, Debra Strauss (Chair), Joan Weiss

Administrators: SVPAA Lynn Babington, Deans Don Gibson, Bruce Berdanier

Student Representative: Jason Abate

Regrets: Professors Alison Kris, Jo Yarrington, Deans Bob Hannafin, Meredith Kazer, Yohuru Williams

Guests: Professors Harvey Hoffman (item 7b), Erica Hartwell (item 7c), Stephanie Storms (item 7d)

This meeting was a continuation of business that we did not conclude previously.

7d, Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees: report on October meeting.

Prof. Strauss welcomes Stephanie Storms:

Prof. Storms reports that on October 1 the committee visited the active learning classroom along with board members, she reported progress on goals, and suggested that future meetings will focus on goals. The next meeting is December 3rd with the objective of talking about study abroad and other learning opportunities. Prof. Storms reported that the meeting was very collegial, and the trustees had questions about pedagogy. They are very interested in talking about academics rather than finances. Board Member Bob Murphy thanked committee for responses to the “what makes us happy” survey.

SVPAA Babington noted that the role of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board is to advocate for academics at the Board level. After discussion with the Committee on Conference and seeing the active learning classroom, the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board decided it should monitor progress on updating all of the classrooms and advocate for increasing video conferencing capabilities.

Prof. Rakowitz asked whether we were done with the joys and challenges survey, especially given the disappointing response rate last time.

Prof. Storms acknowledged the issue and said that we will send it again in the middle of the semester this time. She asked what issues and concerns the Council would like the committee to bring to the board.

Prof. Rakowitz asked whether the committee had ideas.

Prof. Weiss asked for specifics on the goals.

Prof. Storms reported that the committee intended to monitor progress on 2020; monitor study abroad; support areas of strength, especially in the College of Arts and Sciences, specifically in the areas of Communication and emerging media programs; there is a desire to increase visibility, pay attention to core revision, and look at educational technology and classroom design.

Prof. Boquet opined that the strategic plan and core revision both loom large. She had no specific suggestions for the agenda, but as we move task force ideas forward, it is important that the committee stay in dialogue with the Board.

SVPAA Babington noted that the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board and the faculty committee on conference wants to wait until the core revision process is further along in development before presenting it to the Board of Trustees.

Prof. Boquet emphasized that we should be underscoring the importance of supporting faculty work.
Prof. Lane asked whether those goals were vetted before the Academic Council.
SVPAA Babington responded that the faculty and Board of Trustees came up with them. It was a joint process.
Prof. Storms affirmed that they were shared goals.
Prof. Epstein offered what he considers his “standard comment:” support from the Board for pedagogical resources is appreciated, but technological innovation is only one component. This is one sort of support, but only one. Staffing and infrastructure are others. Pedagogy broadly should always be supported.
Prof. Kelley asked whether the Board knew about digital humanities, and noted that we are trying to get the digital humanities off the ground here.
SVPAA Babington noted that there was a presentation to the Board last year, but did not remember who made it.
Prof. Rakowitz agreed with Prof. Epstein, and noted that there are many areas of strength in the College. There's no reason to single out Communication; it's no stronger than other departments in the College.
Prof. Klug also affirmed the importance of making the Board aware of the variety of things we do.
Prof. Storms assured the council that they seem to support the visibility of the faculty with the Board.
Prof. Preli noted that one area of innovation is collaboration. She suggested that looking for mechanisms or funding that would facilitate collaboration in teaching would be welcome.
Prof. Storms thanked the committee.

7b, the Proposal for 5-year BS/MS Management of Technology (MOT).

Prof. Strauss welcomed Prof. Harvey Hoffman of Engineering.
Prof. Hoffman noted that there are already five-year engineering programs. We have five-year plans, this is an additional one. The most significant difference with what students take as core is that two courses (senior design) is replaced by MOT program capstones. Undergrad engineering has approved this. Students will still do a year long project, but in their fifth year. They do not receive a bachelors until their fifth year. Software engineering currently does the same thing. This should help young engineers.
Prof. Weiss asked about data on five-year programs. She also wondered whether students could do what looked like 15 credits of graduate work a semester.
Prof. Rusu suggested that there were really 12 credits.
Prof. Downie noted that there are many programs where students take 15 or 18 credits, but not in the sciences. “It’s the new normal.”
Prof. Boquet noted that this program is in line with programs we already have, but that we should be tracking completion rates. What do we do with students who are not on track? What happens to students who in their fourth year are not able?
Prof. Hoffman noted that students can transition to a regular engineering degree if they don’t think they can make it.
Prof. Weiss asked when students declare their intention to stay for the fifth year and Prof. Hoffman noted that it would be at the end of their second year.
Prof. Weiss wondered about accreditation.
Profs. Hoffman and Rusu noted that only undergrad are ABET accredited.
Prof. Weiss noted that since a Management of Technology degree is a professional degree, students ought to have a residency.
Prof. Hoffman questioned why.
Prof. Weiss suggested that students need experience before they begin managing.
Prof Hoffman suggested that there were all sorts of ways to make the program stronger by adding more time. “I could make it better still by demanding three to five years of experience. I think it would be terrific. Only 5% go into academics. The rest will be working for managers.”
His point was that when our students get out right now, they have no idea what to expect. They go into industry and discover they need more than design. They need schedule, budget, return on investment. We give that to them in this program so that they are prepared to work in industry. They will know the questions that managers will ask. They get the equivalent of 36 credits of management.

Prof. Steffen noted that it is always good to have these kinds of things, and there is a temptation to say that they will not take new resources. This proposal does not seem to ask for resources as it grows. How do you manage the increasing workload? Are you considering new resources?

Prof. Hoffman noted that we have about 55 students in the MOT program. About half are full time, all of whom are international students. All of the faculty other than Prof. Hoffman are adjuncts (he is full time, Professor of Practice). All of the adjuncts are experts in the field that they teach. Intellectual property is taught by a patent lawyer, for instance. Basically, if the school could afford it, we would take full time positions. But we’re doing a good job getting experts at the undergraduate level. I don’t see a significant impact in the short run.

Prof. Epstein asked who was teaching these capstones. They are required for full and part time BA level MOT? That would also be the capstone for the masters? Where do the projection numbers come from. What’s this based on?

Professor Hoffman noted that he has two students who are interested. That’s where he got the initial projection of two students. He notes that we would need to market the program, but that he thinks it would grow.

Prof. Epstein returned to the issue of resources. “Would you not need greater resources if the program grows how much you expect?”

Prof. Hoffman suggests not.

Prof. Epstein asks whether there are ways it requires resources no matter how much it grows (or does not).

Prof. Hoffman responded that the program does not require laboratories. It does not require computer resources. It requires expertise in certain engineering management areas.

Prof. Rakowitz noted that while Prof. Hoffman teaches half the classes but his Professor of Practice term is complete in two and a half years. What’s the plan?

Prof. Hoffman agreed that the school is going to have to replace him with a full time faculty member. That’s a question for the Dean, who had left the meeting early.

Prof. Hoffman departs and the Council moves to the discussion phase.

Prof. Epstein noted that other things like this exist, but wondered what people would be finishing in the fifth year.

SVPAA Babington suggested that because the senior design courses are not taken during their 4th year they cannot walk with the BS degree at the end of the 4th year.

Prof. Epstein asked whether people in the five year program walk with their four year class.

Prof. Rusu: They will get both BS and MS at the end of 5th year so theoretically they could walk in both ceremonies but at the end of the 5th year not 4th.

SVPAA Babington: they just need to take the capstones.

Prof. Boquet wanted to follow up that in discussions over resources, one need is support for scientific and technical communication. I can’t see how a masters program with a senior design project happens. Engineering students need lots of support for writing. As we grow our graduate programs, especially in sciences and technology, we have to grapple with other resource questions.

Prof. Steffen noted that it sounds like this one guy is doing all these capstones. And I really think we should require some sort of writing course.

Prof. Lane pointed out that this is an addition to an existing program. He did not think it was a big deal. His more serious concern is that this thing is driven by one person.

Prof. Preli noted that a lot of engineering programs have work experience and internships. It fits with our institutional mission. Also, at the graduate level it seems like 15 credits is extraordinary. 9 is more typical.
Prof. Rusu noted that all projects in Engineering are real-world projects, including the capstone projects. Even the senior design projects for undergrads have industry mentors.

Prof. Preli wondered whether this meant that they are getting management experience.

Prof. Rusu opined that we should not confuse management of projects with leadership. This is not a leadership program.

Prof. Preli noted that it specifically says you are going to manage projects.

Prof. Rusu suggested that this is really about being better engineers at managing projects.

Dean Gibson noted that we have a fifth year MBA. That does not mean you leave the program as a manager. The general trend is for fifth year programs to teach these things.

Prof. Rusu noted that some of the courses might be spread out, with students taking only 12 credits at once.

Prof. Smith echoed the resource question. International students are tough. It’s a chicken and egg situation: you need the students to justify hiring a professor, but you need the professor to get the students. I empathize with the situation. It is common in the professional schools.

Prof. Epstein also wanted to echo that. If there is no interest, why have a program. If there is interest, then we have to provide resources.

SVPAA Babington explained that the program already exists. This is just a new pathway into it. That’s a common thing. Five-year programs in engineering are becoming the norm nationally.

Prof. Epstein agreed that we have been doing lots of these five year programs, but asked why these particular ones?

SVPAA Babington replied that the suggestions came from the faculty.

Prof. Boquet again noted that the resource issue is not separate. We have industry professionals, but they need support. Many of them are teaching students with acculturation issues. This is great, but we need to support them in all different ways.

Prof. Rusu makes a motion to approve the Five Year Masters of Management Technology.

Prof. Lane seconds.

Prof. Downie: I speak in favor of it. These students will already go through the core. They can opt out and just get a BS. I speak for it.

Mr. Abate says that on behalf of the students, expediency is also a positive thing. But there is already a Management of Technology masters degree; this is just a five-year thing. It’s just making it more convenient.

Prof. Rakowitz questions why we are expanding a program which is based on one person who is here for a maximum of two and a half more years.

Prof. Strauss wonders whether we need to have the Dean of Engineering here.

Prof. Downie suggests that if the program is successful, they will hire somebody.

Prof. McDermott speaks in favor of the motion. If this is another pathway, then I speak in favor of the motion. He does not want to conflate the bigger issues with this smaller one.

Prof. Preli is concerned. What do you do if there is a sudden influx?

Prof. Downie believes they’d have to be accepted into the college.

Prof. Rusu notes that the decision is made at end of sophomore, beginning of junior year.

Students might come for the undergrad degree and see this as another opportunity.

Prof. Preli: so we’re saying the adjunct-only courses would service this?

Prof. Babington thinks there will be plenty of time to plan for it. She suggests that the Council doesn’t need to look at resources. New faculty in the SOE have been growing each year to meet the needs of the school and increased student enrollment.

Prof. Preli suggests that perhaps this is far more planned than it seems, but that we at Fairfield have a tendency to put things in motion and then figure out the resources. We have a habit of doing this.

Prof. Lane calls the question.

Prof. Downie seconds.

Only two opposed to calling the question; question is called.

Motion to approve the program now on the table. (Rusu / Lane)
11 for; 5 opposed; 1 abstention.

7c: UCC proposal for revision to US Diversity criteria

Prof. Erica Hartwell enters. She was on the US Diversity Committee last year and is chairing it this year. She explains that they were asked by the UCC to examine the language in the US Diversity criteria. We decided that there were two points for revision. We decided to examine this as a result of a specific course that we were presented with that dealt with disability. We wanted to have the focus on race, class, and gender. Other things are OK if they intersect with those categories. So we made some changes including changing race and ethnic to race-ethnicity.

Prof. Rakowitz asked whether this would this impact any existing courses.

Prof. Hartwell: no.

Prof. Lane makes a motion to accept the language on page 82; Prof. Weiss seconds; unanimous approval. The text of the new language is:

“In order to help students develop a critical consciousness of self and society, all undergraduates are required to take one course that gives significant treatment to aspects of diversity and pluralism in U.S. society. Such courses will explore, in a systematic manner, connections among race-ethnicity, class, and gender, and will examine issues of privilege and difference in U.S. society. Additional aspects of diversity may be considered provided that their intersection with race, class, and gender are examined.”

Election of Faculty Members to the Search Committee for University Librarian

Prof. Rakowitz notes that we agreed last time to vote for people to serve on the committee to hire a new head librarian. A vote is conducted by the council and Prof. Rakowitz reports that Profs. Gil-Egui, Miecznikowski, Etemad, Planas have been chosen to serve.

7e, Change of name of program in Russian and Eastern European Studies

Motion [?/ Rusu] to change Russian and Eastern European Studies to Russian, Eastern European, and Central Asian Studies, approved unanimously.

The meeting is adjourned at 5:02.

Respectfully submitted,
David Crawford
Recording Secretary
Date: November 23, 2015
To: Members of the Academic Council
From: Susan Rakowitz, Secretary of the General Faculty
Re: Electing faculty to the newly established Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty

The General Faculty and Board of Trustees have agreed to add the following text to the Faculty Handbook.

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 issues regarding non-tenure track faculty.
   Specific Duties
   1. To draft or review policies on matters 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 professional development of non-tenure track faculty.

Proposal
Once the Board approved this text in October, I began consulting with the Committee on
Committees regarding the election of three non-tenure track faculty members to serve on this
committee. We propose that the following text be added to the Journal of Record:

Defining Non-Tenure Track Faculty for the Election to the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty
Those eligible to stand for election and/or to vote in the election of "three non-tenure track
faculty members...by the non-tenure track faculty in an election overseen by the Secretary
of the General Faculty each spring" shall be anyone who meets the Handbook definition of
"Lecturer," "Adjunct Professor," "Visiting Instructor," "Visiting Professor," or "Professor of the Practice."

Rationale
These categories are defined in the Handbook as follows:
A Lecturer shall be a teacher carrying less than the normal teaching load and is appointed
for a single semester or academic year.
An Adjunct Professor, who may have any of the three grades - Assistant, Associate, or
Professor - shall be an expert in a particular field whose main post is outside this or any
other university and who shall be appointed to give part-time or discontinuous service. The title in any grade shall not imply tenure.

A Visiting Instructor, or a Visiting Professor (who may have any of the three grades), shall come to give full-time service for one or two semesters. This may be renewed on an annual basis but not ordinarily for more than a total of three years. The title in any grade does not imply tenure.

A Professor of the Practice, who may have any of the four grades – Instructor, Assistant, Associate, or Full – is appointed to make a contribution to the teaching curriculum and university service based on expertise and professional credentials that differ from professors appointed to tenure-track and tenured positions. The rank of the Professor of the Practice is fixed at appointment and the appointee is not eligible for promotion in rank. The title in any grade does not imply tenure, nor will time served in rank be considered a probationary period toward tenure. The Professor of the Practice may be appointed to as many as two three-year terms. In extraordinary circumstances, the Professor of the Practice may be appointed to a third, and final, three-year term.

Members of these categories meet any definition of non-tenure track faculty. The proposed definition excludes some people who can also be described as non-tenure track faculty, namely, non-tenure track administrators with faculty status (who may or may not teach a partial load), and other full-time employees of the university who sometimes teach a course. Our proposed definition excludes these two groups because their primary relationship to Fairfield is not centered on teaching.

Timeline

Barring objections from the Academic Council, we propose the following timeline for the initial staffing of this committee:

1. If the Academic Council and the administration approve the proposed eligibility definition in December, and the Provost's office can provide me with email addresses for all those who meet this definition as of the spring semester of 2016, I will send out a call for nominations at the start of the spring semester.

2. In late January, we'll conduct an election by email, through a unique, single use, and anonymous link sent to each eligible faculty member.

3. As soon as the election for non-tenure track faculty is complete, I will put out a call for nominations to the General Faculty, and we will hold the election for the three members of the General Faculty at the February or March GF meeting. The committee can begin meeting right after that election.

4. In each of the two elections: the top vote getter will be assigned a term running through the spring of 2019; the second highest vote getter will serve through the spring of 2018; and the third highest vote getter will serve through the spring of 2017. There will be no election for this committee at the GF committee elections in May of 2016.

5. Beginning in the spring of 2017, each year's election of a new non-tenure track faculty member to the committee will take place in March, before the call for nominations goes out for the May election meeting of the General Faculty.