ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, April 4, 2016 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 March 14, 2016 (attachment)
   b. Correspondence
   c. Oral Reports

4. Council Subcommittee Reports
   a. Subcommittee discussing post-tenure review (AC 9/21/15) (attachment)
   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
   a. Proposal to change procedures for electing faculty to Handbook committees (attachment)

7. New business
   a. Approval of CoC ballot for May 4 General Faculty meeting committee elections
   b. Proposal for a Minor in Graphic Design (attachment)
   c. Proposal for the Doctorate of Nursing Practice: Nurse-Midwifery Program (attachment and additional materials posted on the GFS website)
   d. Proposal to amend Handbook language to reflect current practices of the FDEC (attachment)
   e. Proposal to adopt newly revised IDEA evaluation and platform (attachment and additional materials posted on the GFS website)
   f. Report on mission and identity self-study (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 March 14, 2016 (pages 3 – 8)
For item 4.a.: Post-tenure review report (pages 9 – 17)
For item 6.a.: Proposal to change procedures for electing faculty to Handbook committees (pages 18 – 19)
For item 7.b.: Proposal for a Minor in Graphic Design (pages 20 - 28)
For item 7.d.: Proposal to amend Handbook language to reflect current practices of the FDEC (page 51 - 52)
For item 7.e.: Proposal to adopt newly revised IDEA evaluation and platform (pages 53 - 56 and additional materials at: http://faculty.fairfield.edu/gfs/AC/2015-2016/ac15-16.html)
For item 7.f.: Report on mission and identity self-study (pages 57 - 70)

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, March 14, 2016 from 3:30 to 5:00 PM
CNS 200

Faculty Members Present: Professors Behre, Bhattacharya, Boquet, Crawford, Epstein, Klug, Kris, Lane, McDermott, Preli, Rakowitz, Rusu, Smith, Strauss, Weiss, Yarrington
Administrators Present: Babington, Berdanier, Gibson, Hannafin, Kazer, Williams
Observer: Jackie Kremer
Student Observer: Megan Benson
Guests: Professors Harding (7b), McFadden (7d), Staecker (7c)
Regrets: Professors Downie and Steffen

1. Presidential courtesy
Postponed until next meeting.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty
Nothing to report

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
Minutes from the February 1, 2016 meeting were approved with minor corrections.

Motion to approve (Lane/Weiss): approved unanimously with 1 abstention

Prof. Rusu presented a report from Chris Huntley (ongoing item #1) showing varsity athletic events scheduled during final exam week. Prof. Lane noted that the baseball team has a regularly scheduled game during finals week which is a violation of the Journal of Record. He asked if the provost was aware of this. Prof. Strauss suggested revisiting the question once the provost arrives at the meeting.

7. New business
7a. Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees: report on December meeting, preparation for March meeting

Prof. Behre gave a brief overview of the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees December meeting with the Academic Affairs subcommittee of the Board. She reported that the conversation revolved around enrollment and staffing which is a problem that needs attention. She said that Provost Babington presented data showing that we have more full-time faculty than ever but these are not necessarily tenure-track faculty. Prof. Behre reported that Prof. Dallavalle gave a presentation at the Board meeting and then led a discussion related to mission and identity.

Prof. Behre then presented some concerns she has related to faculty participation at meetings with the Board. She said that the Committee on Conference’s time with the Board is very limited and is often taken up with presentations, not substantive discussions. In addition, the meetings in New York City are a logistical problem for faculty. This year Provost Babington has offered travel...
funding but it is difficult for faculty to get to the New York City meeting because of teaching schedules. Prof. Behre acknowledged that the hour with the Academic Affairs subcommittee was hard won and that cultivating a positive relationship with the Board is important and she is sympathetic to that but feels that time is limited and constrained. Prof. Preli noted that this isn’t the first time we’ve had the conversation that this time is overscheduled. Prof. Lane said that it used to be a 1.5 hour meeting with half devoted to the provost and half to faculty. He said that the pattern changed during the last SVPAA’s administration. Provost Babington noted that for the past couple of meetings, she hasn’t done any presentations. Prof. Behre replied that there were presentations by others, including touring classrooms and Prof. Dalavalle’s presentation. Provost Babington replied that these are presentations that the Board members requested and noted that the only thing on the April agenda is a conversation on shared goals. She said that these shared goals were developed in partnership between the Board and the faculty. Prof. Behre said that she tries hard to make sure there is enough time but it is a difficult balance.

Prof. Rakowitz reminded the Council that one of our roles is to send items to the Committee on Conference with the Board for discussion with the Board. For example, over the past 5 years, the percentage of all full-time teaching faculty who are tenure-track has fallen from 91% to 85%. Is that a staffing conversation we should be having? Prof. Behre said they’d love to have some direction from the Council. Prof. Crawford agreed that staffing is clearly an issue, but so are other things that we continue to bring up, including a multi-year MOU and healthcare concerns. Prof. Lane said that the Committee on Conference should bring up the issue of the size of the undergraduate population. He said that Fairfield 2020 changed the enrollment goal but the faculty haven’t voted on it or addressed it which brings up huge issues. There are implications for resources and faculty; it needs to be strategic. Prof. Rakowitz said she shares the concern at how the number was arrived at and the lack of faculty involvement. She is not sure that all of the issues have been thought through. She added that she doesn’t want to ask the Committee on Conference to address salary and benefits because that is the purview of the Faculty Salary Committee. Prof. Epstein said that he doesn’t like the fact that every year the BOT hears the negative related to salary and benefits. He noted that those issues do have an impact on mission. He said that in the context of the discussions going on in the salary committee, we have to set priorities consistent with our mission for education not the business model. For example, much of the fundraising for the capital campaign was originally to be for the general endowment in support of the education mission. Now, there has been a shift with more of the funding going towards new buildings. If there is a shift in funding, this affects mission. Prof. Epstein said he thinks we should be discussing this with the Board. Prof. Behre asked how Prof. Epstein would like these issues presented. Prof. Epstein replied that he wasn’t sure but that he thinks we need to think more about how to have these conversations. Prof. Behre asked whether there could be a more formal way to communicate information from the Academic Council to the Committee on Conference to make sure these issues get raised. Prof. McDermott said that from a business model sense, everything the Board is doing makes perfect sense if the goal is to maximize profit but that is not what we are about. Prof. Epstein asked whether it is a good business model if the goals are quality. Prof. Lane pointed out that the share of the operating budget that goes to what we’d call education has had a long decline. Prof. Boquet suggested framing this discussion around the concept of 3 pillars: 1) The priorities of Fairfield 2020 which sets the future of the University; 2) The Fairfield Rising campaign which determines what we are raising money for, and how has it shifted; and 3) the way in which these two things are aligned with the budget priorities. She continued that if we set it up like this, then
the conversation is less about salary negotiations and more about the overall tension between priorities and funds.

Prof. Lane suggested that the Academic Council form a subcommittee that would work with the Committee on Conference with the Board to decide which issues to bring forward for discussion. Prof. Bhattacharya concurred saying that we want to make sure the Board sees the connections between the issues raised in the discussion today. Dean Williams voiced his support for the idea. Prof. Behre agreed saying that it would present a more unified voice from the faculty. She said that at this point, committee members are reluctant to bring forward individual issues/ideas that may not be shared by others.

**Motion (Lane/Strauss): That the Academic Council form a subcommittee of three people to prepare the Academic Council for its meetings with the Committee on Conference with the Board. Passed unanimously.**

Prof. Lane volunteered to chair the subcommittee. Prof. McDermott volunteered to serve. Prof. Lane will solicit volunteers for the 3rd position. Prof. Behre agreed to communicate with the subcommittee in advance of the March meeting with the Board of Trustees.

**7b. Proposal for Concentration in Behavioral Neuroscience (attachment)**

Prof. Harding presented the proposal from the Psychology department. Briefly, there is a minor in Behavioral Neuroscience that is not available to Psychology majors because of course overlap. There is interest among Psychology majors and so they designed a concentration to have the same set of classes as the minor.

Prof. Lane noted that the EPC approved this proposal quickly and that it is one of the best proposals he’s ever seen. Prof. Crawford said that he can’t see any objections since it is simply a change in terminology. Prof. Bhattacharya asked if there are any other concentrations available to Psychology majors. Prof. Harding answered no, that this was a way for a student to show an interest in behavioral neuroscience on their transcript. Prof. Bhattacharya noted that there are multiple concentrations in management and there is always a question of overlap among classes and how they should double count. Prof. Epstein asked whether there were any biology requirements for the Psychology major. Prof. Harding said no, and that is one reason why behavioral neuroscience is not a major. A major in behavioral neuroscience would have to have more biology and chemistry. She noted that students who pursue the B.S. in Psychology take biology and chemistry.

**Motion (Rakowitz/Yarrington): To approve the Concentration in Behavioral Neuroscience for Psychology majors. Passed Unanimously.**

**7c. Proposal to change procedures for electing faculty to Handbook committees (attachment)**

Prof. Staecker presented a proposal from the Committee on Committees to change from a plurality to an approval voting system for electing faculty members to committees. Prof. Staecker explained that he has studied the mathematics of voting and thinks an approval system is a better system given that we typically have more than 2 good candidates on the ballot. He said plurality voting works well when there are only 2 candidates but that strange things happen when more than 2. Prof.
Staecker explained that in an approval system, voters vote for all candidates they approve of rather than voting for the best candidate. It allows voters to voice support for multiple candidates. For example, rather than choosing between a junior colleague who needs a committee assignment and a respected senior colleague, approval voting allows you to vote for both. He said that approval voting tends to favor consensus candidates rather than extreme candidates which is something we should consider.

Prof. Preli said that in a small school you may rally votes to support a junior colleague who needs to get on a committee. She asked whether an approval system would make it more difficult for junior colleagues to be elected. Prof. Staecker said that people from small schools already have an uphill battle in the plurality system and the approval system should be no worse. Prof. Staecker also noted that if you want to elect an outsider candidate, you can withhold approval of the other candidates. Prof. McDermott asked if you are gaming it and trying to get someone elected, wouldn’t this degrade to plurality. He said that if we all game the system, it would be the same as it is now. Prof. Staecker agreed but said that lots of people won’t do this.

Dean Hannafin asked whether the approval system is more susceptible to gaming than the plurality system. Prof. Staecker said no. Prof. Strauss asked what would happen if the opposite occurs, that is, if everyone checks off everyone. She asked whether there would be more ties. Prof. Staecker said that it is not a good idea to vote for everyone. That is the same as voting for no one. He said there won’t be more ties. Prof. Yarrington asked whether it would take more time to count the votes. Prof. Staecker replied that he doesn’t think so. Prof. Lane said he agrees with Prof. McDermott’s concern. He said that bullet voting can change the average and he is worried about gaming this system. Prof. Staecker said that people are gaming the system now but we just don’t think of it that way. He said that the tricks of gaming the system are different for approval vs plurality. Prof. Bhattacharya noted that if someone has decided that they are only going to vote for their department then they will do this no matter what the system. Dean Williams said that he appreciates the committee looking out for junior faculty because this is an issue. He also complimented Prof. Staecker on his clear discussion and explanation of the approval system. Prof. Crawford said that if we want to protect junior faculty and small schools, we need to designate spots for them on committees. Prof. Lane asked whether we can change the rules on voting. Prof. Rakowitz said that rules related to voting system are not discussed anywhere in the governance documents. She said that we can change the system and make a presentation to the General Faculty or we could ask them to vote. She said that it is Academic Council’s call as to whether the General Faculty needs to vote. Prof. Strauss suggested that the Council table the issue until the April meeting for a more extensive discussion. There was consensus to table.

7d. Proposals for Core Curriculum Revision (attachment)

Prof. Lane asked for a point of information. He asked why the proposal for core curriculum revision wasn’t presented to the EPC since resources are clearly needed. Prof. Epstein responded that he (as Director of the Core) is planning to come to the EPC with a strategic plan but he can’t do that until we know what the core will look like and what resources are needed.

Prof. McFadden then presented a proposal from the UCC for core curriculum revision. He said that it is similar to the proposal submitted to UCC by the Core Advisory Council. Prof. McFadden said that UCC made 3 changes leading to a 48 credit core with 10 courses in Tier 1 and 6 courses in Tier
II. He said that the UCC proposal adds a Visual and Performing Arts course and a Natural Science course to Tier I and allows AP credit to substitute for courses in either Tier I or Tier II.

Prof. McFadden then explained the UCC’s rationale for the changes. He said that they felt that all Jesuit core curriculums should include a VPA course. He said that the addition of a Natural Science courses was a direct response from science, engineering and nursing departments that Natural Science important component of core. He said that the UCC thought that since it is ok to use AP credits to exempt from Tier II then it should be ok for Tier I as well.

Prof. Bhattacharya asked how diversity courses fit into this proposal. Prof. McFadden said that diversity courses are not part of the core but are graduation requirements. Prof. Boquet asked about the process that led the UCC to this proposal. She said that the core task force had worked on a proposal for a long time with input from various sectors. That task force handed a proposal off to the Director of the Core and a Core Advisory Council. Prof. Boquet expressed surprise to see a changed proposal from the UCC. Her understanding was that the various handbook committees were going to provide feedback which could be incorporated by the Core Advisory Council. Prof. McFadden said that the UCC is in charge of core curriculum and the UCC rejected the Core Advisory Council proposal. He said that the UCC made amendments based on feedback because there were strong feelings within UCC that some things needed to be changed. Prof. Lane responded that the General Faculty is in charge of the core curriculum and noted that the last time there was a change, it went directly to the General Faculty. He suggested that both proposals (the Core Advisory Council and the UCC proposal) be brought to the General Faculty.

Prof. Epstein asked why the UCC did not express their concerns to the bodies bringing forth the proposal. He said there are elements in the revised proposal that are not supported by the Core Advisory Council and that the changes do not seem minimal to the Core Advisory Council. Prof. Epstein said that the Core Advisory Council would have appreciated the chance to revise or consider UCC’s concerns before their proposal was voted down by the UCC. Prof. Epstein said that the UCC proposal does not add a Natural Science course; it simply moves a Natural Science course from Tier II to Tier I. He also questioned the decision related to AP exemptions saying that if AP credit can be used to exempt course from Tier I than there is no advantage for a course to be placed in Tier I. Prof. McFadden said that Prof. Epstein had a fair point and that the UCC did not discuss that issue. Prof. Epstein noted that the AP issue was one of many things that we could have discussed if we’d talked about this.

Prof. Epstein said that one of the founding principles for the core revision team was that all undergraduate students have the same core curriculum. He said that it was not clear that engineering students could do a 48 credit core. Dean Berdanier said that it depends on how course are counted and that the UCC proposal may work if the CAD course is counted as VPA. Prof. Kris said that there are some concerns that nursing students could not complete a 16 course core. Provost Babington asked whether this is the right forum to talk about implementation. Prof. Epstein said no, but these are critical questions that should have been discussed. He said that his main concern is that the Core Advisory Council did not have the chance to discuss the changes the UCC is proposing.

Prof. Bhattacharya asked whether the UCC considered Study Abroad. Prof. McFadden replied no.
Motion (Boquet/Lane): The Academic Council directs the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to communicate its concerns with the submitted Core revision model directly to the Core Director and the Core Advisory Council and to reconsider the proposal with any changes or revisions offered by that body

Provost Babington spoke in favor of the motion. She noted that the revised proposal passed UCC by 9 to 7 so there was room for discussion.

Prof. Rakowitz spoke in favor of the motion. She said that while it is true that any committee has the right to edit a proposal, the core revision proposal is negotiated document. She noted that the General Faculty doesn’t vote to amend the MOU because it doesn't make sense to amend a negotiated document.

Prof. Weiss said that she doesn’t understand why the EPC isn’t involved. Prof. Epstein said that the EPC will be involved but doesn’t make sense until we know what core will look like. He noted that we also want to address the issue of diversity courses. It is an issue that keeps coming up and it is important. Prof. Epstein said that if the core is revised, he will come to UCC and suggest a revision to the diversity requirement so that it fits better with the core.

Prof. Rusu requested that the Core Advisory Council include members from all schools. Prof. Epstein asked if it would be ok if instead, the council communicates to all schools at each step. Profs. Rusu/Strauss/Bhattacharya expressed concern that this model hasn’t worked so far. Prof. Epstein said he will bring more members from outside the college onto the council.

Prof. Crawford spoke in favor of the motion. He noted that the core revision process has been going on for 2 years and that much has been discussed. He said it must be frustrating to those involved when someone changes something without considering consequences.

Dean Williams agreed with Prof. Crawford and said it sets a dangerous precedent if major changes can be made at this point in process.

Prof. Boquet said that there needs to be some sense of how ad hoc and standing committees interact with our governance structures. She noted that this is not the only current example where there is some question about how and where different parallel structures meet.

Prof. McDermott spoke in favor of the motion but said that he would like the language of the motion to be such that it doesn’t diminish the importance of the work of the UCC.

Motion passed unanimously.

Motion to adjourn (Rusu/Strauss). Passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Jen Klug
Post-Tenure Review Report to Academic Council 3-24-16

This document contains three distinct sections:

1) Recommendation for replacing the current merit system with a system of annual faculty review and a post tenure review system,
2) Rationale for these recommendations based on the feedback received from faculty,
3) The actual resolution that we respectfully request faculty approve as a change to the Journal of Record.

Members of the Post Tenure Review Committee: Lynn Babington, Joe Dennin, Dennis Keenan, Carl Scheraga, Emily Smith, Kate Wheeler, Jo Yarrington, Wook-Sung Yoo Charge: Discuss in earnest the feasibility of a post-tenure review system that could replace the current merit system and be in place for FY17 (2016-2017).

Recommendations: To replace the current merit system with the following:

1. Annual evaluation and self-assessment for all full-time faculty members.

The purpose of this review is to determine whether a faculty member qualifies for the annual salary increase determined by annual collegial discussions between the Faculty Salary Committee and the administration regarding the “Memo of Understanding: Faculty Compensation (Salary and Benefits).” The annual evaluation and self-assessment (currently three 250 word reflections) should reflect the past year in the areas of teaching, scholarly and/or creative activities and service. Each school may continue to use their current process for the annual evaluation and self-assessment.

2. Post-tenure review process.

The principles guiding this recommendation for a post-tenure review process are drawn from “Post-Tenure Review: An AAUP Response”: “Post-tenure review ought to be aimed not at accountability, but at faculty development. Post-tenure review must be developed and carried out by faculty. Post-tenure review must not be a reevaluation of tenure, nor may it be used to shift the burden of proof from an institution’s administration (to show cause for dismissal) to the individual faculty member (to show cause why he or she should be retained). Post-tenure review must be conducted according to the standards that protect academic freedom and the quality of education.”

The post tenure review process is a formative process and will not be tied to the annual salary increase agreed to as part of collegial discussions between the Faculty Salary Committee and the administration regarding the “Memo of Understanding: Faculty Compensation (Salary and Benefits).” The post tenure review process replaces extraordinary merit. There is no financial component tied to this process.

Post tenure review will be conducted at a minimum of every 5 years (with a three year interval recommended for associate professors with tenure). This formative process will recognize past accomplishments, support goals and identify and address areas for development. Components of the post tenure review include:

1. Completion of a self-assessment by the faculty member on past performance and aspirations for the future.
2. A meeting between the faculty member and the Dean. Though this post-tenure review process is developed by faculty (as recommended by the AAUP), it is not carried out (entirely) by faculty. Given that the purpose of the meeting is to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development, it seems appropriate that the Dean play a role in mentoring process (but it must be emphasized that this review is not a re-evaluation of tenure). In preparation for the meeting, the faculty member would submit the self-evaluation, curriculum vitae, and a summary of teaching evaluations.

3. If there are areas identified by the faculty member and the Dean that require further development for the faculty member, a developmental plan with a timeline will be outlined and signed off on by both the faculty member and dean. Some examples:
   a. It may be that a faculty member continues to receive teaching evaluations from students and peers that are less than desirable. Then a plan would be jointly developed that includes such things as participation in CAE programs, seeking individual consultation with CAE staff, working with a master teacher, and joining a faculty learning community.
   b. If a faculty member has not been involved in any service, the developmental plan could include an agreement to serve one’s department, school, University, community or professional organization.
   c. If the faculty member indicates they have an interest in moving into new fields of scholarship or if their scholarship has stalled a bit, the Dean may be able to provide resources to engage the faculty member in new programs, interdisciplinary scholarship or other new forms of scholarship.

Rationale for Recommendations based on Faculty Feedback

1. Recommendation that post tenure review be carried out by a meeting between the applicant and the dean.
   a. Department chairs may not be at the same or higher rank than the applicant.
   b. Deans are responsible for allocating resources.
   c. Provides an opportunity to have a discussion on career accomplishments and goals with the Dean.

2. Recommendation that we continue with an annual review process for all full time faculty to determine eligibility for an annual salary increase.
   a. As a community of scholars, faculty are committed to our mission of expanding knowledge and deepening understanding, thus supporting and encouraging scholarly research and artistic production of faculty and students.
   b. It is prudent for any employee to reflect annually on accomplishments and this review is tied to annual salary increase.

3. Recommendation for a minimum of 5 years between reviews for tenured full professors and 3 years for tenured associate professors.
   a. Since this is a formative process, an associate professor may find more frequent guidance and support than a full professor useful in presenting a strong case for promotion in a timely fashion.
   b. For a full professor, a maximum of 5 years between reviews allows reflection on accomplishments and goal setting for future career objectives.
Resolution: Be it resolved that the Appendix 12 from the Journal of Record be revised to remove all references to merit, further merit, additional merit and extraordinary merit, and to add text on post tenure review as follows (additions underlined, deletions struck through):

Appendix 12: Guidelines for Faculty Annual Merit Review, and Self-Evaluation and post tenure review

Post Tenure Review

Post tenure review will be conducted at a minimum of every 5 years (with a three year interval recommended for associate professors with tenure). This formative process will recognize past accomplishments, support goals and identify and address areas for development. Components of the post tenure review include:

1. Completion of a self-assessment by the faculty member on past performance and aspirations for the future.
2. A meeting between the faculty member and the Dean. Though this post-tenure review process is developed by faculty (as recommended by the AAUP), it is not carried out (entirely) by faculty. Given that the purpose of the meeting is to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development, it seems appropriate that the Dean play a role in mentoring process (but it must be emphasized that this review is not a reevaluation of tenure). In preparation for the meeting, the faculty member would submit the self-evaluation, curriculum vitae, and a summary of teaching evaluations.
3. If there are areas identified by the faculty member and the Dean that require further development for the faculty member, a developmental plan with a timeline will be outlined and signed off on by both the faculty member and dean. Some examples:
   a. It may be that a faculty member continues to receive teaching evaluations from students and peers that are less than desirable. Then a plan would be jointly developed that includes such things as participation in CAE programs, seeking individual consultation with CAE staff, working with a master teacher, and joining a faculty learning community.
   b. If a faculty member has not been involved in any service, the developmental plan could include an agreement to serve one’s department, school, University, community or professional organization.
   c. If the faculty member indicates they have an interest in moving into new fields of scholarship or if their scholarship has stalled a bit, the Dean may be able to provide resources to engage the faculty member in new programs, interdisciplinary scholarship or other new forms of scholarship.

Faculty members will take part in annual merit evaluation and self-assessment by writing three short essays, one each on teaching, scholarly and/or creative activities, and service. The essays should inspire reflection on the year’s achievements and suggest areas for improvement. Schools or curriculum areas may request that evidence be appended to the essays, e.g., teaching evaluations, new pedagogical materials or reprints of published work. The essays and appended materials will constitute the application for merit pay annual salary increases. In addition, faculty members will receive qualitative feedback on their performance from their chairs, program area directors, or a duly constituted committee.
This document describes the process and provides guidelines for writing the essays. There will be three potential levels of merit: “standard” and two levels beyond this (called “additional” and “extraordinary”). Whether merit is salary increases are actually awarded in a given year will depend on budget considerations, but the yearly assessment should be done regardless of the status of the budget.

Below you will find an overview of what might constitute standard, additional and extraordinary merit eligibility for an annual salary increase in the three categories of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service, and additional detail on how to submit the assessments.

**Standard Merit**

**Eligibility for an Annual Salary Increase**

Standard merit eligibility for an annual salary increase is a threshold that the great majority of faculty should be able to achieve annually. Because Fairfield University recognizes that effective teaching is critical to our mission and a fundamental promise that we make to our students, each faculty member must make a case for teaching effectiveness. In addition to demonstrating professional and quality engagement with teaching, the standard merit threshold eligibility for an annual salary increase requires a positive professional contribution in scholarly/creative activity or service. The evaluation period for standard merit eligibility for an annual salary increase is the calendar year.

Eligibility for an annual salary increase requires sufficient achievements or activities in teaching and one other area.

**Further Merit**

Further merit is characterized by two levels, additional merit, and extraordinary merit. The differentiation among the levels is determined by the standards of the curriculum area according to the quality, impact, prestige, reach, difficulty, and/or rarity of the accomplishments. The lists below reflect some examples that distinguish among standard, additional, and extraordinary merit. These are not checklists but guides. The emphasis should be on the positive, professional contribution the faculty member has made through the activity.

The evaluation period for further merit includes all calendar years since further merit was funded by the salary pool.

The lists below indicate the types of achievements and activities appropriate to each level of merit. As stated above, Standard Merit requires sufficient achievements or activities in teaching and one other area. To earn Additional Merit, the faculty member must demonstrate achievements at the Additional level in two areas and the Standard level in the third area. Extraordinary Merit requires achievements at the Extraordinary level in one area and at the Additional level in the other two areas.

**The Application: Essays on Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service**

There is a single application for all three levels of merit annual faculty review. It will comprise three short essays reflections (or annotated lists) in the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service (though only achievements in teaching and one other area are required to be eligible for an annual salary increase for the standard merit threshold). Schools or curriculum areas may request appended information that supports the essays reflections. If the faculty member has no activities or achievements to discuss regarding either service or scholarly/creative pursuits, that essay reflection should be devoted to plans for that area. Candidates should have flexibility in making their case,
and the arguments should be primarily qualitative because they are meant to inspire reflection. Each essay reflection should be focused and concise, no more than 250 words or one double-spaced page. Each essay reflection should discuss important highlights in that particular area and not be a detailed list of every activity. In years when there is further merit, the faculty member will specify the level of merit for which he or she is applying.

Below are some guidelines for what could be included in the three essays reflections. The examples listed are not intended to be exhaustive or used as checklists; rather, they are illustrations of typical or common activities in the three areas. Within each area, activities that qualify a faculty member for a higher level include qualification for any lower level.

Note that the relative importance of the three areas within the review is reflected by their ordering. That is, consistent with the norms of the profession and the mission of the university, teaching is the most important thing we do, followed by scholarly/creative accomplishments, and then by service. However, individuals may emphasize different areas at different points in their professional lives.

The structures above reflect campus-wide values for teaching, scholarship and service in order to achieve standard merit be eligible for an annual salary increase. However, schools and curriculum areas differ in their disciplinary approaches to pedagogy and scholarship, accreditation requirements, and even service needs based on the size of the school. These differences may have an impact on the determination of merit eligibility for an annual salary increase through the addition of items in the bulleted examples below and through the merit annual review process itself.

Examples of Activities in Support of Merit an Annual Salary Increase

Teaching:
Teaching includes curriculum design and review, classroom instruction, quality advising, clinical/practicum supervision, close work with students outside the classroom, assessment of learning outcomes, and work that contributes to the improvement of teaching at the university. To qualify for an annual salary increase standard merit in teaching, the faculty member must fulfill the relevant duties specified in the Handbook and provide evidence of active engagement in quality teaching. These duties include: preparing, administering and grading exams; directing, grading and discussing papers and projects; submitting grades in a timely manner; maintaining office hours; and beginning and ending classes on time (Handbook, sections C.1.a, b, c, and d).

Besides meeting these basic professional responsibilities, the faculty member must make the case for being actively engaged in quality teaching. The member should have teaching evaluations that support the case for teaching effectiveness, and the lists below contain some of the additional standard ways to demonstrate teaching effectiveness. The essay and supporting materials are not limited to these activities, and should emphasize how the activity contributes in a positive way to teaching in the department or program and at the university. Finally, where teaching evaluations are relatively weak, the essay reflection should include explanations and plans for addressing any weaknesses.

Teaching effectiveness and contributions in the area of teaching should comprise the most significant part of any annual review.

Typical activities that, done well, might demonstrate eligibility for an annual salary increase:
• Consistently strong teaching evaluations (benchmarked by discipline, course level, and other considerations).
• Developing a new course or substantially revamping an existing course to meet program or university goals.
• Teaching a course that is significantly more labor intensive than a typical course in the curriculum area.
• Supervising an intensive student learning experience outside the traditional classroom (e.g., independent research, clinical/practicum supervision).
• Serving as the director of a master’s thesis or project.
• Incorporating ideas from the Center for Academic Excellence or other pedagogical workshops into teaching.
• Above average student advisement load.
• Other activities that contribute significantly to effective teaching.

Activities that, done well, might demonstrate achievement of Additional Merit:
• Consistently very strong teaching evaluations (benchmarked by discipline, course level, and other considerations).
• Participating in peer review with colleagues in other departments or significant mentoring of others’ teaching.
• Innovative advising and/or unusually heavy advising load.
• Directing student research teams.
• Teaching that contributes to institutional initiatives (e.g., team teaching, interdisciplinary teaching, cluster course teaching, service-learning, or teaching in conjunction with a residential learning community).
• Developing and/or maintaining clinical or other placement sites.
• Contributing substantially to a program self-study, or academic assessment or accreditation activity in a curriculum area.
• Other comparable achievements that contribute significantly to effective teaching.

Activities that, done well, might demonstrate achievement of Extraordinary Merit:
• Consistently superior teaching evaluations (benchmarked by discipline, course level, and other considerations).
• Contributing significantly to the institutional culture of reflective practice and peer review of teaching.
• Significant mentoring or unusually intensive work with students outside class or beyond the usual teaching load.
• Leading a program self-study, or academic assessment or accreditation activity in a curriculum area.
• Receiving a teaching award.
• Other comparable achievements that contribute significantly to effective teaching.

Scholarly/Creative Activity:

It is the responsibility of all professional scholars to participate in their academic communities, through innovation, application, and dissemination of scholarly work. The Handbook specifies forms of participation in the scholarly and professional community, namely: “Involvement in scholarly research or other professionally recognized creative activities; active participation in professional societies and educational organizations; and keeping abreast of current developments in one’s field” (Handbook, sections C.1.h, j, and k). The lists below contain some of the standard ways to demonstrate this active participation. Again, the essay reflection is not limited to the
activities listed below and should **emphasize how each activity makes a positive professional contribution and enhances the university.**

Evidence of and commentary on scholarly and creative contributions to one's field should comprise a significant portion of any annual review.

Typical activities that, done well, might demonstrate achievement of Standard Merit eligibility for an annual salary increase:

- Contributing in peer reviewed publications or creative works relevant to one's discipline or field.
- Presenting at a professional conference or meeting.
- Serving on a panel, roundtable, or special session at a professional meeting.
- Serving as a reviewer for a scholarly journal or professional society.
- Participating regularly in an ongoing scholarly or professional seminar.
- Serving as a reviewer of a tenure application at another institution.
- Communicating academic findings or contributing one's academic expertise to public dialogue through publishing, presenting, media commentary, or task force participation.
- Maintaining clinical licensure or certification relevant to one’s professional program.
- Other significant activities that demonstrate contributions to the candidate’s discipline or field.

Activities that, done well, might demonstrate achievement of Additional Merit:

1. Publishing a peer-reviewed article in a mid–to top-level journal, chapter, or equivalent in exhibit or performance.
2. Leading a scholarly or professional workshop or seminar.
3. Organizing a significant panel or program for a professional meeting or for a public forum for which one’s academic expertise is needed.
4. Giving a notable invited address or similarly notable exhibit.
5. Making a scholarly contribution to the professional organization.
6. Serving on the editorial board of a peer review journal or publication series.
7. Procuring external funding for one’s research.
8. Other comparable achievements that demonstrate scholarly/creative contributions to one's field.

Activities that, done well, might demonstrate achievement of Extraordinary Merit:

1. Publishing a book that has been subject to some form of peer review, article in a top-tier journal or equivalent in exhibit or performance.
2. Giving a major invited address or keynote at a major meeting.
3. Planning and leading the program for a major scholarly meeting.
4. Receiving a major grant from an outside funding source.
5. Receiving an award for research or similar recognition from one's academic peers.
6. Other comparable achievements that demonstrate scholarly/creative contributions to one's field.

Service:

Service to the institution, at the level of departments, schools, or the university, is a vital aspect of our professional responsibility. The *Handbook* specifies basic forms of service to the institution namely, “Attendance at and participation in general faculty and curriculum area meetings; attendance at commencement, convocations and other functions at which the Academic Vice President may request attendance; and service on, and cooperation with, University and curriculum area committees” (*Handbook*, sections C.1.e, f, and g). Besides fulfilling these basic obligations, faculty members who want to qualify for **merit an annual salary increase** in this area must
demonstrate active participation in shared governance and promoting the well-being of the institution.

The lists below contain some of the standard ways to demonstrate active membership in the life of the university and/or the profession. Again, the essay reflection is not limited to these activities and should **emphasize how the activity makes a positive contribution to the institution and/or the profession.**

Typical activities that, done well, might demonstrate achievement of Standard Merit eligibility for an annual salary increase:

- Actively serving on university, school, or department committees.
- Service to a professional organization.
- Organizing campus events.
- Ongoing volunteer community service that fits the mission of the university.
- Actively participating in recruitment, admission, and retention of students.
- Other activities that contribute significantly to the university or the profession.

Activities that, done well, might demonstrate achievement of Additional Merit:

- Chairing a department or directing a program.
- Serving the department, school, university and/or the profession in a significant way through participation on committees.
- Holding and fulfilling the responsibilities of a formal office in a professional association.
- Contributing substantially to the non-academic elements of an accreditation activity.
- Significant participation in the admissions process (e.g., reviewing applications, interviewing applicants, and contributing to the admission decision).
- Participating on a major university or school task force or equivalent.
- Other comparable achievements that demonstrate service to the institution and/or profession.

Activities that, done well, might demonstrate achievement of Extraordinary Merit:

- Providing major leadership to faculty and shared governance or making a particularly significant contribution through committee leadership.
- Providing leadership for a major university initiative.
- Holding a major leadership position in a professional organization.
- Leading the non-academic elements of an accreditation activity.
- Receiving a major service award from the university, professional society, or civic body.
- Other comparable achievements that demonstrate service to the institution and/or profession.

- Support for any activity in the form of a course release, a university or school stipend, or other university funding for the work should be disclosed in the essays. Significant remuneration for an activity may be considered by the curriculum area head or merit committee to reduce the impact of the activity in the merit review.

**Application Process Guidelines:**

The lists are not intended to be checklists but rather used as guides for faculty members to contemplate and present their significant accomplishments for the year. Schools and departments may expand upon items in the various lists and/or add to the lists those items appropriate to their disciplines and should maintain and distribute the revised list. However, because these lists reflect the activities that the institution as a whole values, schools or departments may not remove any items, although some items may receive greater or lesser emphasis consistent with disciplinary distinctions or programmatic and curricular goals.
In applications, the emphasis should be on the quality of the work and how it reflects the faculty member's productive engagement with his or her department, school, university or profession.

Because they are already extensively reviewed each year and they should be focused on longer-term, rather than annual, goals, untenured, tenure-track faculty members automatically qualify for standard merit. An annual salary increase as long as their continuing (tenure track) contracts are renewed. In years when further merit is available, they may apply for it. In addition, the merit assessments in annual reviews for untenured, tenure-track faculty should recognize that they do not have as many opportunities for leadership in service as tenured faculty do. Faculty members who are promoted in rank during the course of an academic year, automatically qualify for an annual salary increase standard merit and may apply for additional merit.

By a specified due date, each faculty member will submit her or his application to the head of the appropriate curriculum area or a committee within the area or school. The head or committee will make a recommendation to the appropriate dean as to what level of merit the candidate qualifies for. After the dean makes a final decision, the head or committee will communicate this decision to the faculty member. Individuals (whether the head of a curriculum area or on a committee charged with making merit annual salary increase recommendations) may not make recommendations regarding their own merit annual review application.

The annual review process should be summative for the purposes of awarding merit annual salary increases, but also must be formative. Each faculty member should receive feedback from the appropriate administrator (department chair and/or dean) indicating areas in which the faculty member can improve as well as areas in which he/she is doing well. This feedback should include constructive ideas for how this improvement might be accomplished and consideration of the support that is available to enable those improvements.

The role of the Deans and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs will be to ensure that the results of the merit annual review process in each curriculum area are appropriate and have a reasonable degree of consistency across curriculum areas. At the same time, the assessment of these results must be cognizant of distinctions in disciplinary approaches and programmatic and curricular goals.

An appeals process will be developed by the joint Salary Committee (FSC and administrative team) in collaboration with the Deans and SVPAA prior to the first implementation of this plan.

**Distribution of Funds**

If the increase in the salary pool is at or below the increase in the cost of living (CPI-U), the entire increase in the pool will go to Standard Merit. If the increase in the salary pool is above the increase in the cost of living, then the percent going to Standard Merit will be cost of living plus one quarter of the remainder of the increase in the pool. Standard Merit Annual salary increases will be distributed to recipients as a percent of salary or of the mean of the rank, whichever is greater. Additional and Extraordinary Merit will be distributed in such a way that each faculty member who receives Extraordinary Merit in a given year will receive the same dollar amount, and it will be twice the amount awarded to each recipient of Additional Merit.

GF: 10/23/2009
Amended AC: 02/25/2013
To: Academic Council  
From: Committee on Committees  
Re: Proposal to Change to Approval Voting for Handbook Committee Elections  

**Background**

Our faculty policy documents specify some aspects of our Handbook Committee election processes (voting eligibility, role of the Committee on Committees in assembling the ballot, etc.), but it does not specify what voting procedures are to be used. We have always used “plurality voting” in which each voter can vote for as many candidates as there are seats available either on the committee as a whole or within a particular category (school, rank, etc.), and the candidate(s) with the most votes wins.

In the Spring of 2016, Chris Staecker, a mathematician with expertise in the mathematics of voting, joined the Committee on Committees and proposed that we change to “approval voting”. In approval voting, each voter can vote for any number of candidates, with votes thereby representing acceptable rather than best. Again, candidates with the most votes (overall or by category) win. The Committee discussed the proposal and unanimously agreed that it should be forwarded to the Academic Council for the Council’s consideration.

**Proposal**

Insert into the *Journal of Record* (section 6, Items related to Committees of the General Faculty):

**General Faculty Elections of Handbook Committee Members**

Elections conducted by the General Faculty to determine membership on Handbook Committees will be conducted using approval voting, in which each voter receives a ballot and marks any and all candidates whom they approve for the position. The total number of approvals received by each candidate is counted, and the candidate with the most approvals is declared the winner.

In the case of several vacancies on the same committee, the winners are chosen by taking the appropriate number of candidates with the most votes. When vacancies are allotted by categories (e.g. for school, division, or rank), the candidate with the most votes in the required category is declared the winner, even if that person did not receive the most votes overall.

In the case of a tie, a runoff election is held, consisting only of those candidates who tied. In all runoff elections, voters may vote for only one candidate on the ballot. If a runoff election leads to a tie among all remaining candidates, then the General Faculty will decide the election by some other method to be approved on a case-by-case basis.

Some committee positions must be elected by majority vote. “Majority” in this context means that the winner must be approved on more than 50% of the ballots. In the case where no candidate receives a majority approval, a runoff election is held including only those candidates who received approvals in the first round. If necessary, further runoffs will be held, each eliminating the lowest vote getter from the previous round. If a tie in any runoff round renders this elimination impossible, the General Faculty will decide the election by some other method to be approved on a case-by-case basis.

---

1 This procedure is modified for the Committee on Committees and the Rank and Tenure Committee, both of which require a majority of votes cast, rather than a plurality. Contested seats on those committees may require runoff elections until a majority is reached.
Rationale

What's wrong with the current (plurality) system?

The plurality system is so common that most people (at least in America) are unaware of the existence of better systems. Researchers in the mathematics of voting are unanimous in rejecting the plurality system. It is especially bad in elections with more than 2 strong candidates, which is the typical situation for faculty committee elections at Fairfield.

The plurality system's failing is that it forces voters to choose only one candidate on the ballot. This has several negative implications. For example:

- If a voter likes two candidates and strongly dislikes some third candidate, he or she must make a hard decision. The result is a vote that places all of the voter's weight behind a single candidate, even if the voter only slightly prefers the first to second choice candidate. This results in the well-known “vote splitting” phenomenon, where similar candidates with broad support can ruin each other's chances of being elected.
- Voters will formulate their votes not merely to express their opinions, but also strategically, taking into account “electability” of their favorite candidate. For example if I believe that my top choice candidate will not win the election, I should change my vote to avoid “throwing my vote away”. In this way the results of the election are strongly influenced by perception of who will win, rather than opinion about who should win.

For our committee elections, both of these effects are real issues. Faculty may, for example have to choose between a respected senior faculty member and a pre-tenure colleague, both of whom they find quite acceptable. If dozens of ambivalent faculty members compromise by throwing their full support behind one candidate, the election outcome won’t necessarily reflect true preferences.

The proposed new system

The well-known system known as approval voting is commonly used by many professional organizations, is very simple for voters and talliers, and immediately removes the bad effects described above. As explained above, each voter can vote for as many candidates as they like. The candidate who receives the most vote wins. If there are n committee vacancies, then the top n candidates win. With this system, the voters should be instructed to vote for whichever candidates they “approve” for the committee position. The voters do not need to consider which candidate is best, they simply choose any whom they support. If voters do not approve of any candidate, they can vote for nobody. If they approve of every candidate, they can vote for everybody.

This system removes issues of vote splitting and “throwing your vote away” on outsider candidates.

Additional issues to consider

Approval voting makes consensus candidates (e.g., everyone’s second choice) more likely to be elected than polarizing candidates.

Finally, the Committee on Committees discussed, without resolution, which style of voting would be likely to produce more thoughtful consideration of the candidates. One argument is that forcing a choice among acceptable candidates (plurality voting) could lead voters to make a random selection. Alternatively, having to make a choice might lead voters to a more careful consideration of qualified candidates than they might engage in with approval voting.
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SUMMARY
The interdisciplinary minor in Graphic Design will prepare students to learn, reflect, and act within the increasingly complex role of design in virtually all facets of both profit and not-for-profit fields. The minor will complement students’ other fields of study with the concepts, theories and competencies of design as well as being mindful of the core mission of Fairfield University as a Jesuit institution.

Through the expertise and course offerings of faculty at Fairfield University, students will have opportunities to learn about and acquire design skills, explore different understandings of visual communication in a variety of cultural contexts, enhance their fields of study and career goals, and prepare them to be engaged local and global citizens. This minor will bridge a gap in the Undergraduate curriculum.

Graphic design, also known as communication design, is the art and practice of planning and projecting ideas and experiences with visual and textual content. The form of the communication can be physical or virtual, and may include images, words, or graphic forms. The experience can take place in an instant or over a long period of time. The work can happen at any scale, from the design of a single postage stamp to a national postal signage system, or from a company’s digital avatar to the sprawling and interlinked digital and physical content of an international newspaper. It can also be for any purpose, whether commercial, educational, cultural, or political.

NEED
Growing Student Interest
Students in the departments of Visual and Performing Arts, Communication, and Marketing have expressed a need for training in graphic design. In addition, with the new majors in PR and Digital Journalism, there will be further demand for this minor. All our competitor and peer institutions, both Jesuit and local, such as Quinnipiac and Providence, have a graphic design program, leaving us behind in meeting student demand and losing students to other institutions.

Increasing Career Opportunities in Design
Virtually every field has a design component, allowing students of any school or any major to find a relevancy with design training through the proposed minor.

In addition, the administration reports that Graphic Design is one of the three skills areas in the most demand.

RATIONALE
The impact of Design is far reaching. Design that is meant to be experienced in an instant is the easiest to recognize and has been around the longest. For over a hundred years, designers have arranged type, form, and image on posters, advertisements, packages, and other printed matter, as well as information visualizations and graphics for newspapers and magazines. Motion graphics are equally predetermined and crafted, but are meant to be experienced over a fixed time span, such as for the opening credits of a movie or an online video meant to accompany a newspaper article.
The design of books and magazines also has a long history. Whether physical or digital, these are objects that are meant to be enjoyed over time, during which time the reader has control over the pace and sequence of the experience. In books, the content usually comes before the design, while in magazines, the design is a structure that anticipates written and visual content that hasn’t yet been created. Some commercial websites or exhibition catalogues also fit in this category, as do digital or physical museum displays that show information that doesn’t change. All have fixed content, but the user or reader determines their own path through the material.

Many designers also produce systems that are meant to be experienced over time, but aren’t confined to the making of objects. Wayfinding, which is a form of environmental graphics, refers to the branding and signage applied throughout and on buildings. While each sign or symbol in a public or private building is a work of design, they’re all part of a larger system within the building. The design of the system—the relationships between all of those parts—is where the designer brings value. Similarly, while all of the artifacts of a commercial or institutional brand, such as a business card, sign, logo, or an advertisement are individual expressions of design, how those are experienced together and over time is the design work. No part of it has been created without considering the others, or without thinking through how a target customer will encounter and then develop a relationship with that brand.

Designers are also responsible for interactive designs where the content is fluid, sometimes changing minute to minute, as well as interfaces that help users navigate through complex digital experiences. This work differentiates itself by adding another element: responding to the actions of the viewer. Editorial design for web and mobile is the most tangible example of content-driven work in this area, including publication websites, mobile apps, and blogs. Some design involves the presentation of streaming information, also known as data visualization. Other designers work on digital products, which are digital services or platforms that can be brought to market. Product design for web and mobile is related to software design. Sometimes different designers work on the user interface design (UI), which mostly refers to the individual layouts of pages, and the user experience design (UX), or the total experience of the user as they move through a website or app.

Type design carries aspects of almost all of these things. While the form of a single letter has meaning, a typeface, like a brand, is also composed of the relationships between characters that work together to create meaning. And like software, typefaces are licensed and can be installed on individual computers.

**OBJECTIVES**

Students seeking a minor in Graphic Design will demonstrate proficiency in design principles, design process, theory, history and contemporary design practice. Students will develop an understanding of design process and problem solving methods and explore the effect graphic design has upon the human environment from social responsibility, sustainability and interdisciplinary perspectives. Students will demonstrate proficiency in identified technical skills, understand and apply basic principles in the process of creating, analyzing, and evaluating graphic design solutions in relation to specific end uses and consumer needs. Students will demonstrate proficiency in research, writing, communication and presentation skills.
Learning Outcomes:
I. Graphic Design: Specific knowledge and skills
   - Acquire, articulate, and apply specialized terminology and knowledge relevant to graphic design including relationships to other disciplines and to contemporary global issues.
   - Assess, predict, and articulate the influence and importance of graphic design issues within the human environment from social responsibility, sustainability and interdisciplinary perspectives.
   - Acquire and demonstrate competency in technical skills applicable to graphic design.
   - Demonstrate the ability to use design thinking strategies in an iterative design process.
   - Demonstrate the ability to analyze, synthesize, and develop probable solutions.

II. General knowledge and skills
   - Communicate concepts, design solutions, and arguments clearly and concisely through visual, verbal and written means.
   - Access information through traditional and new technologies, and synthesize this information for problem solving activities.
   - Critically analyze and evaluate information from multiple sources and diverse perspectives.
   - Understand the relationship of graphic design to other disciplines and to society.

In addition, the Graphic Design minor will:
   - Provide a high quality interdisciplinary minor that will meet existing student demand.
   - Leverage and repurpose existing courses.
   - Attract students to Fairfield interested in coupling design with their career goals in other major fields of study.
   - Maximize the value of existing faculty with expertise in design to deliver the curriculum, the direction of the program, and the advisement and mentoring of its students.
   - Expand the teaching and research interactions among faculty and students
   - Expand research and collaboration among faculty with shared interests across schools and in other interdisciplinary programs.
   - Strengthen Fairfield’s connection with non-profit and for profit organizations through student internship opportunities.
   - Prepare students for a range of post-graduate opportunities, including in the non-profit sector and graduate school.

IMPACT
The Graphic Design minor will not replace any current academic program or degree or reallocate any faculty to other departments nor require significant new resources. The minor will add to and enhance Fairfield’s curricular offerings.

PROGRAM DETAIL
The proposed Graphic Design curriculum will be rigorous, highly interdisciplinary and includes two specialized courses. Drawing especially from resources in the College of Arts and Sciences as well as Fairfield’s professional schools, the minor will offer courses on a range of course offerings that mirrors real-world practice. The minor will be a progressive and demanding sequence of 6 courses (18 credit hours) that will provide ample opportunities for students to tailor their academic plan to
their major/minors, particular school requirements and requirements in the Core, while aligning with academic standards for professional norms in this field.

Graphic Design Minor 18 Credits
A. Two classes from the following that focus on learning to see visual art.

Art History Options:
AH 10 Origins and Transformations in Western Art
AH 11 Visual Culture Since 1400: Expression and Experimentation
AH 13 Art of Africa, the Caribbean, and the Americas
AH 14 Art of Asia
AH 15 History of Architecture
AH 102 Art of East Asia
AH 109 Jewish Art: Moses to Modernity
AH 111 Greek Art and Archaeology
AH 112 Etruscan and Roman Art and Archaeology
AH 113 Art and Archaeology of Ancient Egypt
AH 115 Archaeology of Athens
AH 120 Medieval Art of Western Europe
AH 121 Celtic and Early Irish Art
AH 130 Early Renaissance Art in Italy
AH 135 Renaissance and Baroque Architecture
AH 140 Baroque Art
AH 142 The Art of Early Modern Spain and Latin America
AH 150 Neoclassical and Romantic Art
AH 152 Modern Art
AH 161 American Architecture
AH 164 American Art: Civil War to Civil Rights
AH 165 The Black Experience
AH 172 History of Photography
AH 175 Contemporary Art
AH 180 Fundamentals of Architecture
AH 191 Art and Mythologies of Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, Bolshevik Russia

Film/Television History Options:
FTM 12 Art and Language of Film
FTM 101 American Cinema: History and Analysis
FTM 102 American Television: History and Analysis
FTM 103 World Cinema: Fiction
FTM 104 World Cinema: Nonfiction
FTM 105 American Film: Decades
FTM 106 Film Genres
FTM 201 Filmmaker Studies
FTM 204 African American Cinema

Communication Options:
CO 130 Mass Media and Society
CO 337 Visual Communication

B. Two classes from the following that focus on drawing and painting, keeping a sketchbook and visual composition:

*Studio Art Options:*
- SA12 Foundation: Drawing
- SA13 Foundation: Figure Drawing
- SA 130 Painting I
- SA 132 Sculpture I
- SA 134 Digital Photography
- SA 136 Investigation of Text and Image
- SA 138 From Drawing to Painting
- SA 105 Color Workshop
- SA XXX Digital Art Making (course pending approval)

*Theatre Options:*
- TA155 Design I
- TA158 Scene Painting
- TA 253 Costume Design
- TA288 Scene Design

C. Two classes that focus on graphic design. Students may only enroll in these courses after they have completed the requirements above. Each class will feature a few software tutorials, but students are expected to train themselves in digital graphics software, with tutorials available through the University via Lynda.com.

GD201 Graphic Design I, Making Meaning – please see syllabus for details
Text: Typography
Images: Symbols, Photographs and Drawings
Layout and Composition: Proximity, Context, Alignment, Repetition

GD2 Graphic Design II, Clients and Collaboration (Prerequisite: GD201 Graphic Design I) – please see syllabus for details
Collaborating with Clients
Publishing to Digital Media
Publishing to Print

A formal review of the minor will be initiated during the fifth year of the program.

**ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE AND GOVERNANCE**

After consulting with other departments, it was determined that the most efficient use of resources was to house this minor within the Department of Visual and Performing Arts as a sixth component. In addition to the Chair, there are three program directors: one for music and film, one for studio art and art history, and the third for theatre and graphic design. No additional administrative role is required for this minor as it has been incorporated into our existing structure. The specialized
faculty required for the two new courses would be hired within the existing adjunct budget structure of the department. The addition of more students to the various preparatory classes in AH, TA, CO, FTM will be negligible, as there are so many options for students.

RESOURCES
The existing resources provided by the University (library resources and Lynda.com), as well as the hardware and software infrastructure of the department will support the minor.

PROJECTIONS FOR THE FUTURE
We anticipate significant student demand for this minor. As part of the fifth year review, both an industry review and survey of students will be used to discern the viability of creating a Graphic Design major. In addition, given the anticipated demand, we envision that there will be a need for a full-time faculty person in Graphic Design. Given the need for this person to be current in best practices of the industry, we envision this position being a Professor of the Practice rather than a tenure-track hire.

ASCC Meeting Minutes, November 10, 2015 (excerpt)
III. Graphic Design Minor
   a. 6-class minor; 4 can be fulfilled with core courses and 2 specific graphic design courses (not part of core)
   b. Manhattan College started a graphic design minor and within a year 100 students declared the minor which then became a major because of the demand
   c. Laura Nash foresees this minor being very popular for students
   d. Classes are mainly pulled from Art History and other VPA courses and Communication courses
   e. Proposing the minor will be a part of VPA as a 6th program
   f. Lynn Porter will oversee the program
   g. Discussion:
      o Kraig Steffen: Can you explain how this does not overlap with media arts (FTM)?
        ▪ David Lerner: FTM is mainly motion-based (interactive, creating films and videos) whereas graphic design will not be motion-based (posters, web art, digital photography)
      o Kraig Steffen: Wouldn’t it make more sense to pick 3 to 5 directly related graphic design courses rather than a long menu of Art History Courses? And if not, why not?
        ▪ Laura Nash: The intent behind it is to help students. A lot of students do not take an arts core until second semester freshmen year or even sophomore year and they take it without even knowing they are interested or want to pursue an arts path. Counting lower level arts courses will help them complete the minor easier. Also lower level arts courses cover visual analysis and building on that skill. Visual analysis is the same whether you are looking at Etruscan art or 20th Century modern art.
        ▪ David Lerner: The Capstone will help teach retroactively and find those connections even if it wasn’t taught specifically in those courses.
        ▪ Laura Nash: If the Core changes maybe the program can be more streamlined, but the structure of entry-level courses is what will work.
      o Kraig Steffen: How is this program going to impact other minors?
        ▪ Laura Nash: Does not think this will take students away from any other minors. This program is what students are asking for and is completely missing from the College’s
offerings. It may impact some from Communication or Marketing. It may be a value added not taken away from anything else.

- Steven Bayne: Are there any graphic design courses in Marketing?
  - Laura Nash: There is a web design course.
- Kraig Steffen: If the Communication School becomes a reality, how does this program fit in with that?
  - Laura Nash: The understanding is that the program will be a part of the School. It prepares students to have the necessary skills in the 21st century to go out and find a career with the things they learned.
- Margaret McClure: Are the two final courses meant to be taken simultaneously? Will students able to take them by junior year?
  - Laura Nash: It will be handled case-by-case. If a student has completed 3 of the 4 classes and they take the last co-currently with graphic design one, which would be fine.
- Michael Pagano: Is there a reason why a Theatre professor is heading this program instead of someone in the art department?
  - Laura Nash: Neither one of the full-time faculty of studio art are designers. Suzanne Chamlin-Richer is a painter- it is a different conceptualization of looking at art. Jo Yarrington is an instillation artist. Lynn Porter is a scenic designer; she conceptualizes and produces her ideas. It just makes the most sense for her to head and oversee the program. She will not be teaching the courses. Adjunct professors will be hired to teach. The field changes too fast to have a full-time hire only teach the courses. Goal is to have people who work in the field to share their expertise and keep up with what is current.
- Steven Bayne: Clarify resources in relation to director (not a new position; just adding more responsibility) and hiring full-time faculty after two years.
  - Laura Nash: Yes, the director position is not a new position it is an additional responsibility for the Theater director. Philip Elisoph felt that it was good to include a possibility for a full-time hire (professor of the practice or tenure-track).
- David McFadden: Was there a discussion about why there are only two courses that are graphic design and the other courses come from other areas of VPA? Why not have half of the courses in graphic design?
  - Laura Nash: At other schools their programs include a drawing course, which is offered already in studio. It does not make sense to offer them in two places. We also did not want to offer a class that only teaches how to use a computer. Those skills will be used in our courses but not in a class totally devoted to how to use software.
- Two classes and the minor are in the proposal; classes have been previously approved.

Glen Sauer motioned to approve; Margaret McClure seconded; All in favor.

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES (excerpt) 12/1/15

Minor in Graphic Design

L Nash reported on the proposal of having a minor in Graphic Design. There has been a growing student interest for training in graphic design. L Nash explained that almost all fields have a design component and would allow students across all disciplines to find relevancy with this as a minor. Many competitor and peer institutions have a graphic design program. This minor would create career opportunities.

M Pagano expressed a concern that this minor would have more courses taught by adjunct faculty. S Bayne asked if it could be noted to incorporate mostly full time faculty members teaching the courses in the minor if after a few years it proves successful.

Motion to Approve:  G Sauer  Second: M Pagano
In Favor: Unanimous

Educational Planning Committee Minutes (excerpt) 3/17/16

AGENDA ITEM #1: Proposal for a Minor in Graphic Design
L Porter presented a proposal for a minor in Graphic Design at the College of Arts and Sciences.

Background
Students in the departments of Visual and Performing Arts, Communication, and Marketing have a growing interest for training in graphic design. Competitor institutions have a graphic design program. L Porter explained that students across all disciplines would find relevancy with this as a minor. The Graphic Design minor will not replace any current academic program or degree or reallocate any faculty to other departments. This minor would create career opportunities.

Requirements for students:
1. Minimum two classes of analyzing visual, i.e. Art History.
2. Two classes that focus on drawing/painting and visual composition, i.e. studio art, theatre design.
3. After completing above, students take Graphic Design I and Graphic Design II.

Questions
• M Kazer asked if the two graphic design courses been taught yet. L Porter responded that they have not been taught. The classes will be taught by adjuncts.
• A Biselli inquired about software for the program. L Porter responded that classes would take place in a computer lab with an adobe cloud. Students can purchase Adobe software on a month-to-month basis.
• D Mager asked what students can participate in the minor. L Porter responded that the minor is open to any student.
• R Hannafin asked if the minor would attract new students into Fairfield University. L Porter expects that it will draw new students due to the growing interest.
• D Peduti asked about projections for the first year. L Porter commented that there are currently four students ready, and she projects several dozen more in the next year.

C Scheraga thanked L Porter, at which point L Porter stepped out.

Motion to accept proposal for a minor in Graphic Design: V Rosivach Second: A Biselli

Discussion
M Kazer was in favor, but would like to see the addition of a budget for two adjuncts @ $5,000 each.
R Hannafin suggested adding projections for the new minor drawing new students coming into Fairfield University.

Vote In favor: Unanimous
Doctorate of Nursing Practice: Nurse-Midwifery Program (DNP-NM)
The Egan School

**Need**
Fairfield 2020 identified 6 key essential priorities for the University, the first of which is “Growth and Diversification of Revenue Streams:” accomplished by growth of grad programs.

The American College of Nurse Midwifery (ACNM) also states that to reach its goal of certifying 1,000 CNMS per year (571 were certified in 2014), higher education institutions need to expand offerings for midwifery programming.

The Bureau of Labor predicts that there will be approximately a 1/3 increase in the job demand for midwives from 2012 to 2022. ACOG has reported that currently, 49% of counties within the U.S. do not have obstetric care providers, and a 25% shortage of obstetricians/ gynecologists is predicted by 2030. Midwives are needed to fill this gap as the primary care givers of women for obstetric and gynecologic care.

**Rationale**
The midwifery philosophy of care aligns seamlessly with the Jesuit ideals of ‘cura personalis’, and men and women for others. Except from midwifery philosophy of care: “Finally, we value formal education, lifelong individual learning, and the development and application of research to guide ethical and competent midwifery practice. These beliefs and values provide the foundation for commitment to individual and collective leadership at the community, state, national and international level to improve the health of women and their families worldwide.”

**Objectives**
For the first cohort beginning in the Fall of 2017, and second cohort beginning in the Fall of 2018, our goal is to enroll at least 5-7 students each year. Our objective will be to establish (and maintain) a level of demand of approximately 7-12 students with the subsequent cohorts.

The DNP-NM program only adds 5 new didactic courses and 5 new clinical courses.

**Impact**
Collaborate with both undergraduate (NS 314) and graduate programs (DNP-nurse anesthesia) currently offered to enhance the educational pedagogy, yielding positive learning outcomes with the addition of the DNP-NM program.

**Program Details**
The DNP-NM program is designed as a 74 credit / 1000 clinical/immersion hour program that will be completed full-time over three academic years. 7 semesters (1 is summer)

**Target Markets**
- BSN graduates with or without work experience (at least one year experience is preferred in the area of women’s health or maternity - labor and delivery/postpartum.)
- MSN graduates looking to become certified nurse midwives.

**Market Demand Study**
47% of respondents (N=42) indicated that they are “very interested” or “extremely interested in pursuing a DNP in Nurse-Midwifery or a related degree. Results indicate that in order to obtain the 5-7 student initial enrollment we are seeking, we would only need 14% of the 42 respondents who indicated that they are “very interested” or “extremely interested.”

Additionally, the Accreditation Commission for Midwifery Education reports that there are more qualified applicants each year to midwifery programs than there are spaces available for these students in any of the current 39 midwifery programs in the U.S.

**Other**
Collaborations between Yale SON and the Egan School are being developed for the nurse midwifery program.
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Description, Overview, and Summary

Nurse-midwifery focuses on holistic care of women throughout the lifespan. Certified nurse-midwives (CNMs) are registered nurses who hold advanced degrees in nursing (masters in the science of nursing, and/or doctorate of nursing practice) with a specialty in midwifery, are certified through the American Midwifery Certification Board (AMCB), and are licensed in the state they practice. The scope of practice for a nurse-midwife includes independently conducting visits for preconception, antepartum, intrapartum, postpartum, gynecologic, primary care, newborn assessments, menopausal care, sexually transmitted infection (STI) treatment for male partners, and breastfeeding care. Certified nurse-midwives (CNMs) are licensed, independent health care providers with prescriptive authority in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, and Puerto Rico. CNMs are defined as primary care providers who can provide care from adolescence to old age, and to newborns up to age 28 days, under federal law.

The word midwife means “with women” and midwives are in fact with women, providing full scope care throughout the lifespan. Graduates of the Fairfield Doctorate of Nursing Practice - Nurse-Midwifery (DNP-NM) program will provide high quality healthcare, and also serve as leaders in the field of midwifery education and research. The American College of Nurse Midwives (ACNM) has called for “a midwife for every woman”\(^2\) in their vision statement and seeks to increase the number of midwives in the United States. Fairfield’s program is helping to meet this call for an increase in the number of midwives through the addition of a Doctorate of Nursing Practice- Nurse-Midwifery (DNP-NM) program.

The following proposal for a DNP - Nurse-Midwifery program at Fairfield University will detail the 3 year full time plan of study for the DNP-NM degree and how this degree fits seamlessly in with the already highly successful graduate programs (BSN to DNP, post masters DNP, Family Nurse Practitioner MSN and DNP, Psychiatric Nurse Practitioner MSN and DNP, Clinical Nurse Leader, Executive DNP, and DNP-Nurse Anesthesia) in the Marion Peckham Egan School of Nursing and Health Studies (Egan School).

Need

This proposal addresses Fairfield 2020: The Way Forward\(^3\). Specifically, Fairfield 2020 identified 6 key essential priorities for the University, the first of which is “Growth and Diversification of Revenue Streams.” In this essential, the development of graduate programs within the university is discussed, with the highlight on producing high quality and high performing programs. This proposal will discuss in depth how the DNP-NM program within The Egan School meets this call for a high quality graduate program as outlined in Fairfield 2020, essential number one.

In addition to meeting a need identified by the University, this proposal also addresses a growing need within the healthcare sector. According to a 2014 Advanced Degree Market Scan by Hanover Research\(^4\), “all of the fastest growing occupations in the tri-state area that typically require an advanced degree for entry are in healthcare.” According to the December 2015 Market Scan for 3232

\(^4\)Hanover Research. (9/2014). Market Scan for Post-Master’s Nursing Certifications.
Nurse-Midwifery (DNP) by Hanover Research, “the demand for midwifery education is growing with current enrollments and graduations consistently rising since 2010. Except for a decline in 2014 (845 applicants compared to 877 in 2013), the number of applications and new enrollments in midwifery programs has also increased.”  

The steady increase of qualified applicants combined with the lack of spots for them in current programs, speaks to the need for a DNP-NM at Fairfield University. The American College of Nurse Midwifery (ACNM) also states that to reach its goal of certifying 1,000 CNMS per year (571 were certified in 2014), higher education institutions need to expand offerings for midwifery programming.

Also, according to the Hanover Research market scan, “Over the last three decades, the demand and use of midwives has gradually increased. Additionally, the number of professionally certified midwives continues to rise.”

In the United States, midwives attend 12% percent of all vaginal births. “Furthermore, the American College of Nurse-Midwives (ACNM) predicts a continued national shortage of midwives. Thus, the ACNM calls for the expansion of midwifery programming to address this shortage.”

The most recent data on percentage of births attended by Certified Nurse Midwives is from 2013. In this year, midwives attended 320,983 births, an increase despite a decrease in total US births compared to the previous year. Midwives attended 12% of all vaginal births and 8.2% of total US births. With a steady increase in the percentage of births attended by CNMs, it is clear the profession is growing. The graph on the following page will illustrate the increase in births attended by CNMs in the last decade.

![Percentage of Births Attended by Certified Nurse-Midwives and Certified Midwives, 2004–2013](chart.png)

Again according to the December 2015 Market Scan for Nurse-Midwifery (DNP) by Hanover Research, the labor market projections for nurse-midwives indicate positive growth across the United States and Connecticut. The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects growth rates much faster.

---


than average than other occupations and O*Net (Occupational Information Network) describes nurse-midwifery as a “Bright Outlook” occupation that will experience rapid growth in the coming years. The Bureau of Labor predicts that there will be approximately a 1/3 increase in the job demand for midwives from 2012 to 2022.

Lastly, to speak to the need of a DNP-NM program, the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) has reported that currently, 49% of counties within the United States do not have obstetric care providers, and a 25% shortage of obstetricians/gynecologists is predicted by 2030. Midwives are needed to fill this gap as the primary care givers of women for obstetric and gynecologic care.

The Doctorate of Nursing Practice Nurse-Midwifery Program at Fairfield University’s Egan School seeks to answer the notable call to increase the number of midwives in the United States. Increasing midwives seeks to improve birth outcomes and to provide midwifery care to more women. The Egan School will prepare DNP-NM graduates to develop shared decision making skills, clinical and cultural competence, leadership abilities, and a strong interest in social justice issues in the field of women’s health. Current SON faculty possess the expertise required for this degree, and the motivation to foster the development of this specialty program (see Appendix D). We are well positioned to answer the call of “a midwife for every woman.”

Rationale

The midwifery philosophy of care aligns seamlessly with the Jesuit ideals of ‘cura personalis’, and men and women for others. To illustrate the direct connection between Jesuit principles and midwifery care, The American College of Nurse-Midwives “philosophy of care” states the following:

“We, the midwives of the American College of Nurse-Midwives, affirm the power and strength of women and the importance of their health in the well-being of families, communities and nations. We believe in the basic human rights of all persons, recognizing that women often incur an undue burden of risk when these rights are violated.

We believe every person has a right to:

• Equitable, ethical, accessible quality health care that promotes healing and health
• Health care that respects human dignity, individuality and diversity among groups
• Complete and accurate information to make informed health care decisions
• Self-determination and active participation in health care decisions
• Involvement of a woman's designated family members, to the extent desired, in all health care experiences

We believe the best model of health care for a woman and her family:

• Promotes a continuous and compassionate partnership
• Acknowledges a person's life experiences and knowledge
• Includes individualized methods of care and healing guided by the best evidence available
• Involves therapeutic use of human presence and skillful communication

3434_________________________________
We honor the normalcy of women's lifecycle events. We believe in:

- Watchful waiting and non-intervention in normal processes
- Appropriate use of interventions and technology for current or potential health problems
- Consultation, collaboration and referral with other members of the health care team as needed to provide optimal health care

We affirm that midwifery care incorporates these qualities and that women's health care needs are well-served through midwifery care. Finally, we value formal education, lifelong individual learning, and the development and application of research to guide ethical and competent midwifery practice. These beliefs and values provide the foundation for commitment to individual and collective leadership at the community, state, national and international level to improve the health of women and their families worldwide."

In addition to ‘cura personalis’, and men and women for others, the midwifery philosophy highlights the importance of lifelong learning. A Jesuit university such as Fairfield is prepared to offer a nurse-midwifery program given the clear alignment of philosophies.

Furthermore the Egan School of Nursing’s mission also clearly follows the Jesuit idea of men and women for others. As a nurse-midwife, graduates of this program will be prepared to provide high quality, culturally sensitive care to women of all ethnicities, socioeconomic backgrounds, and family make-ups. The current graduate programs within the Egan School include, BSN-DNP, post masters DNP, Psychiatric Mental Health MSN and DNP, Family Nurse Practitioner MSN and DNP, Clinical Nurse Leader, Executive DNP, and DNP-Nurse Anesthesia, which all have a strong reputation for graduating leaders in the healthcare field who are dedicated to caring for the underserved.

The Egan School of Nursing’s mission and vision statements are:

Mission Statement
Consistent with the mission of Fairfield University to develop men and women for others, the Marion Peckham Egan School of Nursing and Health Studies inspires students to become leaders in healthcare. These students are actively engaged with faculty in practice, research, scholarship, and service. As a Jesuit institution, a central focus of our care is to improve health outcomes with particular attention given to the needs of underserved or vulnerable populations.

Vision Statement
Our vision is to create providers who demonstrate clinical excellence. Building on a tradition of caring, our commitment is to provide evidence-based, culturally sensitive interprofessional healthcare education.

The proposal for the DNP-NM program fully speaks to the School of Nursing’s mission and the needs of the healthcare market, which is calling for an increase in nurse-midwives. First, as an increasing amount of women are demanding midwifery care in the United States, graduates of this program will be prepared to provide evidenced based, professional care to women given the high level of scholarship that these doctorally prepared NMs have gained through didactic and clinical

---

10 Egan School Mission Statement. Retrieved February 2016, from
http://www.fairfield.edu/academics/schoolscollegescenters/eganschoolofnursingandhealthstudies/administrationfaculty/missionstatement/
work to prepare them for the competitive healthcare market. Second, as a DNP prepared nurse-midwife, these students will be educated not only to care for women, but also to be leaders in their field. For example, that when a clinical issue arises these doctorally prepared NMs will not only note the trend, but engage in the research to see why the trend is occurring and plan the intervention for change that may be needed. The graduates will have the opportunity to travel internationally as opportunities present. Currently, there is collaboration with the Universidad de CentroAmericano (UCA) in Nicaragua that will develop further to provide gynecology clinical experiences for students abroad. Additionally, a potential exists to collaborate with current Jesuit midwifery programs (i.e. Seattle University) to coordinate international opportunities. Lastly, in speaking to the Jesuit notion of “cura personalis,” care of the whole person, the program will produce nurse-midwives who are socially responsible to the needs of women across the lifespan, provide holistic care in the clinical setting, have the competencies required to practice as a nurse-midwife, and be prepared to serve others. Building on the strong reputation of our existing graduate programs (BSN-DNP, post masters DNP, Psychiatric Mental Health MSN and DNP, Family Nurse Practitioner MSN and DNP, Executive DNP and DNP-Nurse Anesthesia) the Egan School is prepared to produce the nurse-midwife as described above.

The DNP-NM program fits within the University’s strategic goal and will aid the university in moving forward. In developing this DNP-NM program proposal, the Dean and faculty have discussed with midwives in the Connecticut and New York regions, the proposal of a nurse-midwifery program at Fairfield University, which through anecdotal evidence was positively received. There are strong clinical partners in the greater Waterbury, Connecticut area for clinical sites for our students. The Egan School advisory board is supportive of moving this program forward.

Further, conversations have taken place regarding collaborative ideas between Fairfield University and Yale University midwifery programs. For example, interprofessional simulations will take place at Fairfield amongst undergraduate BSN, nurse-midwifery and nurse anesthesia students, and we will be inviting Yale nurse-midwifery students to participate. Yale has invited Fairfield to participate in the New England Midwifery Education Consortium. This involves formally getting together midwifery students and faculty in this area twice a year for collaboration, workshops, and speakers and more often informally. Our market demand study prepared by Hanover Research (Appendix F) provides further indication of the student demand for this program.

Fairfield’s geographic location with many major hospitals and medical centers located nearby in Connecticut and New York will serve to provide unique clinical opportunities for students in this program. Beyond the apparent demand in the marketplace for nurse-midwives, Fairfield’s location and current strong connections with area hospitals such as Bridgeport and The Western Connecticut Health Network will enhance the attractiveness of the DNP-NM program.

**Tangible Outcomes.**

The DNP-NM program will educate a knowledgeable, holistic, evidence-based practice midwife who is prepared to serve as a leader at the community, national, or international level. The program provides tangible outcomes for students seeking this degree and area of specialization within the healthcare setting. These outcomes cover not only the development of critical academic,
professional, and leadership skills but also opportunities for employment in needed sectors of the healthcare field.

Graduates from this program will be prepared to sit for the credentialing exam through the American Midwifery Certification Board (AMCB) to become a Certified Nurse-Midwife. Furthermore graduates will be able to provide full-scope midwifery care in a variety of settings, including outpatient settings, hospitals, rural health settings, and birth centers. Students will be exposed to the following clinical experiences in order to achieve this level of preparation:

- Gynecologic
- Primary care of women
- Antepartum
- Intrapartum
- Newborn care (0-28 days of life)
- Treatment of male partners for STIs (sexually transmitted infections)

Lastly, the final clinical experience will be an integration into the practice of midwifery and include a semester of 6 credits (a minimum of 300 hours) during which time they will provide full scope midwifery care. The specific examples of employment opportunities for the nurse-midwife include:

- Hospitals
- Birth centers
- Home birth practices
- Private outpatient practices
- Federally qualified health centers

**Objectives**

For the first cohort beginning in the Fall of 2017, and second cohort beginning in the Fall of 2018, our goal is to enroll at least 5-7 students each year. Our objective will be to establish (and maintain) a level of demand of approximately 7-12 students with the subsequent cohorts. These students will move through the proposed sequence of courses as a cohort. As will be discussed below in the Program Detail section, and later in the Resources section, students will complete the program in a full-time (3 year) format, which includes 2 summer semesters. At the outset, we anticipate current DNP-NM students bolstering enrollments in 15 existing courses (NS 604, NS 640, NS 601, NS 608, NS 605, NS 610, NS 611, NS 612, NS 613, NS 614, NS 615, NS 641, NS 687, NS 697, NS 699). The DNP-NM program only adds 5 new didactic courses (NSNM 701, NSNM 703, NSNM 704, NSNM 707, NSNM 709). The remaining DNP-NM program requirements are five clinical courses.

In order to evaluate program effectiveness and the quality of the program, application and admission numbers each academic semester and year will be closely monitored. More specifically, the quality of the applicants will be based on their experience in clinical practice, two references, GPA from previous academic degrees, interviews, and personal statement for undertaking the program. The Egan School Associate Dean for Graduate Studies (Dr. Joyce Shea) will be working closely with the DNP-NM program track coordinator (Dr. Jenna LoGiudice) to have ongoing discussions regarding the quality of current students and applicants, specifically addressing strengths and challenges noted. This conversation will also include ongoing evaluation of the structure of the DNP-NM - program, using formative evaluation to make changes in real time.
Discussion of what is working and what needs improvement will be ongoing each semester. The Egan School Associate Dean for Graduate Studies, Dr. Joyce Shea, will oversee the DNP-NM program and the curriculum will undergo the same stringent review that all current graduate course do. This review is heavily steeped in the feedback from idea forms and narrative summative assessments student submit each semester. In this process, courses are discussed on a regular basis throughout the year at graduate committee meetings to assess what has worked well and what needs to be improved upon for the next iteration of the course.

Key Benchmarking points for the DNP-NM program are:

- Graduation rate
- Academic performance in nurse-midwifery (NSNM) courses
- Attainment of program learning objectives via assessment process
- Passing rates of students on the AMCB (American Midwifery Certification Board) National Exam.
- Obtainment of a job following graduation and job placement

Impact

Impact on current Egan School programs. Internally, this new degree will draw on fifteen existing courses (NS 604, NS 640, NS 601, NS 608, NS 605, NS 610, NS 611, NS 612, NS 613, NS 614, NS 615, NS 641, NS 697, NS 699) NS 601, NS 604, NS 640, NS 601, NS 608, NS 605, NS 610, NS 611, NS 612, NS 613, NS 614, NS 615, NS 641, NS 697, NS 699) and propose five new didactic courses and 5 new clinical courses (see Program Details below). By enrolling DNP-NM students in these 15 existing courses, enrollments in existing graduate classes will increase, addressing some of the needs set out in Fairfield University’s, Fairfield 2020 report. More specifically, this program addresses the University’s need for higher graduate program enrollments and revenue, as articulated by the Fairfield 2020 strategic process. The program maximizing existing resources (15 existing courses) and provides growth through the addition of another advanced nursing option, nurse-midwifery.

Fifteen of the twenty-five required courses that are being proposed for the DNP-NM program already exist and are currently offered with adequate frequency. Egan School Graduate enrollments are already robust. The addition of DNP-NM students to these core courses will force additional sections as reflected in the budget (beginning with the third cohort in academic year 2019-2020).

The Egan School graduate committee consistently conducts a review of these existing courses with the faculty member teaching each respective course and updates the course description and/or course content to keep courses current and relevant to the healthcare industry. Egan School faculty have the expertise and clinical experience to develop and teach these courses at a rigorous and evidence-based practice level as the market expects from a Fairfield University graduate/doctoral educational program. However, with the need for additional sections, adjuncts may need to supplement our existing faculty. The 5 new didactic courses being proposed are essential for the preparation of a nurse-midwife and for the program’s accreditation by the Accreditation Commission for Midwifery Education (ACME), and will require a new faculty position to be added as reflected in the budget. The addition of these 5 didactic courses and 5 clinical courses will allow for the Egan School at Fairfield to offer a robust, competitive, interprofessional DNP-NM program.
**Impact on other Fairfield Programs.** This program is not intended to replace any existing programs at the University, but certainly represents an opportunity for interaction and cross-fertilization between existing programs, such as the DNP-Nurse Anesthesia program. The program track coordinator of the DNP-Nurse Anesthesia program, Dr. Nancy Moriber and the program track coordinator of the DNP-Nurse-Midwifery program, Dr. Jenna LoGiudice have had several discussions regarding joint obstetric simulations amongst these students who will interact heavily in their professional roles. Additionally, there is potential for collaboration at the undergraduate level to involve undergraduate nursing students enrolled in NS 314 (Maternal and Newborn Nursing) for joint simulations in which these students are within the RN scope of practice role while the DNP-NM student is the healthcare provider in the simulation. These two collaborations across both the undergraduate and graduate programs currently offered, seek to enhance the educational pedagogy, yielding positive learning outcomes with the addition of the DNP-NM program. 

Also, through the addition of a DNP-NM program at Fairfield, an existing master’s (MSN) prepared midwife who is seeking a DNP degree may now consider Fairfield for the post-masters DNP program, bolstering enrollment in this cohort.

**Program Details**

The DNP-Nurse Midwifery program is a designed as a **74 credit / 1000 clinical/immersion hour** program that will be completed full-time over three academic years. **Appendix B** provides an illustration of the full-time schedule for this program. The DNP-NM course of study structure is similar in format to the DNP-Nurse Anesthesia program currently offered by the Egan School, which is a robust and well-respected program with a positive reputation among students, graduates, and employers. Furthermore, the Nurse Anesthesia program has proven attractive to students generating high enrollments annually. The difference is that the Nurse Anesthesia students begin classes the summer of their first academic year and the Nurse Midwifery students will begin classes the fall of the their first academic year. The reputation of the Fairfield University and Bridgeport Hospital Nurse anesthesia program is strong and proven highly favorable to students seeking this specialty.

The DNP-NM program will benefit the Egan School’s flexible graduate course offering schedule. In addition to providing courses during the traditional fall and spring semester (typically, a course meets one day or evening each week, over 14 weeks), the courses can also be offered in 7-week formats during the fall and spring. Further, the opportunity exists to provide either two- or four-week sessions during the summer months. Finally, current courses in the Egan School MSN and DNP programs offer hybrid options, and these classes will be offered in that same format to midwifery students. The intent is to enhance the flexibility of the program to foster student accessibility while preserving the academic rigor and high-interaction environment essential to a Fairfield program.

The proposed curriculum can be found on the following two pages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>SEMESTER/YR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YEAR #1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall Semester</strong> (15 credits)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS 604  Advanced Health Assessment (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS 640  Advanced Physiology &amp; Pathophysiology (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS 610  + Advanced Nursing Roles &amp; Reflective Practice (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NSNM 701</strong> Antepartum Care (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NSNM 702</strong> Antepartum Clinical (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring Semester</strong> (13 credits)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS 601  Epidemiology and Biostatistics (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS 608  Research Methods for Evidence-Based Practice (3) [Pre-/Co-Req: NS 601]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS 641  Advanced Pharmacology (3) [Prereq: NS 640]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NSNM 703</strong> Women’s Primary Care &amp; Gynecological Health I (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS 697  DNP Seminar I† (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YEAR #2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer Term</strong> (12 credits)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS 611  Clinical Prevention &amp; Strategies for Change (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS 612  Research Translation for Clinical Practice (3) [Prereq: NS 608]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NSNM 704</strong> Women’s Primary Care &amp; Gynecological Health II (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NSNM 705</strong> Women’s Primary Care &amp; Gynecological Health Clinical (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall Semester</strong> (11 credits)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS 613  Finance &amp; Quality Management in Healthcare Organizations (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS 614  Information Technology for Healthcare Improvement (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NSNM 707</strong> Intrapartum Care (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NSNM 708</strong> Intrapartum Clinical (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSE-MIDWIFERY (BSN to DNP) CURRICULUM PLAN</td>
<td>Page 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring Semester</strong> (9 credits)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS 605  Advanced Healthcare Policy (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NSNM 709  Advanced Midwifery Management (3)
NSNM 710  Advanced Midwifery Clinical (2)
NS 687  DNP Immersion (1)

YEAR #3

Fall Semester  (8 credits)
NSMN 711  Integration to Nurse-Midwifery Practice (6)
(300 clinical hrs)
NS 687  DNP Immersion*  (2)

Spring Semester  (6 Credits)
NS 615  Leadership & Interprofessional Collaboration  (3)
NS 699  DNP Seminar II†  (1)
NS 687  DNP Immersion*  (2)

Total Credits:  74
Total Clinical/DNP Immersion Hours: 1000

† In the final semester of the curriculum plan, students must register for 1-credit of DNP Seminar advisement. Students who have not completed their portfolios must continue to register for 1-credit advisement each semester until completion.

Appendix C contains the syllabi of all 10 (5 didactic and 5 clinical) proposed nurse-midwifery (NSNM) courses. The intention of the 5 didactic and 5 clinical courses specific to the DNP-nurse-midwifery program is prepare students with the needed content and clinical experiences to sit for the certifying examination offered through the American Midwifery Certification Board (AMCB). The new courses proposed include advanced topics essential for midwives and as a result will always be required.

Target markets. Regarding student profile, it is possible that Fairfield University’s second degree nursing students, nursing undergraduates, and health studies undergraduates may be interested in pursuing this program. These students may interview for the program and, depending on their experience and qualifications, will be considered for admission or have a deferred acceptance pending gaining more women’s health experience. However, the main focus will be to target nursing professionals and alumni who have had at least one year of experience (preferably in the area of women’s health or maternity - labor and delivery/postpartum) who are looking to pursue an advanced practice/DNP role in the area of nurse-midwifery. Entry into the nurse midwifery program is not dependent on having women’s health or maternity clinical experiences, but preferred. Thus the NM-DNP is designed for:

- BSN graduates with or without work experience (at least one year experience is preferred in the area of women’s health or maternity - labor and delivery/postpartum.)
- MSN graduates looking to become certified nurse midwives.
With regard to growth potential and expanding on the initial market reach, this program is geared for BSN and MSN graduates (preferably with women’s health or maternity nursing experience) looking to practice within the scope of a certified nurse-midwife. Certainly, initial marketing/promotion efforts must focus on the healthcare sector where Fairfield’s reputation is already established (via BSN, MSN, DNP alums). As enrollment increases and the reputation of the program becomes publicly known, more effort should be spent on reaching out to non-traditional sectors (recruitment across undergraduate nursing programs in the United States and among Registered Nurses currently practicing in maternity and women’s health settings).

The Competition: Distinctiveness of a Fairfield program

As shown in Appendix A, there are six programs in the region or online that would compete with the proposed DNP-NM at Fairfield. While this is substantial competition, the proposed Fairfield University DNP offers several distinctions:

• The content of the program will have a strong focus on shared-decision making, incorporation of case based learning, simulation pedagogy to teach theory using the flipped classroom approach, reflective practice, and strong clinical threads in the classroom.

• Faculty members who are experts in their areas and utilize their clinical practice to effectively teach within the classroom.

• Incorporation of our community midwife partners to create meaningful and needed DNP-NM final projects.

• It is compact; the credit requirement and clinical hours for the DNP-NM program at Fairfield are on par with competitor programs. The approach of offering summer semesters, allows for a meaningful use of clinical and didactic courses throughout the traditional academic semesters.

• With graduate programs, commuting distance to the school is a critical variable. Our closest physical competitor, Yale University, offers a joint Nurse-Midwifery/Women’s Health Nurse Practitioner, master’s degree. Despite being geographically close, Yale University primarily attracts and markets GEPN (graduate entry to practice of nursing) students. This means the target student for Yale is a non-registered nurse with a bachelor’s degree in another field. The student completes coursework related to nursing before the master’s portion of the program for nurse-midwifery. While, BSN Registered Nurses can attend for the master’s degree portion of the degree only, the student population is primarily GEPN and therefore a different population than the Fairfield program will attract.

• Two online competitors exist, Frontier University and Georgetown University. Fairfield University’s program would offer primarily on-ground, high-interaction teaching with the flexibility for students to supplement with online and hybrid offerings in some courses. For highly clinically based coursework, interaction with expert faculty is essential and will be an attraction for students. Further, this format will allow for interprofessional simulation in the clinical area to promote graduates who are leaders in their field of midwifery.

Market Demand Study
The Egan School worked with Hanover Research on a market demand study for the DNP-NM in the Fall of 2015. Because we foresee the potential target market for this degree to include our own Fairfield Egan School alumni who often return to Fairfield for their master’s and DNP degrees, we surveyed alumni in the tri-state area, current undergraduate juniors and seniors, second-degree BSN students, graduate students, and health studies minors.

Overall, approximately 350 participants were invited, and the final responses were N = 91. 51% of respondents indicated they were Fairfield University graduates. The data from this market demand study looks supportive for this program (see Appendix F). 47% of respondents (N=42) indicated that they are “very interested” or “extremely interested in pursing a DNP in Nurse-Midwifery or a related degree. The remaining respondents (N=48) indicated that they are “somewhat interested” or “moderately interested.” No respondents indicated they were “not at all interested.” Respondents were asked their interest in pursing a DNP in Nurse-Midwifery, or a related degree, at Fairfield University, Yale University (a regional competitor), Frontier Nursing University (an online distance learning competitor), or Georgetown University (also an online distance learning competitor). 54% of respondents (N=45) indicated that they are “very interested” or “extremely interested” in pursing a DNP-NM at Fairfield University. While only 2% indicated “very interested” or ”extremely interested” in this degree at Frontier Nursing University, 18% at Georgetown, and 32% at Yale (which is an MSN, not a DNP program). A caveat to these results is the use of a different sampling strategy than in past Fairfield market research, and the overall low response rate. We assume the low response rate was due to both email fatigue, and only students interested in advanced nursing degrees responding. However, given the sample includes our target market, combined with the very specific program being presented, it is not surprising that the response rate is low. As it is, these results indicate that in order to obtain the 5-7 student initial enrollment we are seeking, we would only need 14% of the 42 respondents who indicated that they are “very interested” or “extremely interested.” We find these market survey results convincing that there is interest in Fairfield University offering this degree program.

Additionally, the Accreditation Commission for Midwifery Education reports that there are more qualified applicants each year to midwifery programs than there are spaces available for these students in any of the current 39 midwifery programs in the United States. These numbers further support the student demand for Fairfield University offering this degree program.
Administrative structure and governance

As has been the case with the other DNP specialty programs in the Egan School, the faculty members who offer the curriculum are the primary “keepers” of the program. In this capacity, the Egan School will rely on the Associate Dean for Graduate Programs Dr. Joyce Shea, the DNP-NM program track coordinator Dr. Jenna LoGiudice, and the graduate committee to ensure that the DNP-NM curriculum remains rigorous, relevant and competitive with other institutions’ graduate offerings in both the academic and clinical settings. Thus, all decisions pertaining to curriculum have and will continue to be discussed at the graduate committee level.

The Egan School has a Graduate Program Committee, which has oversight for curricular issues in all the graduate programs. The NM program track coordinator (Dr. Jenna LoGiudice) is responsible for bringing any curriculum changes or proposals to this committee, to be vetted by its members and by the Associate Dean for Graduate Programs, Dr. Joyce Shea. It is only after approval has been granted by the Graduate Committee, that curricular issues can be brought before the SON faculty for consideration.

The Associate Dean for Graduate Programs and Associate Professor is Dr. Joyce Shea and in her capacity she oversees the entire admissions process for all graduate school of nursing programs. In addition, she works with various other parties on campus (e.g., Graduate Admissions, Institutional Marketing/Communications, Office of International Students/Study Abroad) on tactics and strategies for communicating and advertising graduate programs to the larger marketplace. Further, the Associate Dean serves as resource to each graduate student. In the case of each of the specialized master-level and DNP programs, a faculty member within the discipline serves as the students’ major academic advisor. This model will be replicated for the DNP-NM.

The Dean of the School of Nursing (Dr. Meredith Wallace Kazer, Professor of Nursing) has the responsibility of not only communicating and advertising the graduate programs to the larger marketplace but also specifically to the alumni, recruiters, employers and friends of Fairfield
University. In addition, the Dean is the primary liaison between each graduate program (and its accompanying faculty/department) and the Egan School Advisory Board and Clinical Partnership Council. Thus, the Dean is able to provide guidance and input from the advisory board on matters concerning the healthcare industry needs and trends.

**Resources**

The Graduate Program in the Egan School has the expertise to create, maintain and regularly enhance the DNP-NM program. The individual research expertise of each faculty member, in combination with their clinical and teaching expertise in existing graduate and undergraduate programs and courses, provide a strong set of skills that ensure the development and maintenance of a unique and rigorous program of study for the DNP-NM. Currently, the Egan School department members who will be teaching in the DNP-NM program consist of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Qualification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sally O’Toole Gerard, DNP, RN, CNL, CDE</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Grossman, PhD, FNP-BC, APRN, FAAN</td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey F. Hoffman, Ed.D</td>
<td>Professor of the Practice Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Kris, RN, PhD</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenna LoGiudice, PhD, CNM, RN</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana R. Mager, DNP, RN-BC</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy A. Moriber, PhD, CRNA, APRN</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen O'Shea, DNP, APRN, PCNS-BC, CHPPN</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn E. Phillips, PhD, MS, MA, APRN</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Roney EdD, RN-BC, CPEN</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Shea, PhD, RN</td>
<td>Adjunct Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Shea, DNSc, APRN, PMHCNS-BC</td>
<td>Associate Dean for Graduate Programs and Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joyce Shea, DNSc, APRN, PMHCNS-BC, Associate Dean for Graduate Programs and Associate Professor
and

The Egan School is currently conducting a search for a replacement position of a tenure-track faculty member with the specialty of women’s health or midwifery, in anticipation of a hire for fall 2016. A faculty member will be sought with expertise in areas to include primary care of women, gynecologic care, and intrapartum care.

Appendix D provides a summary of all NM-DNP faculty and their qualifications.

Dr. Jenna LoGiudice, the current certified nurse-midwife (CNM) tenure-track faculty has expertise in antepartum care, intrapartum care, and gynecological care. She actively maintains clinical practice in the gynecologic and intrapartum settings, staying up to date on the latest practices in the field. She is fully capable of teaching any of the courses in the NM-DNP program but specifically has expertise in the following five new courses in the proposed curriculum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSNM 701</td>
<td>Antepartum Care (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSNM 702</td>
<td>Antepartum Clinical (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSNM 707</td>
<td>Intrapartum Care (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSNM 708</td>
<td>Intrapartum Clinical (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSMN 711</td>
<td>Integration to Nurse-Midwifery Practice (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The replacement tenure-track faculty will be capable of teaching the following new course in the proposed curriculum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSNM 703</td>
<td>Women’s Primary Care &amp; Gynecological Health I (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSNM 704</td>
<td>Women’s Primary Care &amp; Gynecological Health II (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSNM 705</td>
<td>Women’s Primary Care &amp; Gynecological Health Clinical (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSNM 710</td>
<td>Advanced Midwifery Clinical (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Either Dr. Jenna LoGiudice, or the replacement tenure-track faculty, or an adjunct hire would be capable of teaching:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSNM 709</td>
<td>Advanced Midwifery Management (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(In regards to a potential adjunct hire, this faculty member would broaden the experience for the NM-DNP student offering the ability to hire a full-time practicing midwife to teach this course largely from a case study perspective for students. This would deepen student learning and exposure to faculty within the midwifery profession).

Additionally in regards to financial resources, the current Family Nurse Practitioner MSN and DNP program at Fairfield supports students through HRSA grants. The nurse-midwifery curriculum would actively begin grant writing to offset student costs in this degree. Once the
midwifery program is accredited by ACME, the goal will be to apply for HRSA grants such as Advanced Nursing Education ([http://bhpr.hrsa.gov/nursing/grants/ane.html](http://bhpr.hrsa.gov/nursing/grants/ane.html)).

The greatest costs for the DNP-NM, especially at the outset, are those associated with the pre-accreditation process through the Accreditation Commission on Midwifery Education (ACME) and effectively communicating about the opening of Fairfield’s program to the outside market. Given the competitive alternatives that currently exist, as well as those that are being planned based on demand from industry, it will be imperative to educate the marketplace on Fairfield’s offering, with the hope that Fairfield’s reputation for high interaction-high quality and rigorous education will enhance demand for the DNP-NM program. With a competitive program in relatively close proximity and online competitors, it is necessary to have a well-developed and separate communications/advertising plan for the DNP-NM program.

Additionally, in academic year 2017-2018, there will be a need for a new faculty line to cover the portion of course loads previously taught by both Dr. Jenna LoGiudice and the faculty member hired as the replacement women’s health tenure-track position starting Fall 2016 (both of whom as of Fall 2017 will begin teaching in the DNP-NM program). This new faculty line will largely help to cover the courses in the undergraduate program previously taught by Dr. Jenna LoGiudice and the faculty member hired in the replacement tenure-track position. To clarify, both Dr. Jenna LoGiudice and the faculty member hired in the replacement tenure-track position will still retain some courses in the undergraduate program for their teaching load.

**Appendix E** provides an illustrative budget for full-time cohorts over 4 academic years. The various costs and revenues contained within these budgets are based on current numbers, with a conservative estimation of increased costs in future years.

**Program Evaluation**

The Dean, Associate Dean for Graduate Programs, program track coordinator of the DNP-NM, and members of the Egan School Graduate Committee will undertake a number of activities over the first three years, to obtain feedback on the growth of the new DNP-NM program. These initiatives will include closely tracking the following criteria:

- changes in application and enrollment numbers from year to year;
- number of program inquiries within the school and through Graduate Admissions;
- professional placement opportunities as a result of graduating from the program;
- whether the RN experiences and length of time in practice of the students increase;

In addition, the Egan School learning goals will be applied to the DNP-NM curriculum. As a result, the DNP-NM will be held to the same rigorous curriculum standards as are the other DNP programs currently offered (DNP - Nurse Anesthesia). This requires that student work pertaining to specific learning goals (e.g., critical thinking, reflective practice, shared decision making, leadership goals, professional practice, clinical practice, presenting research findings, and acting ethically and responsibly) be assessed on a yearly basis. Further, goals specific to the DNP-NM program, especially with regard to clinical practice and the DNP project (a requirement of the DNP degree) will be articulated and added into the curricular assessment process, as a means of maintaining the rigor and relevance of the DNP-NM.
Over the long term (5 years), the Egan School will formally assess the need and relevance of the DNP-NM. To do this, a formal committee (Dean, Associate Dean of Graduate Programs, members of the Egan School graduate curriculum committee, nurse-midwifery faculty) will review all statistics related to demand, including: inquiry information, application and admission numbers, cohort sizes, student academic and professional background, placement and job opportunities, and financial results of the program. In addition, it will be of paramount importance to work with the SON Advisory Board to determine the continued relevance of the DNP-NM program and demand for its specialized knowledge by healthcare leaders. Given that the SON Advisory Board has been a strong supporter of nursing education, they should be able to provide candid and insightful commentary on where Fairfield's program stands in five years. Additionally, the Accreditation Commission for Midwifery Education (ACME) will be evaluating the program through its 5-year reaccreditation process. The DNP-NM program track coordinator will ensure focus groups are conducted with clinical preceptors, and both graduating and current students to have summative and formative evaluations of the program.

**Projections for the future**

As has been noted throughout, it is the intention of the Egan School to market the DNP-NM program as a highly specialized, high-demand degree, terminal clinical degree, that can be completed in a relatively short period of time (3 years). The projection is to be at a cohort of 7-12 students by the third year of the program, with a maximum enrollment 30 students at any time. Also, once the DNP-NM program is accredited, the intent is seek grants through HRSA for example, to aid students financially to pursue this degree. As indicated through budget estimates, the DNP-NM program has the potential to begin generating revenues in academic year two.

**Appendix G**

**SCHOOL OF NURSING**

**GRADUATE PROGRAM**

**Graduate Curriculum Committee Meeting**

**Thursday, February 11, 2016**

**Minutes (excerpt)**

**Mid-Wifery Update (J. LoGiudice)**

Jenna and Meredith met recently with Holly Powell Kennedy from Yale School of Nursing (YSN), Director of Mid-Wifery, and described YSN’s general support of Fairfield University establishing a NMW program. They discussed a potential collaboration with Yale for a Fairfield University NMW-DNP student who might want to go on to get their PhD. Jenna then reviewed the highlights of the full NMW proposal, including results of the market analysis. There is a steady number of applicants interested in a NMW program but current programs are unable to fill the need. NMW programs have become increasingly popular over the past 10 years. There are fewer OB-GYNs going in to practice obstetrics, so NMWs are expected to supplement the difference. There is very healthy support in the Northeast region for mid-wifery, and in particular for a Jesuit institution to have a NMW program. Jenna will include the newly revised Egan School mission statement in the proposal once it is voted on during the next Faculty Organization meeting. The numbers of NMW students through the first few years of the program were discussed and how the Egan School can
support them in terms of full-time and adjunct positions. The NMW curriculum plan, course descriptions and objectives have already been approved.

**Motion to approve the full NMW program proposal:** J. Shea; **Seconded:** S. Grossman; **Approved:** unanimously.

---

**School of Nursing: February 19, 2016**  
**Faculty Organization Meeting Minutes - DRAFTct**

**Midwifery Program:** J. LoGiudice reviewed the proposed Midwifery program with faculty. Jenna detailed her research and development of the program. Faculty reviewed and voted to accept. M. Kazer congratulated Jenna on preparation and proposal.

S. Grossman Motion to accept proposed DNP Nurse-Midwifery Program at The Egan School  
2nd: K. Wheeler  
Approved: Unanimous

---

**Educational Planning Committee Minutes (excerpt): 3/17/16**

**AGENDA ITEM #2: Doctorate of Nursing Practice: Nurse-Midwifery Program**  
J LoGiudice presented a proposal for the Doctorate of Nursing Practice: Nurse-Midwifery Program at the Egan School of Nursing and Health Studies.

**Background**  
Midwives are healthcare providers: RN, sits for a certifying exam, has a masters or doctorate of nursing practice, certified to practice in all healthcare studies.

- **Need:** Job demand for midwives are predicted to increase from 2012 to 2022. One reason is that less people are going into obstetrics, and midwives are predicted to fill that gap. 49% of counties in U.S. do not have enough obstetric care providers. The organization that accredits midwifery programs has called for more programs, hoping to certify 1,000 midwives annually (571 certified in 2014).

- **Market demand:** 47% of survey respondents indicate a strong interest in the program. There are more qualified applicants than spaces available for students in current midwifery programs in the U.S.

- **Objectives:** Three-year full/time program, projected start in fall 2017. Ten new proposed courses (5 classroom, 5 clinical). Goal is to enroll 5 – 7 students each year.

- **Resources:** J LoGiudice, certified nurse midwife; and a visiting professor coming in the fall, who is a practicing nurse midwife.

- **Impact:** Not conflicting with any other program.

**Questions**
• A question was raised about the credits being frontloaded. J LoGiudice explained that if there was no summer program in the first year, they would have had to add another semester. The last year is spent off-campus integrating into life with a midwife. With six credits in the last spring semester, students prepare for the boards and complete DNP projects.

• D Peduti inquired about the decrease in people going into obstetrics. J LoGiudice responded that the malpractice cost for OBGYNs is higher than malpractice for midwifery.

• V Rosivach raised a question about revenue remaining in the School of Nursing.* M Kazer explained that the DNP program originally started was under-resourced and the new program would put resources into the DNP program.

C Scheraga thanked J LoGiudice, at which point J LoGiudice stepped out.

Motion to accept proposal for DNP Nurse-Midwifery Program: D Peduti Second: R Colwell

**Vote**
In favor: Unanimous

* V Rosivach motioned for a recommendation about revenue remaining in the School of Nursing: “The EPC recommends as part of this proposal that revenues beyond direct educational expenses and beyond contributed expenses remain in the School of Nursing.”

Second: C Scheraga

**Discussion**
R Hannafin commented that language be edited to say “percentage of direct contributions”. M Kazer agrees with recommendation, but not inserting it as part of the proposal.

Motion to table recommendation: R Hannafin
Second: C Scheraga
DATE: March 21, 2016
TO: Academic Council
Amalia Rusu, Executive Secretary
FROM: Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee
Carol Ann Davis, Chair
SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend Handbook Language to Reflect Current Practices of the FDEC

Proposal to Amend Handbook Language to Reflect Current Practices of the FDEC

Background: The FDEC is a committee that came into being prior to the inception of the Center for Academic Excellence, and because of that, the committee has invited the director (or his or her designee) to attend meetings throughout the CAE’s history. The CAE plays an integral role in the committee’s efforts to facilitate and support faculty development, such as helping to plan FDEC Days, helping to educate faculty on a number of teaching resources, and assisting faculty with the interpretation of IDEA results. Each of these activities the FDEC does in concert and consultation with the CAE and so we think it more appropriate for a Director of the CAE to be a member of the committee as opposed to an invited guest. As we discussed those changes, we also took the opportunity to update the language in the faculty charge to better reflect the role of the committee in faculty development around teaching and research. In March, the FDEC voted unanimously to make the following changes that better reflect the current practices of the committee. Each change is offered below, with accompanying rationale. Minutes are also attached to reflect the discussion of these items at the FDEC meeting.

1. Changes to Membership description:

   Current language:

   Seven members elected from the faculty for three-year overlapping terms, according to the following electoral divisions: three from the College of Arts & Sciences, one each from the School of Engineering, the School of Nursing, the School of Business, and the Graduate School of Education & Allied Professions. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs or the appointed representative of the same shall be an ex officio member with a right to vote.

   Proposed language:

   Seven members elected from the faculty for three-year overlapping terms, according to the following electoral divisions: three from the College of Arts & Sciences, one each from the School of Engineering, the School of Nursing, the School of Business, and the Graduate School of Education & Allied Professions. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and a Director from the Center for Academic Excellence, or their appointed representatives, shall be ex officio members with voting rights.

   Rationale:

   The final sentence was revised to give a CAE director or her/his representative ex officio status with voting rights. This will better reflect the active role the CAE plays on the committee and empower that person to be a full member of the committee.

2. Changes to Specific Duties:

   A. Current language item i.:
i. to coordinate the activities of all University sectors in the promotion of teaching excellence.

Proposed language:

i. to coordinate activities that promote teaching excellence.

Rationale:
This change better approximates the committee’s role, as the committee is not in a position to be responsible for “all University sectors,” but does “coordinate” activities around “teaching excellence” with their partners in Academic Affairs and CAE.

B. Current language item iii:

iii. to design a regular system of classroom evaluation for all University faculty.

Proposed language:

iii. to monitor and improve the regular system of classroom evaluation for all University faculty.

Rationale:
This change reflects the evolution of the committee. The original FDEC was the committee that designed an internal student evaluation system and then helped to transition the University from this internal system of evaluation to the IDEA system of evaluation. Now that the IDEA system is in place, the role of the committee in designing “regular system of classroom evaluation for all University faculty” has ended and transitioned to one in which we monitor and improve the evaluation instrument as needed. This reflects the committee’s current practice and updates the charge accordingly.

FDEC Meeting Draft (excerpt): Wednesday, March 16, 2016

2. DISCUSSION OF ROLE OF CAE ON COMMITTEE AND GOVERNANCE STEPS TO FULL MEMBERSHIP RE: HANDBOOK LANGUAGE CHANGE

Committee took on charge to make changes to the writing in the handbook so that the language in the first paragraph is updated to reflect true role of CAE as discussed at meeting.

The General Purpose remains as it is in the handbook (unchanged).

Specific Duties changes:

i. Is a revision and slight simplification of handbook language (omitting "all University sectors")
ii. Remains as it was in handbook—no revisions
iii. Is a revision of the original iii. from the handbook—no longer appropriate, since it directed the committee “to design a regular system of classroom evaluation for all University faculty.”
iv. Remains as it was in handbook—no revisions

FDEC members will submit these changes in April to Academic Council. The topic will be put on the agenda for Academic Council and attached and put forward to AC in April. Carol Ann will write up a rationale for the changes and add the rationale to minutes.

Amanda moved to make motion to accept changes in the handbook language and Shannon seconded the motion. All members were in agreement.
DATE: March 23, 2016
TO: Academic Council
    Amalia Rusu, Executive Secretary
FROM: Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee
    Carol Ann Davis, Chair
SUBJECT: Proposal to Adopt Newly Revised IDEA Evaluation & Platform

Proposal to Adopt Newly Revised IDEA Evaluation & Platform
Fairfield University has been administering the IDEA evaluation form since 2010. Fairfield originally adopted this form to replace the internal Fairfield quantitative evaluation to reap the benefits of a valid and reliable quantitative evaluation focused on student learning, faculty-determined course purposes, as well as on the availability of comparison data and professional development support. In 2015, we adopted a model of all-online administration of IDEA evaluations. This change has not affected the actual evaluation or results format, which remained the same, but sped up the availability and distribution of IDEA results.

IDEA has recently worked to improve their product in response to current knowledge about student learning and constituent feedback, offering a revision of the evaluation instrument and a new web-based platform for viewing the evaluation and results. These changes preserve all of the benefits of the original instrument while adding new ones. The two major improvements are:

1. An improved, more valid and reliable evaluation form based on routine statistical analysis of the current instrument with updated teaching methods and learning outcomes mapped to those of regional accreditors such as the AAC&U
2. A user-friendly web version of the evaluation and diagnostic report with substantial improvements in data presentation and interpretation through a Campus Labs format

Although IDEA has no imminent plans to eliminate the current IDEA evaluation and platform, within the next 3-5 years, the current format will most likely no longer be available. **Because of its many benefits and the eventual planned phase out of the current instrument and platform, the FDEC recommends that Fairfield adopt the revised IDEA evaluation and new platform at this time under a three-year contract to take advantage of significant improvements.** The revised IDEA evaluation and Campus Labs platform will cost only slightly more than the current IDEA online platform; the difference has already been added to the FY’17 Academic Division Budget in anticipation of Academic Council approval.

Below is a more detailed description of the improvements that the newly revised IDEA evaluation and platform include. Minutes, as well as an example of the new web format, follow as appendices.

Improvements Related to the Evaluation Instrument:
IDEA has significantly improved their evaluation instrument by completing statistical analysis on the responses to IDEA forms from 2002 to 2011, by consulting a variety of focus groups including IDEA users, expert panelists, item writers, faculty, administrators, and students, and by working to map their learning objectives and teaching methods more closely with those of regional accreditors...
such as the AAC&U (see example of comparison between AAC&U Value Rubric and IDEA learning objectives in Appendix B).

IDEA’s research led them to revise their teaching methods to include methods related to diversity, self-reflection, and service-learning. In addition, the learning objectives have been revised to include objectives related to diverse perspectives and global awareness, ethical reasoning and decision making, civic engagement, and quantitative literacy. These changes to teaching methods and learning objectives seem to correlate well with Fairfield’s own common teaching methods and objectives.

The changes also resulted in a more streamlined student evaluation form. Some items were dropped, while others were added, but the resulting diagnostic long form is now only 40 questions long compared to 47 questions on the long form Fairfield currently administers.

The current IDEA long form is made up of 20 initial questions about the instructor’s teaching methods, then 12 questions on progress made on 12 learning objectives, 3 questions about the course work, 6 questions on student characteristics, a rating of the teacher, a rating of the course, and finally 4 additional questions related to the instructor’s practices. The changes to the current form are summarized below:

- The last 4 questions on instructor’s practices were always experimental items that were not involved in any evaluation scores or suggested actions and so have been deleted.
- The 6 questions on student characteristics have been decreased down to 3 because three were not used to adjust scores.
- There have been changes to the teaching methods and learning objectives, but while the teaching methods have gone down from 20 to 19, the learning objectives have gone up to 13 from 12, making the overall number the same.

  - Some examples of specific changes to learning objectives include:
    - Current Objectives 1 and 2 (related to gaining factual knowledge and learning fundamental principles) have been combined in the newly revised form because of high correlation in terms of faculty selection and student ratings.
    - Objective 10 (related to understanding of and commitment to personal values) in the current form is not emphasized by any higher education organization anymore. IDEA has replaced this with an ethical reasoning objective that is emphasized now.
    - Some learning objectives were rewritten to improve them such as making Objective 9 not just about finding and using resources, but also evaluating resources.

IDEA has published a white paper that summarizes all of the data that contributed to revising the IDEA evaluation instrument. Faculty that want to compare results from the current form to the newly revised form may find it useful to consult the tables on pages 87 through 91 of this paper (see link above). These tables will be helpful for those summarizing their student evaluation data for rank and tenure or for other similar purposes. Many faculty successfully negotiated the tenure and promotion processes during the transition from Fairfield’s internal evaluation form to IDEA, and since the change from one IDEA form to another is much less disruptive, the FDEC does not see any problems emerging from this change. Furthermore, it is also the nature of these types of instruments that they evolve over time, and the FDEC sees the new form as an improvement over the current one, since it takes into account current teaching methods.

Should the Academic Council adopt these changes, the FDEC will widely distribute materials to faculty highlighting the opportunities inherent in these changes and making faculty aware of them.
Improvements Related to New Web-Based Platform:
IDEA has collaborated with a technology company, Campus Labs, to improve the ease of use of the evaluation and results through a new web-based platform. Below is a list of many of the improvements.

- Evaluation and results are simplified, color-coded, and easier to read (see example screens in Appendix B)
- Results are stored more securely in the cloud and not on Fairfield’s server
- Faculty receive results within 48 hours without any Fairfield-required interface such as my.fairfield
- Faculty can track student responses to the evaluation in real time as the students are completing it
- Pedagogical papers available on how to improve teaching are now imbedded within the results screen that the faculty member sees so that a faculty member can easily click within this screen to find out suggestions to increase student learning outcomes (see Appendix B for example screen)
- Evaluation can be administered on cell phones or computers and renders on any device automatically. (IDEA has been looking into whether student responses would be different on cell phones versus computers and what they have found so far indicates that there is not a big difference in quality of responses; they have not yet prepared a white paper on this issue but have communicated the above to the committee via email and teleconference.
- The new platform provides for four possible surveys available as opposed to the current system, which offers only two. The new platform provides a Diagnostic (equivalent to current long form), Learning Outcomes (equivalent of current short form), Teaching Essentials (additional new short form), Instant Feedback (a faculty-driven quick formative assessment, not related to end-of-course survey and available as a kind of electronic MAT).
- The OCC (on-campus coordinator, IDEA) can more easily load course and enrollment information to the IDEA database through a direct feed from Blackboard

Appendix A: Meeting Minutes

FDEC Meeting Draft (excerpt)
Wednesday, March 16, 2016

1. MOVING IDEA EVALUATION TO CAMPUS LABS PLATFORM PROPOSAL
Follow up discussion ensued based on November conference call with Ken Ryalls, President of IDEA, whether to adopt a change to the Campus Labs platform.
Reference to handout distributed on Proposal to Adopt Newly Revised IDEA Platform and Evaluation:

Advantages discussed for adoption that should be emphasized to faculty:
- Much better interface and survey (color coded-ease for students and faculty)
- The revised survey is now available on a new platform based on a collaboration between IDEA and the technology company, Campus Labs
- The Campus Labs platform provides easier input and access to formative information than current version of IDEA provides and even has an option for a mid-semester survey that
offers feedback on teaching that can be used before end of semester to drive changes in instruction. Faculty results from Campus Labs IDEA platform is in the Cloud and available within 48 hours.

Questions by FDEC members:
Should we stay with current PDF version of IDEA or a slightly different form that aligns with our mission?
Have other academic institutions piloted Campus Labs? Yes, Azusa Pacific University is one example of a university successfully using the new platform. Information from Ken Ryalls, IDEA president, indicated no difficulties with the Campus Labs platform based on university experiences.

Cost: Approximate additional cost is 1500.00 per year and Academic Affairs has budgeted for this cost.

Suggested Improvements Related to the Proposal on the Evaluation and Presentation of Instrument to faculty:
Amalia suggested need for more transparency when proposal to adopt Campus Labs is presented to faculty. Committee agreed that we should add more content/explanation showing the link to instruction and why this revision is beneficial to faculty.
Reference Changes: Reverse the two major improvements cited in proposal handout to read:
1. An improved, more valid and reliable evaluation form based on statistical analysis with updated teaching methods and learning outcomes mapped to those of regional accreditors such as the AAC & U.
2. A user-friendly web version of the evaluation and diagnostic report with substantial improvements in data presentation and interpretation through the Campus Labs format.

Additional comments to support use of Campus Labs over IDEA Evaluation:
 a) Some of the additional information in original IDEA Evaluation was not valid so Campus Lab offers fewer questions getting at the targeted points to be assessed.
 b) Tracy will obtain the “old language vs. new language” to demonstrate repetitive questions.
 c) Many learning objectives are the same, but some have been revised or combined to fine tune instrument.
 d) On campus IDEA coordinator will upload information easier into the new Campus Labs IDEA platform

In sum:
Revisions will be made and distributed to FDEC members by email along with the 90 page PDF which will be attached when submitted / sent to Academic Council by Friday, March 25th for approval.

Motion to approve the proposal to adopt Campus Labs with suggested amendments presented by Shannon and seconded by Amalia. All eight members approved. No abstentions.
Appendix B: Campus Labs example screens: see PDF file at GFS website
AN OVERVIEW OF THE PROCESS

Fairfield University is one of 28 Jesuit colleges and universities in the United States, organized into a network known as the AJCU (Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities). At the behest of the Society of Jesus, the AJCU is asking all Jesuit colleges and universities in the US to undertake, at some point during the next five years, a year-long process to re-affirm their Jesuit, Catholic mission. This will be done through the completion of a self-study document (with appendices that give relevant detail) that responds to the guidelines provided by the AJCU: "Some Characteristics of Jesuit Colleges and Universities: A Self-Evaluation Instrument."

The text below is a draft of our self-study document. It will be posted on this site for three weeks, as we seek your comments, questions and suggestions.

[How did we get here? In fall 2015 self-study teams of faculty, staff and administrators assembled draft reports in response to different sections of the “Some Characteristics” AJCU self-study guide. These draft reports, each of which ended with suggestions for mission priorities, were the focus of the President’s Retreat in November 2015. At that retreat – a day-long event attended by over 50 members of the faculty, staff and administration – each of the reports were presented and the combined total of 21 suggested priorities were whittled to three institutional mission priorities. Additional opportunities for comment were offered to the student and academic affairs divisions, and the sections on academics and campus culture were discussed with students from FUSA and Campus Ministry. This input was drafted into the document below, which follows the chapters and major headings found in the “Some Characteristics” guide.]

After this public comment period, this self-study document will be submitted to representatives of the Board of Trustees for their consideration. The final copy, with links to our numerous mission-related programs, will be posted on the Fairfield University website this summer. In fall 2016, an external team from the AJCU will visit Fairfield, conduct their own discussions, and offer their impressions in a report to the Provincial of the USA/Northeast province.

As Fairfield completed an institutional strategic planning process (Fairfield 2020) in June 2015, and will begin with the NEASC re-accreditation process in Fall 2016, it has worked well for us to undertake this mission self-study during this 2015-2016 academic year, during the first wave of the five year AJCU cycle. After all 28 schools have completed the self-study process (several will do so each year, over the next five years), the AJCU will evaluate this procedure, which should yield some interesting insights about how “Jesuit, Catholic” is understood by Jesuit schools across the United States in a rapidly changing higher education context.

INTRODUCTION
Founded in 1942, Fairfield University, while fairly “young” among institutions of higher education, has always identified with the almost 500-year tradition of Jesuit and Catholic education. This identity is lived in our vibrant institutional mission, which seeks to educate our undergraduate and graduate students so that they become not merely skilled professionals but, as the Jesuit tradition requires, “men and women for others.”

This identity is lived in the deeply engaged work of our faculty and staff. Faculty teaching, enriched by ongoing scholarship, is the heartbeat of mission-driven university education. Students also encounter this education in the context of Fairfield’s residential and community life, with its co-curricular program of activities, athletics, service and reflection. This interplay is named well in the Vision Statement that opens our recent strategic plan, *Fairfield 2020: The Way Forward*: “As Catholic, we carry forward a rigorous intellectual tradition in our teaching and research; as Jesuit we take great pride in the Ignatian educational model that prizes cura personalis — the development of the whole person — as the foundation of just and vibrant communities.”

This mission lives on in our graduates and alumni, as their lives and work give evidence of Fairfield’s commitment to serve as a learning environment that, true to the early Jesuit vision of pedagogical mission, has as its ultimate goal “the transformation of the whole world.”

The Society of Jesus – with its roots in the early modern world and its global reach in our own day – understands well that the mission of Jesuit Catholic education must continually adapt to address its changing societal context. The Society, too, is changing, with fewer members to carry forward its apostolates. In this situation, the ability of Jesuit colleges and universities to take charge of their mission-driven identity, and to live this in new ways, is essential.

Thus the AJCU has asked for the reflection we offer below, and the affirmation of our continued energies for mission found in its closing articulation of three mission priorities. We look forward to the discussion of this document that will occur as we receive an external visiting team from the AJCU in Fall 2016.

**CHARACTERISTIC 1: LEADERSHIP’S COMMITMENT TO THE MISSION**

Recognizing how mission and identity are institutionally perpetuated, the AJCU self-study guide asks whether “the University’s leadership competently communicates and enlivens the Jesuit, Catholic mission of the institution.” At Fairfield, this mission is communicated with intention across the enterprise, in explicit ways via public institutional signs and in implicit ways that enliven the work of each division.

The starting point for mission articulation at Fairfield is our University mission statement, which has stood for decades as a singular point of agreement in an otherwise appropriately lively academic conversation about identity. This statement clearly sets forth what it means to be part of this “community of scholars,” in an institution that is shaped by the norms of Jesuit education and the “promotion of justice.” Fairfield’s high expectations for the faculty, as the heart of this mission-driven community, are set forth in the faculty handbook’s norms for teaching, research, and service.

Fairfield has understood its Jesuit and Catholic identity in broad terms, welcoming, since its 50th anniversary celebration in 1992, centers for Judaic Studies and Catholic Studies as well as interdisciplinary programs that focus on race, gender, regions and nationalities. Campus Ministry has offered inter-faith programming, with part-time chaplains for Muslim and Protestant students,
as well as partnering for Shabbat services and the recognition of Jewish holidays. The President’s Seminar on the Catholic Intellectual Tradition has sought to place Catholic questions in strong dialogue with secularism and post-secularism.

Faculty and staff have a variety of mission formation programs, featuring both the story of the Society as well as the animating themes of Catholic thought – the goodness of creation, the dignity of the human person and the value of both faith and reason. The magazine Conversations in Jesuit Higher Education has been the subject of panel discussions that bring together faculty, staff and administrators from across campus. In all this conversation, we reflect the understanding of “Catholic” as put forward in the University mission statement: “Fairfield is Catholic in both tradition and spirit. It celebrates the God-given dignity of every human person. As a Catholic university it welcomes those of all beliefs and traditions who share its concerns for scholarship, justice, truth and freedom, and it values the diversity which their membership brings to the university community.”

The Board of Trustees is keenly appreciative of the Catholic and Jesuit identity of Fairfield University. Article II, Section 1 of our by-laws, which establishes the Board of Trustees, states it plainly: “The Board of Trustees shall preserve and promote the educational objectives of the University within the context of a Jesuit and Catholic commitment.” The Board includes Jesuits among its members; our by-laws call for 10-40 trustees (including the President), adding that “[a]t least six (6) of the Trustees shall be members of the Society of Jesus in good standing.” (Article II, Section 2)

New trustees receive a half-day of orientation to the mission of Fairfield, and the Vice President for Mission and Identity visits each of the committees of the Board once a year. Notably, in Spring 2015, the Board underwent a more intensive period of conversation about mission, supported by a $10,000 grant from the Council of Independent Colleges NetVUE initiative, which included Rev. John O’Malley, SJ’s short book on the history of the Society as well as presentations by Rev. Roger Haight, SJ and Rev. Matt Malone, SJ. The short text by Superior General Rev. Adolfo Nicolás, SJ, “A Call for Spiritual Leaders,” has been in good use by the Board as well as the University’s senior leadership team.

The University’s Center for Ignatian Spirituality has done extensive outreach to the senior leadership, as part of their more general practice of offering the Spiritual Exercises to administrators, faculty and staff. At the June 2015 meeting of the Board of Trustees, several members of the senior leadership shared their own experience of being directed through the Exercises, as a way of introducing the opportunity offered by the Center for Ignatian Spirituality to the Board. This outreach has been well-received.

The leader of Jesuit and Catholic mission at Fairfield is our University President, the Rev. Jeffrey P. von Arx, SJ, who also brings a deep understanding of the academy as a former faculty member, chair, and dean. Fr. von Arx is a tenured professor in the department of history, and welcomes the chance to teach as his schedule allows. His vision for Fairfield shapes those he brings into its leadership. Supporting these administrators, particularly when current events raise challenges between the discussion appropriate to University life and the Catholic identity of Fairfield, is a positive relationship between members of the administration and our Jesuit Director of Campus Ministry, the Director for the Center for Catholic Studies and the Director for the Center for Faith and Public Life.
An additional strong partner in this task has been the **Ignatian Colleagues Program** (ICP). Fairfield has been an active part of the ICP since its inception, and has found this to be a valuable formation program for administrators and faculty that seem poised to make a strong contribution to Jesuit education, both at Fairfield and elsewhere in the AJCU. As the newest Executive Director of the ICP was already serving in student affairs at Fairfield, we were happy to have that program move its national office to our own campus.

The **Academic Deans** at Fairfield offer clear support for Jesuit education in their understanding of the purpose and work of their academic units. A typical statement of this is drawn from the mission statement of the Charles F. Dolan School of Business, which claims that it is “committed to the Jesuit tradition of educating the ‘whole’ person to be a socially responsible professional.” The door of justice and the common good, championed by the Society, forms the entry point for many of these units. Courses in engineering, business and nursing ethics are required components of each of these professional tracks, as they are for the programs in counseling and education that are among the programs in the Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions (GSEAP). In the College of Arts and sciences, the liberal arts tradition that is the ground of Jesuit education is presented as an holistic and integrated body of study that offers a broad, multidisciplinary approach to the world.

Through the leadership of the Deans, service learning programs are present across the Schools, with an emphasis on “community engagement” driving the GSEAP. This element of skilled, reflective service is also clearly present when Deans speak to students and parents about carefully developed study abroad programs with service learning components in our nursing and engineering schools.

Questions over the nature and role of mission undeniably raise **tensions**. On the one hand, issues of faith and spirituality arise regularly in conversations with students. They also emerge in the academic division. Courses in the School of Nursing and the Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions, for example, acknowledge spirituality as a reflective component in the work of practitioners and a valuable resource for some of the clients they serve, all of whom are understood to have the “God-given dignity” mentioned in the University’s mission statement. The Department of Religious Studies offers depth in this area as well, presenting courses that are clearly in the field of “religion” alongside courses that are explicitly theological in methodology. The mission of the institution is also engaged in the core curriculum’s focus on the liberal arts.

Nevertheless, in terms of **personnel**, the issue of “hiring for mission” can evoke tensions about the Jesuit Catholic mission. Fairfield’s approach when hiring for mission has been to emphasize interest in questions of social justice and the turn to the marginalized that mark the focus of the more recent decades of the Society. We value and promote the profoundly reflective approach to education and the person that characterizes Jesuit pedagogy. And finally, we are able — grateful for the opening made by Pope Francis — to raise the question of the common good to perhaps a more profound degree than before. These are the most fruitful avenues as we seek to hire those who will advance the Jesuit and Catholic mission and identity at Fairfield.

**CHARACTERISTIC 2: THE ACADEMIC LIFE**

As at all Jesuit schools, Fairfield University’s division of Academic Affairs is the heart of the university as an institutional force.
At Fairfield, the commitment to the academic exploration of great achievements of the humanities, the social and natural sciences, and the arts is codified in our core curriculum, currently one of the largest core programs among those of the 28 Jesuit colleges and universities. As currently structured, the study of religion, philosophy, and ethics represent 5 courses in the core. The introductory course for our department of religious studies acquaints students with the breadth of scholarship in religion, asking that they take a step back from their own experience to critically examine religious texts, practices and beliefs in a scholarly manner. The second course in the core for our students will often focus on a particular tradition, with many offerings in Catholic Christianity, but also choices in Judaism, Islam, Hinduism and now, courses that study religion in America. The academic energy for our mission is also found in other areas of the core, most clearly as courses in history, literature, and the fine arts that address themes and events that mark not only Christian, Jewish, and Muslim history and culture, but also other various religious traditions found across global history and culture.

This material is certainly taught with passion. Our Faculty Handbook states the criteria for teaching, service and research that are the benchmarks for tenure and promotion. It is central to our Jesuit Catholic mission as a university that, by faculty policy, these benchmarks are set high, finding, for example, “conspicuous success in teaching to be of paramount importance” in consideration for tenure. In addition, in 2015, Fairfield was again selected by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching for its prestigious 2015 Community Engagement Classification (2008 was the first time), which recognized, among other things, that 42 faculty members are involved in service learning. Following our first year of recognition through this award in 2008, we revised our rank and tenure guidelines so that they now explicitly recognize the value of community-engaged teaching and scholarship.

The academic mission is significantly supported as a mission-driven enterprise by the work of the intentionally restructured Office of Academic and Career Development, a key component in Fairfield’s person-centered pedagogical approach. Combining the efforts of several programs — Academic Support and Retention, Disability Support Services, Project Excel, and the Career Planning Center — this office prepares students for a meaningful life by offering comprehensive and integrated academic support and professional development services.

Several Centers continually support and promote aspects of our Jesuit and Catholic mission to the University community. The Center for Faith and Public Life offers strong support for the local CAPP chapter and grant-funded research initiatives including substantial funding from the Teagle Foundation for humanitarian action efforts (JUHAN) linking Fairfield, Georgetown, and Fordham students in a consideration of “Enduring Questions.” The director for the CFPL and three faculty members, with the support of a grant from the Hagedorn Foundation, have undertaken a research project called “Strangers as Neighbors: How Religious Dialogue Can Help Reframe the Issue of Immigration.” The Center for Catholic Studies offers a lively round of lectures across the spectrum of Catholic thought, including academics such as Shawn Copeland and Rev. John Padberg, SJ, novelists such as Alice McDermott, and public voices such as Bishop Frank Caggiano (Bridgeport) and Catholic University’s Stephen Schneck. The CSC has also produced major conferences, on Catholicism and the media, same-sex relationships and, in fall 2016, on the future of Catholic theology. In summer 2014, the CSC hosted the third international conference on Receptive Ecumenism. Most importantly, the Center for Catholic Studies supports a variety of courses across the humanities, which students take individually or as part of the Catholic Studies minor.
The Center for Ignatian Spirituality trains lay directors to work alongside Jesuits as they offer introductory and short-term prayer experiences, as well as leading experiences in the Spiritual Exercises for students, faculty, administrators, trustees as well as neighbors in the Diocese of Bridgeport. Further service to the academic mission is found in the permanent collection and travelling exhibits at the Bellarmine museum; Fairfield’s institutional support for this “jewel” testifies to the importance of the arts for Jesuit education.

Additional Catholic initiatives include extending our academic programs in service of the Diocese of Bridgeport, including coursework and degree completion for seminarians and religious women, and graduate courses for certification for teachers in the parochial system.

Finally, our professional schools have embraced the vibrancy that mission-related service and justice work brings to their many areas of competence (only a few examples can be listed). The commitment to student diversity as a key component of mission has become a focus for the School of Nursing in its new ZAM (Zero Attrition Mission) effort. Nursing also continues its work on spirituality in nursing as well as a new initiative in palliative care. The School of Engineering, in March 2015, opened a student chapter of Engineers without Borders, focusing on water and sanitation projects in Bolivia. Students in the Dolan School of Business assist a variety of non-profits in the Bridgeport area with strategic planning and tax issues. The Bridgeport area is also the focus for students in the Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions, which has numerous partnerships, most recently initiating a broad-based interprofessional effort around the many educational and psycho-social needs at several high-need public schools.

The graduate and undergraduate programs offered by Fairfield University’s College of Arts and Sciences and the four professional schools anchor themselves in the tradition of Jesuit education, and express the Catholic tradition as they seek the common good, including the development of an ethical framework that focuses on care for the environment and the concerns of social justice. Thus we do not see the “quest to remain competitive” as requiring a trade-off between a deep education in the arts and sciences and the skills and competencies of the trained professional.

The self-study group that discussed Characteristic 2 developed three mission priorities for their division: 1. Ensure that the Catholic Jesuit tradition remains an integral part of our academic mission and identity. 2. Identify and prioritize a common intellectual experience that articulates our Catholic Jesuit mission to our undergraduate students. 3. Continue our commitment to diversity and the promotion of multicultural competencies.

All three of these priorities has been incorporated in the overall mission priorities that form the actionable outcomes of this self-study process.

**CHARACTERISTIC 3: A CATHOLIC, JESUIT CAMPUS CULTURE**

Through its campus culture, Fairfield University explicitly and implicitly expresses a Jesuit and Catholic identity in co-curricular programs, engagement opportunities, policies and physical structures. Through these diverse touch points, community members are able to intersect with our Jesuit and Catholic identity while making meaning of their educational experience.

The Egan Chapel of St. Ignatius Loyola, located at the center of the campus, supports the full range of Catholic liturgical life, with a vibrant community of students serving as Eucharistic ministers,
lectors and musicians. Each of these groups meets monthly for formation in addition to their Sunday service. Weekly meetings for the RCIA program prepare students for reception into the Roman Catholic Church. Times for adoration, confession and daily mass are well publicized, though the numbers of students participating in these practices are small. On the other hand, over 400 students attend Sunday mass, with non-Catholic students drawn to the experience of community with their Catholic classmates.

The staff of Campus Ministry, located in the lower level of the Egan Chapel, also serves other faith traditions, organizes domestic and international service trips, and offers retreat experiences throughout the year. Most importantly, the spaces available in Campus Ministry invite all to reflection and connection, both with peers and ministry staff.

Fairfield is intentional about building a healthy culture of community ties and respect for others. Starting with the initial freshman orientation experience, students and families are introduced and welcomed to a community committed to cura personalis, the care for the whole person that is the hallmark of Jesuit education, and to the correlative concepts “magis,” “men and women for others,” and “contemplatives in action.” Residence hall programs encourage an exploration of questions of identity, including questions of intimacy and relationality, and a critical examination of the context for their academic study and personal growth.

With the support of a 1999 grant from the Lilly Endowment, Fairfield University opened the Ignatian Residential College, a living and learning program for sophomores. Since then, two other sophomore residences have been added, Creative Life and Service for Justice. Half of the sophomore class now has the experience of these residential college programs, which include courses that take up the question of vocation as well as monthly mentoring groups. An introduction to Ignatian spirituality is frequently a component of these programs. An active chapter of Alpha Sigma Nu, the Jesuit honor society, often finds that its inductees, as sophomores, were members of a residential college. For all students, however, our advising process and comprehensive case management system express the deep care of Fairfield for all members of the community.

Fairfield students are active in intramural, club and varsity sports. These activities develop community and individual healthy habits. Beyond the formal norms for our NCAA teams, all athletes at Fairfield sign on to a very specific code of behavior that supports their identity as student athletes at a Jesuit school. We value the energy and broad comradery engendered by the team sports and fitness programs at Fairfield, and are vigilant about ensuring that our students are supported in their own development as young adults.

The physical structure of campus lends itself to this development, as it covers 200 acres with room for walking, running and playing fields. This physical structure speaks as well, as students “absorb” the mission via its appearance in word and symbol on our buildings — that incorporate Jesuit saints and their stories, as well as other messaging — and the intentionality with which these symbols and messages are placed. Our current building plan explicitly incorporates a concern to have the Jesuit Catholic mission speak through the built environment.

At Fairfield, the undergraduate population is influenced by the social culture of Twitter and Instagram, a culture that can work against the development of sustained reflection. Fairfield students across the socio-economic spectrum are also part of a culture of consumerism, in which material goods define identity. They are often overly self-interested and many have not been
challenged to see their connections with those experienced as other, or to think through their own privileges. Some students see the years of college as a “bubble” disconnected from the responsible interactions they imagine will characterize their future selves. At the same time, their selves are actively under construction, as they face questions about their sexuality, sexual orientation, family patterns and cultural biases. Technology does not merely “impact” our campus culture, in many ways it serves as the conduit for it, albeit via constantly changing channels and platforms.

The self-study group that discussed Characteristic 3 recognized that even as our campus culture is positive, University campuses need to continually re-calibrate their strategies. It identified first year programming as an important component in culture formation. It identified support for diversity programming and the development of multicultural competence as necessary for our students, faculty and staff. Finally it identified the need to hire for mission and recognized, importantly, that hiring committees need support as they develop appropriate language through which to do so.

**CHARACTERISTIC 4: SERVICE**

Within many departments and programs throughout the University, community service is the strongest expression of our students’ connection to the Catholic and Jesuit mission. This activity, regardless of the rationale for participation (sports team, residence hall program or dean of students sanction, etc.) resonated as the single specific experience that our community felt fostered the deepest connection to our identity.

Fairfield is concerned to develop a sense of *solidarity* throughout our institution. Through such the initiatives as the President’s Council on Institutional Diversity, internal divisions and areas of friction of all kinds are named and efforts — both formative and systemic — are made to address them. Racial and socio-economic divisions continue to challenge the claim to solidarity. Efforts to address these divisions can be undercut by discourtesy or a too-rigid distinction between “faculty” and “administration,” “staff” and “service workers.” While our students may treat faculty with an attitude of (sometimes excessive) deference, those same students will approach student affairs staff or dining service workers with an attitude of entitlement. Throughout the institution, an attachment to the culture of “busyness” also works against the kind of patient engagement that solidarity and community require.

The *Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm* provides a teaching strategy that is of broad interest to the Fairfield faculty, particularly as it presages many of the principles for effective teaching espoused in the field of teaching and learning today. Our Center for Academic Excellence offers workshops in Ignatian pedagogy, and an introduction to this is part of the new faculty orientation every year. In these orientation sessions, we have made good use of a collection that emerged from a Fairfield University national conference on the meeting of Ignatian and feminist pedagogical strategies, *Jesuit and Feminist Education: Intersections in Teaching and Learning for the Twenty-First Century* (Boryczka and Petrino, eds., Fordham University Press, 2012).

Service learning, shaped by Ignatian pedagogy, plays a significant role in the curriculum, though in some areas more than others. Over 40 service learning courses are offered annually at Fairfield, enrolling over 700 students. The strongest concentration of service learning experiences tends to be in the College of Arts and Sciences. Further, data indicates that high numbers of students enrolled in the education minor, the psychology major, the software engineering major and the School of Nursing take service-learning courses. More broadly, justice-based student development is
facilitated through critical reflection that is integrated into courses as well as co-curricular student engagement.

Direct service is organized through Campus Ministry, which sends 200 students weekly to 18 community partners, for a total of 12,000 hours of community service. Other students volunteer once a year: in 2014-2015, 1190 students contributed an additional 3570 hours of community service. Spring break immersion trips form faculty, staff and students at both national and international locations.

While service learning and direct service have been an important part of Fairfield’s community outreach, we have also sought to engage community voices in developing mutually-beneficial campus-community partnerships. Our efforts in these areas were recognized in 2010 by the Carnegie Foundation as we received the Community Engagement Classification, a recognition that was renewed in 2015. This classification recognizes work that has been done, but it also calls us to renewed efforts, which we are now in the process of quantifying through the development of a cloud-based database.

The self-study group that discussed Characteristic 4 recognized that service can become detached from the narrative of faith that grounds the institutional mission at Fairfield. They recommended a more strategic integration of meaningful community service into our curricular and co-curricular programs. This group also highlighted the “culture of busyness” as a factor that works against the time-intensive character of high quality service, and they suggested that our Jesuit, Catholic mission may call us to give up some commitments in favor of a more service-driven approach. Such an approach, they suggest, would be a significant factor in building a culture of respect and solidarity on campus and in the community. To start on these far-reaching suggestions, mission priority 3 recommends a more intentional and integrated approach to service across all sectors of Fairfield University.

CHARACTERISTIC 5: SERVICE TO THE LOCAL CHURCH

Fairfield University is located within the Diocese of Bridgeport, which maps onto the borders of Fairfield County in Connecticut. This county, with its mix of cities, suburbs and rural areas, is the immediate context for our work as a Jesuit Catholic school — a context we share with the fifth Bishop of Bridgeport, Bishop Frank J. Caggiano. While independent of formal diocesan control, Fairfield University actively seeks to support the local church and we value our positive collaborative relationship with Bishop Caggiano.

Fairfield supports the work of the diocese in a variety of ways, both as a resource for skilled and critical insights and as an animator of the Catholic faith.

Members of the Fairfield Jesuit Community routinely serve in parishes of the diocese. Twelve of the 17 current members offer weekly masses on Sundays or weekdays at one or more of the 87 parishes in the Diocese, and are also frequently called upon as confessors and retreat leaders in parish settings. Similarly, the early success of the recently-launched Center for Ignatian Spirituality, and the enthusiastic endorsement of its work by Bishop Caggiano (and the generous service of a deacon of the diocese as the Chair of the Advisory Board), foretells further and more extensive engagement in parish life. There has been a groundswell of interest in the Center’s work as a resource for spiritual direction as well as presentations and workshops on Ignatian spirituality. Led by a highly-qualified Jesuit, the Center not only offers spiritual direction, it serves as a vital
resource for local lay people and clergy to train as spiritual directors. There are currently 15 trained Spiritual Directors offering this ministry from the Center, and several others are in training through the Center’s program. This corps of experienced directors enables the Center to offer broad-based introductions to directed prayer for Catholic laity, with the cooperation of St. Mary’s parish in Ridgefield and St. Anthony’s parish in Fairfield.

As a University, Fairfield’s primary form of support for the work of the diocese is in our broad slate of educational offerings, which bring theologians, liturgists, historians and spiritual writers to our campus in evening lectures that are free to the public, and are well-patronized by a strong group of adult learners. An important benefit of Fairfield’s offerings is the fact that the Bennett Center in Judaic Studies makes the learning of Judaism available to this diocese, joining with Catholic Studies to offer an annual joint Lecture in Jewish-Christian Engagement, and the recent addition of a professor of Islam brings the riches of the Islamic tradition to the public lecture offerings. Other education support includes our hosting of the local chapter of Voice of the Faithful’s annual conference.

Through the faculty of the Department of Religious Studies, Fairfield’s reach into the future of the Church is extended as our graduates have gone on to graduate study to become college professors, parish directors of religious education, priests and vowed religious, and informed members of Catholic communities elsewhere. With the assistance of a funded initiative by the Catholic Theological Society of America, the theologians of Fairfield, joined by diocesan colleagues, hosted Bishop Caggiano for dinner, on the subject of “synodality.” From 2012-2014 Fairfield University received a grant from the John Templeton Foundation to bring leaders of local parishes to campus for a 5 day workshop dedicated to a Catholic approach to the science-religion debate, directed by a Fairfield biology professor. Over the ensuing two-year period monthly meetings continued while the participating parishes developed programing in the area of science and religion for their own parish populations.

Members of the Fairfield faculty, staff and administration also offer skilled consultation and support for diocesan initiatives. Through our Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions, we offer teacher certification pathways for teachers in the parochial system. We have worked closely with the diocesan seminary to welcome and support and advise seminarians who seek the bachelor’s degree or who need coursework that fulfills the requirements for the program for priestly formation. We also offer support for members of Catholic religious orders who study in our undergraduate and graduate programs. Members of our administration and faculty are actively serving in significant leadership roles, at the request of the Bishop, on planning commissions and search committees.

Finally, many members of the Fairfield University faculty, staff, and administration are members of local parishes in their home communities around Southeastern Connecticut and are active as religious educators, Eucharistic ministers, lectors and members of parish councils.

Fairfield University values our strong relationship with the Diocese of Bridgeport and Bishop Caggiano, and looks forward to continuing and strengthening these ties.

**CHARACTERISTIC 6: JESUIT PRESENCE**
The Fairfield University Jesuit Community, in their “presence, work and witness” as Jesuits, is a central animator of Fairfield University’s Jesuit, Catholic mission and identity. As of November 2015, 11 Jesuits were active in the University. Of these, four are full-time faculty members. Seven are staff or administrators: three work in student life or campus ministry, three in specialized projects, as faith and justice, alumni relations, or spirituality, and one is an administrator; four of this latter group of seven also teach at least one class per year. In addition to these 11 fully employed Jesuits, three other Jesuits provide valuable services and assistance to the University as semi-retired scholars or spiritual directors.

The ability of members of the Society to “go anywhere,” has also meant that they bring the narrative of the mission to every corner of the University. Jesuits join our students as they serve on immersion trips abroad and at home. They serve as chaplains to athletic teams and student clubs, and can be found travelling with our teams to conference finals as well as accompanying our Glee Club students to Europe on tour. Jesuits are there to officiate as our students marry and to console them as they fall ill or face serious failure. They are available to our alumni, faculty and staff in formal and numerous informal ways.

There is active conversation with the Society of Jesus in several ways. One notable way is that Fairfield is active in many of the AJCU networks — for chief academic officers, for mission and identity representatives, for student affairs professionals and leadership, for financial and technology leaders and in numerous conferences for academic deans and department chairs. Through these, mission formation is ongoing in ways that are targeted to the inner workings of our institutions of higher education. The Jesuit Provincial has addressed the Board of Trustees each of the last two years, and has visited for conversations on other occasions as well. The secretary for higher education has also been welcome in an annual multi-day visit. These activities provide a window on the national AJCU sensibility — with a strong vision of common purpose — to our campus. While there are some programmatic and faculty ties internationally, the international scope of the Society is less visible at Fairfield. One strategy to address this could be to invite Jesuits on campus with international postings in their background to share their experience.

The self-study group that discussed Characteristic 6, composed of campus Jesuits and one lay person (formed by the Ignatian Colleagues Program), had an extensive conversation about the future. They recognized that the declining number of Jesuits could well impact the Jesuit identity of Fairfield. They observed that Jesuit presence is likely to have a very different face in the years to come, suggesting that, in the future, the mission at Fairfield might be carried to a great extent by people of “Jesuit identity,” who are not “Jesuits.”

Lay formation has been an important theme at Fairfield for some time. Our participation in the Ignatian Colleagues Program is robust, as is our participation in the Jesuit Leadership Seminar each June. Many faculty and administrators take advantage of the offering of the Spiritual Exercises on campus, as well as ongoing programming in mission. Nevertheless, exactly what constitutes a “better educated laity” that will be received as “mission-bearing” is a conversation that has yet to find its footing.

The self-study conversation about the Jesuit Presence (individual and corporate) at Fairfield University suggested two approaches to strengthening that presence. The first approach called for a sustained effort to recruit Jesuits to Fairfield as faculty, staff and administrators, including the
identification of a “mechanism” that would aid this recruitment (such as the position of a “Jesuit Visiting Scholar”). The second approach called for a more expansive and deliberate program of “hiring for mission” and “orientation/formation for mission” (post-hire). Strategies to address the first approach, seeking to think in new ways about our recruitment effort, are under discussion. This second approach is set into motion by the first of the mission priorities listed at the end of this text.

**CHARACTERISTIC 7: INTEGRITY**

Fairfield University demonstrates integrity through our leadership, operating systems, environment and culture.

In our concern for the holistic development of faculty, staff and administrators, we provide **formation for Mission** by offering programs that introduce the values of the Society of Jesus and a variety of opportunities to engage in Ignatian spirituality. Our practice thus far has been to emphasize this formation for faculty, administration, and student affairs staff. We also provide **formation for leadership** by offering professional continuing education to our faculty and staff, and find that many take advantage of the opportunity to take classes or attend conferences that will advance their careers. As an institution, we need to more clearly embed our values into a formal set of leadership competencies. We also need to more clearly establish a more formal approach to grow high potential talent and plan for leadership succession.

Fairfield’s **hiring practices** and **deployment of resources** aim for equity, fairness and inclusion. The University offers a set of benefits to faculty and staff that provide for their health, wellbeing and financial security; the value of these benefits has consistently ranked above average when compared to our regional peer institutions. We seek to attract and hire the most qualified people who understand our mission and are committed to help us achieve business and social objectives. Our Catholic and Jesuit identity is communicated in job postings as well as the various publications shared with the external world through digital and print media, though we do not currently have institution-wide practices for hiring for mission. As part of our broader operating system, we contract with hundreds of service providers who work on our campus. They are valued and respected business partners, and as such, we set expectations regarding professional conduct and fair treatment of their employees. Fairfield has long sought to improve the ethnic diversity of its students, faculty and staff. Further attention is needed on this front, as the percentages of persons of color on our faculty and staff, and among our students, has remained below desired levels the last several years.

The **physical environment** of our campus provides nourishment for body, mind and spirit. Fairfield University is an aesthetically pleasing campus spanning 200 acres with 2.1 million square feet of building space. There are ample areas for rest and reflection as well as the opportunity to participate in social and spiritual activities that underscore our commitment to a healthy and engaged community. Continued facilities’ expansion may create tension as the need to expand infrastructure competes with our goal of maintaining an uncompromising balance between nature and utility.

The self-study group that considered Characteristic 7 concluded that our workforce needs to diversify, and recognizes that this would support our recruitment of a more diverse student body, a need that is addressed in mission priority 1 below. This self-study group also suggested more intentional approaches to our leadership development and evaluation. Strategies for these are currently being implemented in the office of human resources.
SUMMARY

At Fairfield, we recognize that explicit attention to mission is necessary to ensure that the Jesuit Catholic identity of our university continues to be received as lively and relevant. We also recognize that strategies to do this must be continually re-thought, as Jesuit staffing patterns shift and assumptions about formation or acquaintance with religious traditions no longer hold. The guidelines for the structure of this self-study text, “Some Characteristics of Jesuit Colleges and Universities: A Self-Evaluation Instrument,” are forthright in their recognition of these changes, and they clearly identify the tensions that exist in mission-driven higher education and the challenges that persist as a result.

As a Jesuit school, we can count on the Ignatian “way of proceeding,” which has always had an experimental, outward-facing and even entrepreneurial cast. Jesuits were sent into the unknown from the first days of the society, a society marked by significant change during its 450-year history. This reinvention process, ignited by the foregrounding of the poor by Superior General Pedro Arrupe, SJ and continued by Superior General Hans Peter Kolvenbach, SJ, has been emphasized as an imperative for Jesuit higher education moving forward, with Superior General Adolfo Nicolas, SJ, having called for Jesuit schools to vigorously counter the “fundamentalism,” “fanaticism” and “self-absorption” that signal the “globalized superficiality of thought” that threatens cultures and peoples.

As Jesuit schools, our search for justice is fed by the world-affirming vision of Catholic Christianity, in Ignatius’ language, the call to “find God in all things.” As Catholic, our schools are intentionally open to those of all faiths (and no faith in particular) as we find that justice requires recognition of the absolute dignity of the other.

As a University, we do all this the smart way — we seek to develop habits of rigorous thought, careful and objective approaches to data, historical perspective, insightful engagement with cultural forms and a practice of reflection that gives rise to real change. We will bring this same pro-active approach to the vigorous engagement of our mission as we live the future of Jesuit education. Continuing the energetic policies, activities and programs outlined above, we offer the following mission priorities as specific initiatives that further speak to this commitment.

FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY MISSION PRIORITIES 2016-2020

The AJCU has asked that we consider a five-year timeframe as the horizon for our proposal of a few mission priorities. Through our self-study process, particularly as this served as the focus for at the President’s Retreat in November 2015, we have identified three mission priorities that will more clearly foreground our Jesuit, Catholic identity and have a significant impact on our culture as mission driven. Our next step will be to name the specific actions we can take over the next five years with regard to these priorities, and to identify which office will take ownership of each of these steps.

1. Hiring for Mission/Recruiting for diversity. Emerging from the self-study team on Jesuit Presence, the highest ranked mission priority was this: Emphasize the Mission Statement of Fairfield University as an integral component for any search for University personnel. The value of a diverse student body and workforce was mentioned by several self-study teams. We already are committed to both hiring for mission and recruiting for diversity. But there is a sense that these
efforts are not as coordinated, integrated and visible and they should be. We need a stronger process for hiring for mission, so that search committees will elicit meaningful reflection on candidates’ interest in our mission as a Jesuit, Catholic institution.

2. Mission Visible in Academics. The Academics self-study team articulated a priority that was closely linked, at the President’s Retreat, with the need to hire for mission. It called for Fairfield to ensure, going forward, that the Catholic Jesuit tradition remains an integral part of our academic mission and identity. This “integral part,” the self-study team suggested, would be best introduced through the following objective: Identify and prioritize a common intellectual experience that articulates our Catholic Jesuit mission to our undergraduate students.

3. Stronger Institutional Structure for Service. Finally, there was strong support for an initiative that would invest in the infrastructure to support a sustained, integrated approach to service, bringing service learning and community service together for coordination. The centrality of these efforts to our identity as a Jesuit and Catholic institution should, we agreed, be coordinated and highlighted.