ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, May 2, 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 April 4, 2016 (attachment)
   b. Correspondence
      i. CAS Dean’s Search Process (attachment)
      ii. Updated Final Exam Conflicts for Varsity Sports (attachment)
   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

7. New business
   a. Proposal for Core Curriculum Revision (attachment)
   b. Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees: report on March meeting, preparation for June meeting

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 April 4, 2016 (pages 3 – 7)
For item 3.b.i.: CAS Dean’s Search Process (pages 8 – 9)
For item 3.b.ii.: Updated Final Exam Conflicts for Varsity Sports (10 – 11)
For item 4.a.: Post-tenure review report (pages 12 – 20)
For item 7.a.: Proposal for Core Curriculum Revision (21 – 32)

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, April 4, 2016 from 3:30 to 5:00 PM
CNS 200

Faculty Members Present: Behre, Bhattacharya, Boquet, Crawford, Downie, Epstein, Hannafin, Klug, Kris, Lane, McDermott, Preli, Rakowitz (General Faculty Secretary), Rusu (Executive Secretary), Steffen, Strauss (Chair), Weiss, Yarrington
Administrators Present: Babington, Gibson, Hannafin, Kazer, Williams
Student Observer: Megan Benson
Guests: Lynne Porter
Regrets: Berdanier

1. Presidential courtesy

Dean Babington noted that over 11k applications have been received for the incoming freshman class. In addition, students have accepted their offers at a much brisker rate. There has been the same percentage of students without test scores- about 27%.

There are several important faculty accomplishments to note. Prof. Adair was awarded an NEH summer stipend grant, Prof. Farrell was awarded a Franklin Research Grant and Prof. Lacy was awarded a Fulbright scholarship. On 4/5, the Dolan School of Business hosted a “shark tank” program for SOB students. On 4/20, students in the sciences will present their student-faculty research posters and on 4/21 there will be a ground-breaking for the new School of Nursing.

Prof. Rakowitz asked about the timeline for the formation of a committee for the selection of a new CAS dean. Provost Babington noted that we would not be forming a committee at this time. Prof. Lane asked if we should be prepared to form a committee at our next meeting. Provost Babington reiterated that it would not be necessary to form a committee at this time. Prof. Rakowitz expressed concern as to why a committee would not be formed, noting that in the event that an interim dean would be named as the new dean, a committee would still be required. Provost Babington noted, that for reasons she is not at liberty to disclose, it would not be necessary to form a committee. She noted, however, if we needed to form a committee, we would move according to procedure. Provost Babington noted that we should anticipate an announcement later this week which would add clarity to her remarks. Prof. Rakowitz expressed concern at the lack of transparency.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

Prof. Rakowitz notes this is a full agenda. We may need to recess prior to completing the full agenda.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary

Minutes from the March 14, 2016 meeting were approved.

4a. Post tenure review subcommittee report.

Prof. Smith noted that the committee met and discussed feedback from faculty. They tried to include, where possible, rationale for language to be considered. Professor Yarrington notes that
they carefully reviewed the document with consideration of the word “merit”. There was a discussion of the reasoning regarding the types of broader and deeper conversations that faculty might have with their Deans at the time of annual evaluation. The document aims to clarify language, and still have a review system which addresses the needs of Associate and Full professors. Prof. Rakowitz asked about the inclusion of the terminology for calendar year instead of an academic year. She asked clarification about the reference to the word “minimum” as it modifies the term “5 years”. Prof. Rakowitz notes that this language is confusing throughout the document. Prof. Smith clarified that the word should be a “maximum” of five years for Full professors and “3 years” for Associate professors. There was also a question about the need to sit down with a Dean instead of a Department Chair. Prof. Smith explained a scenario in which a full professor, with potential subpar teaching may be sitting down with a Chair, who may hold a lower rank. As a result, the conversation may be difficult. This is the rationale for having faculty sit down with the Dean. Prof. Yarrington noted that Chairs are typically most focused on faculty coming up for tenure.

Prof. Boquet noted that in her department there are very few untenured faculty members. Therefore, the annual evaluation is an important time to think about mentoring faculty at the Associate and Full Professor levels. She noted that she is worried about ceding what should be departmental concerns to Deans. In addition, she feels that it is concerning that Department Chairs could feel unable to have difficult conversations with professors who outrank them. Prof. Boquet is concerned about moving these conversations from the faculty level to the administrator level. Professor Yarrington notes that nothing in this document removes the ability of Chairs from being able to have these conversations, this simply adds another level of review.

Prof. Preli notes that she is concerned that there is an underlying message that Professors need to continue to prove they are worthy of tenure, “If we are continually needing to make the case that faculty are doing their jobs in order to get their pay, it sends the message that tenure is no longer tenure”. If a senior faculty member gets to a point where their teaching is no longer sufficient, why would this conversation not already have happened? Prof. Preli asked, “What is the consequence if a faculty member elects not to participate in this process?” In addition, Prof. Preli noted that she objects to the use of the language “all the ways faculty may be deficient” – this clarification should be a side note, not part of a formal document.

Prof. Klug asked about a situation in which a timeline is set between a Dean and a faculty member: What if the timeline is not met? What is the consequence? Prof. Klug noted that in her experience, she was not sure that this would necessarily motivate a change in behavior. She noted that there are already numerous opportunities for a faculty member to seek help with their teaching.

Prof. Downie asked if there was a timeline for the development of these guidelines. In addition, he thanked the committee for their hard work on their document. He noted that this is something that is necessary to address.

Prof. Strauss noted that the language “we agreed to”, is that we needed to have a conversation, not necessarily agree to a plan. Prof. Downie noted that we would not want to rush into any language.

Dean Kazer wanted to point out that there are schools on campus that do not have Department Chairs, so by including references to Department Chairs, some schools will be excluded from the
process. She notes that each school may need to come up with an individual process which meets their own needs.

Prof. Behre noted that tenure is not about job security, it is about the ability to maintain intellectual integrity. This document seems to cement the fallacy that this is about job security.

Prof. Epstein argued that tenure is about academic freedom by way of job security. This document is trying to separate out something like tenure from performance assessment. He notes that this is something that may be a job requirement, like graduation. The point of this, is to separate out performance assessment from the process of pay and tenure. Prof. Yarrington asked Prof. Epstein if his comments were in support of the document. Prof. Epstein agreed, he is in support of the document.

Prof. Downie wanted to make sure that the language is clear that this is not a process that can be used to remove jobs from the University. Prof. Downie noted that this is a tool of professional development apart from other processes.

Dean Williams argued that he feels qualified to evaluate teaching in his own academic area. He can assess, “Are faculty going to the conferences in their areas? Are they integrating the latest scholarship?” He noted that this should be a formative assessment.

Prof. Smith noted that this process ties into the mission of the University. This should be a formative assessment aimed at faculty development. In any organization you would hope that faculty would seek out guidance and reflect on their professional development. She noted that it was never thought of as being anything other than opportunity for development.

Prof. Yarrington noted that it was being looked at in a positive light. They looked at the AAUP language and other documents to incorporate best practices to strive for academic excellence. Prof. Klug notes that one of the positive aspects of this process is separating the merit system from professional development. However, both in this document as well as in the journal of record, those two things are still linked.

Prof. Epstein noted that the aim is for a decoupling of these two ideas. This is what this document hopefully achieves.

Prof. Steffen noted that this process is meant to be formative. He asked, “Does this reasonably end the current merit system? If so, does it replace it with something worse?” We need to decide if this will put us in a better position in terms of a formative evaluation and in merit. Under Appendix 12, point 3c., he suggested the removal of the words “a bit” from the sentence. The language should simply use the word “stalled”.

Prof. Boquet asked if the committee discussed the use of something like elected bodies, or faculty bodies rather than relying on the structure of a Dean. Prof. Smith noted that they did discuss other possibilities. The committee decided early in the discussion that that might lead to a substantially more complicated process.
Prof. Crawford noted that generally speaking, he is somewhat ambivalent about the proposal. He notes that although he would engage in the process, there may be others that might not participate. He asked to clarify what might happen in that situation.

Prof. Preli read a section of the preamble to the AAUP policy in contradiction, noting that she does not believe that a formal process needs to be in place. These discussions can occur outside of a formal process. Prof. Preli noted that she would be happy to engage in these conversations, however she does not believe that the direction that this is going happens to be in support of a formative process.

Prof. Lane noted that he believes that Deans should be meeting with their faculty members, as per protocol. It would be better to put as little as possible in writing and take out negative language. He notes that he believes this document should go to faculty for more feedback and consideration.

Concerns were noted about the negative language in the document, noting that it is hard to believe that if someone is not fulfilling their contract that they would not be removed.

Prof. McDermott stated that it should be kept in the realm of development, take out deficiencies and use language of continuing excellence.

Prof. Yarrington says that there is not a process in place for formative evaluation. Prof. Bhattacharya noted that big companies are getting away from this type of performance appraisal process because it not productive. Prof. Weiss noted that this is a “good document” in response to the conversations we had last year. Prof. Strauss asked for the will of the faculty in terms of moving forward with the document.

**Motion (Rakowitz/Epstein): The council recognizes the work of the committee in addressing their charge and suggests that the council send specific feedback on the language to the committee.**

Prof. Rakowitz says that she feels that this is better than the current merit system. She noted that she would like some changes in some of the language. While she is aware that the committee has gone through several rounds of revisions, she noted that this may be the first opportunity that we are looking at specific feedback on language.

Prof. Smith noted that in the event that it is not possible to get all of the feedback quickly, she reviewed the timeline of what needs to happen to have this happen this year. If this is not approved, it may not be ready for the General Faculty to approve at the next faculty meeting.

Prof. Strauss noted that the minutes of these meetings are all public record which demonstrate robust discussion on this issue. Prof. Epstein noted that the language we had agreed to is that there would be a discussion, and it seems that we have met that requirement. Prof. Strauss notes that the charge of the committee is verbatim from the language of the MOU. Prof. Rakowitz noted that the language may need to be updated to go to the FSC, as well as the General Faculty.

**Motion passed unanimously.**
Prof. Strauss made note of the time. The Council agreed that should we recess prior to finishing the agenda, we continue moving forward with the agenda on 4/18.

7a. Approval of CoC ballot for May 4 General Faculty meeting committee elections.

Prof. Rakowitz notes that she does not have enough names for a ballot, but that she hopes to have this ready for our reconvened meeting.

7b. Proposal for a Minor in Graphic Design

Prof. Epstein asked why students cannot enroll in graphic design until they have completed several other courses. Prof. Porter noted that students would need these courses by way of background. Prof. Epstein asked if we had offered these classes previously. Prof. Porter clarified that this class will be offered in the fall. It was also asked why the proposal has not asked for additional tenure track faculty. Prof. Porter noted that if there was appropriate demand, there would be a request for additional tenure track faculty. However, they will wait and see how the minor goes.

Prof. Lane asked for numbers. How many students are interested? How many students are here versus at other Universities? Prof. Porter noted that students have been asking for this for a long time. Prof. Yarrington noted that about half of the 10 graduates are interested in this.

Prof. Bhattacharya noted that some of the business students may be interested in this, however because of the prerequisite courses, they may not be able to enroll in the minor. Prof. Porter noted that if students are smart about their core, it is only a 4 course minor. Prof. Porter also noted that it was possible that there may be some exceptions initially, in order to allow students to enroll in the minor without the prerequisite courses. Prof. Rakowitz asked about the CAD course, “What would that count for?” Prof. Porter noted that this is a computer program, not related to the graphic design minor.

Motion to approve the minor in graphic design (Steffen/ Downie)

Prof. Downie spoke in favor of the motion, noting that it is a good use of adjuncts to have them teach professionally in their fields. Prof. Epstein spoke in favor of the motion but noted that if the program is successful he hopes there would be the addition of tenure track faculty to foster development. Dean Williams noted that he is in favor of the proposal. Prof. Yarrington stated that she is also in favor of the proposal, noting it is something that students have been requesting for several years.

Motion passed unanimously.

Motion to adjourn. Passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Prof. Kris
April 22, 2016
Dear Academic Council Executive Committee Members,

We are writing in our capacity as CAS faculty members elected by the Academic Council to serve on the CAS Dean’s Search Committee, constituted in Spring 2013.

On February 20, 2014, the search committee received a message from the SVPAA, at which time she communicated to us that the “search was on hold as we assess the best path forward for the College.” On Monday, April 11, 2016, faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences received an email message, indicating that the provost had yet again "come to the decision that this is not the right time to search for a dean.”

In her various communications, the provost states that she has held "many conversations with academic leaders on campus” to arrive at the decision to put the search for a permanent dean on hold and to appoint an interim dean for two and then three years (leaving the College of Arts and Sciences with an interim dean in what she has herself identified as a “critical position” for potentially four years). The claim that this is “not the right time" is insufficient to justify a delay of four years. Similarly, a forthcoming big announcement need not halt the entire process.

We expect the ACEC is one such body with whom the provost should have been in conversation, yet the remarks and exchange at the April Academic Council meeting suggest this has not been the case. A dean’s search is not one action; it is many actions. In that spirit, at this time, we are requesting that the ACEC work to identify preliminary steps that can be taken to undertake a search for the hire of a College of Arts and Sciences Dean, and we ask that those steps be communicated to the Academic Council at its May meeting.
Organizationally, we missed the opportunity to consider what we learned, collectively, from the process of the previous search and how those lessons might have carried forward into subsequent decisions about CAS leadership. We sense another opportunity is being lost, in this moment, for essential discussions through our shared governance process that would lay the groundwork for a successful search for a future CAS dean. These are conversations that need to be happening, whatever organizational changes might be in the forecast and whatever the timeline for permanent leadership the various stakeholders envision.

We look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Beth Boquet
Professor of English

Dennis Keenan
Professor of Philosophy

Paul Lakeland
Aloysius P. Kelley Professor of Catholic Studies

Shelley Phelan
Professor of Biology
From: "Huntley, Christopher L." <CHuntley@fairfield.edu>
Date: April 27, 2016 at 12:38:53 PM EDT
To: "Babington, Lynn M." <lbabington@fairfield.edu>
Cc: "Malone, Mary Frances" <Malone@fairfield.edu>, "Palazzi, Mary Ann" <mpalazzi@fairfield.edu>, "Caster, Paul" <PCaster@fairfield.edu>
Subject: Updated Final Exam Conflicts for Varsity Sports

SVPAA Babington:

Attached please find an up-to-date accounting of all anticipated varsity athletic events that overlap with final exams. Golf and Tennis have completed their seasons, leaving Baseball, Softball, the two Lacrosse teams, and five members of the Rowing team with scheduled exam week conflicts.

To minimize unexpected disruption for faculty during exam week, it is suggested that the deans' offices send this out with a note that faculty are expected to treat these absences as excused and to make arrangements with the students involved to complete the work.

Chris Huntley
Associate Professor of IS&OM and NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative

Varsity Sports Final Exam Update

April 26, 2016
The following update includes all anticipated conflicts between varsity sports schedules and final exams. Student athletes with conflicts have been asked to make arrangements with their teachers to complete their projects and exams. If a team is not listed (e.g., because the season is over) then there is no conflict with final exam week. A final update will be sent out Sunday, May 8 to account for postseason tournaments listed in gray.

Baseball
May 7 (Final Exam): Home doubleheader starting at noon; players with 8am exams are expected to appear as scheduled.
May 8 (Reading Day): Home game starting at noon

Softball
Given that the MAAC Tournament ends at the end of exams, players have been asked to make prior arrangements with their instructors to ensure that final grades are submitted before the May 15 deadline.
May 7 (Final Exam): Home doubleheader starting at noon
May 10 – 12 (Final Exams): Players leave for the MAAC Tournament at 3pm on May 10; players with morning exams on May 10 should appear as scheduled unless they have made other arrangements.
**Men’s Lacrosse**
**May 4 (Reading Day):** Travel to CAA Conference Championships  
**May 5-7 (Final Exams):** CAA Conference Championships  
**May 8 (Reading Day):** Return from CAA Championships  
**May 10 – 12 (Final Exams):** If the team qualifies for the NCAA Tournament, players would leave on May 10 and may be away until the end of exams on May 12.

**Women’s Lacrosse**
**May 4 (Reading Day) – May 7 (Final Exams):** If the team qualifies for the MAAC Tournament (as expected), players would leave on May 4, likely headed to Buffalo, NY and not return until on or after May 7, depending on whether they make the finals.  
**May 12 (Final Exams):** If the team qualifies for the NCAA Tournament, players would leave on May 12 for an away game on May 13.

**Rowing**
**May 12 (Final Exams):** One team of 4 rowers plus a coxswain will leave for a regatta held on May 13. They are expected to make arrangements in advance to address any missing exams on May 12.
Post-Tenure Review Report to Academic Council 5-2-16

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 maximum 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 agreed to by both the faculty member and dean.

**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 with feedback from peers and/or department chairs as
   appropriate.
   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 (standard merit).
   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 maximum 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

The principles guiding this post-tenure review process are drawn from “Post-Tenure Review: An AAUP Response” Post-tenure review is not 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.”

Post tenure review will be conducted at least 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. It 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).” 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 agreed to by both the faculty member and dean.

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., annual 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 academic 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:

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

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

- 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.
- Giving a major invited address or keynote at a major meeting.
- Planning and leading the program for a major scholarly meeting.
- Receiving a major grant from an outside funding source.
- Receiving an award for research or similar recognition from one's academic peers.
- 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:

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

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

1. Providing major leadership to faculty and shared governance or making a particularly significant contribution through committee leadership.
2. Providing leadership for a major university initiative.
3. Holding a major leadership position in a professional organization.
4. Leading the non-academic elements of an accreditation activity.
5. Receiving a major service award from the university, professional society, or civic body.
6. 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 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
Proposal for Revision of the
Fairfield University Core Curriculum

I. The Purpose and Process of Core Revision

In 2014, as part of the Fairfield 2020 initiative, a Core Curriculum Task Force was established. The charge of the Core Curriculum Task Force was to undertake a comprehensive analysis of the undergraduate core curriculum in order to determine if revisions were desirable, and, if warranted, to develop a set of recommendations for a revised core curriculum grounded in a rationale based on that analysis. In order to fulfill this charge, a 22-person Core Curriculum Task Force, comprised of faculty, staff, students, alumni, and administrators, engaged in a comprehensive analysis of the core curriculum, which involved multiple meetings, subcommittee work, consultations with members of the University community, collaborations with other Fairfield 2020 Task Forces, and solicitation of feedback from the faculty. Through these processes, the Task Force amassed a large amount of evidence about Jesuit education, Fairfield University’s students, and current trends in higher education, which informed its final conclusions and recommendations.

From the beginning of its process, the Core Curriculum Task Force maintained the conviction that any recommended changes to the core curriculum would need to be approved through the established channels of faculty governance for curricular revision. Ultimately, the Core Curriculum Task Force handed off the recommendations for revision to the Director of the Core. Provost Lynn Babington selected Bob Epstein, Associate Professor of English, to be the Director of the Core. In the Fall of 2015, Prof. Epstein selected an advisory council, and over the course of the semester met with the faculty of all the schools at the university and all of the departments within the College of Arts and Sciences to present the Task Force proposals and to hear feedback and suggestions for improvements to the plan. The Director of the Core and the Advisory Council have made amendments to the Task Force plan based on the feedback from faculty, while maintaining the general framework agreed to in the Task Force discussions.

In March 2016, the proposal for Core revision was presented to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. The UCC formed a subcommittee to consider the Task Force proposal as well as other proposals for Core revision. This subcommittee made recommendations for changes to the Task Force proposal, and the UCC voted to approve the Task Force proposal as amended by its subcommittee. This amended proposal was presented to the Academic Council at its March meeting. At that meeting, Bob Epstein noted that a number of the amendments adopted by the UCC ran counter to the goals and rationales of the Task Force and the Core Advisory Council in devising the overall revision plan. The Academic Council voted to remand the proposal to the UCC and to instruct the UCC to reconsider the plan in light of the concerns of the Core Director and Advisory Council. The Core Director and Advisory Council presented their concerns and suggestions to the UCC at its April 2016 meeting, and the UCC voted to adopt a Core revision plan with further amendments and revisions. It is this version of the Core revision proposal that is being presented to the Academic Council to be approved and forwarded to the General Faculty.

Throughout this process the goal has been to formulate a Core curriculum that is rooted in the Jesuit and Catholic tradition of a vibrant humanistic liberal arts experience and responds to the needs of
the 21st century learner. One especially prominent goal was to re-establish a uniform Core curriculum for all Fairfield undergraduates. The profile of Fairfield’s student population has changed as its educational mission has expanded to meet current demands. More than half of Fairfield’s undergraduates are now in the professional schools, and this percentage is likely to increase in the future, as growth is predicted especially in the Schools of Nursing and Engineering. In the College of Arts and Sciences as well, departmental organization and major offerings are evolving to address the needs of a rapidly changing professional and technological environment. Over the years, exceptions to some Core requirements have been granted to students in each of the professional schools. At the same time, the administration and faculty of the university recognize that the liberal arts experience provided by the Core curriculum is one of the elements that make the Fairfield education distinct and valuable for all students. Core revision provides an opportunity to redefine the essential elements of this liberal education and to reaffirm the necessity and desirability that all Fairfield undergraduates participate in and benefit from this curriculum.

One result of this regularizing of requirements for all undergraduates will be a reduction in the overall number of required Core courses. The current Core consists of 20 required classes (60 credits.) The proposed Core will require 15 classes (45 credits.) Most students, particularly those in the College of Arts & Sciences and the Dolan School of Business, will have more electives. In advising, students should be encouraged to use these electives to explore their personal interests across the university curriculum. Many students will find it much easier and more inviting to add a minor or a second major, and to explore interdisciplinary programs.

In addition to a uniform set of requirements for all students, a major goal of Core revision has been to assure an integrated educational experience in the liberal arts. Both students and faculty have regularly reported that their most meaningful and valuable classroom experiences have been those that intentionally designed as interdisciplinary. An interdisciplinary component should allow students to look for commonalities and intersections among their various areas of study, to perceive their Core courses as more unified rather than atomized curriculum, and to think more holistically about the universe of intellectual engagement and their place within it. The multidisciplinary element of the proposed revision accords with current models of educational reform that are seen as most essential and most practical for contemporary students. Additionally, moments of intentionally designed interdisciplinary thought allow for the purposeful self-reflection that is a hallmark of the Jesuit educational tradition. These signature elements include the Core Orientation Seminar in the first semester, the Writing Across the Curriculum component of Tier One, and the Core Integration Experience in Tier Two, at or near the completion of the Core curriculum.

III. Proposal for Revised Core Curriculum

Here are the proposed new Core requirements:

**Tier One: Orientation** (8 courses)

- 1 course in Composition and Rhetoric and 4 courses in Humanities (Religious Studies; Philosophy; History; Arts & Literature), all contributing to a Writing Across the Curriculum program, including one Core Orientation Seminar in the first semester
• 1 course in Mathematics
• 2 courses in Modern or Classical Languages, at any level

**Tier Two: Exploration and Integration** (7 courses)

- **Humanities**: 3 courses in 3 of 4 areas (Religious Studies; Philosophy; History; Arts & Literature)
- **Social and Behavioral Sciences**: 2 courses in 2 different departments (Communication; Economics; Politics; Psychology; Sociology and Anthropology)
- **Mathematics and Natural Sciences**: 2 courses, at least one in Natural Science
- **Core Integration Experience**: 1 team-taught interdisciplinary course or 1 pair of cluster courses in two different disciplines, taken to fulfill any two of the above requirements

AP and transfer credits may not be applied to the WAC courses in Tier One. Students should be encouraged to complete Tier One before the end of Sophomore Year, but students may take classes that fulfill Tier Two requirements before completing Tier One.

**Explanation and Rationale: Tier One**

Tier One of the Core Curriculum grounds students in the intellectual approaches essential to philosophical, religious, rhetorical, historical, quantitative and cultural inquiry. In addition to serving as foundational for the remaining elements of the Core curriculum and for the rest of students’ work in their individual schools and majors, the courses in Tier One represent the most traditional elements of Jesuit education, with roots extending to the Jesuit order’s establishment of its educational mission.

As Tier One of the Core is intended to be a common educational experience for all Fairfield undergraduates, there are to be no place-outs for any element of Tier One. This would mean that transfer and Advanced Placement credits could exempt students from required elements of Tier Two of the Core, but not from elements of Tier One. Students should be encouraged to complete Tier One before the end of Sophomore year. But students may take classes that fulfill Tier Two requirements before completing Tier One.

Tier One emphasizes education in written expression and in the traditional fields of the arts and humanities, which have always been central to the Jesuit pedagogical program. No skill is more essential to educational success or more essential to the modern workplace and the contemporary world than fluidity and self-confidence in written expression. The proposed curriculum requires all students to take a course in Composition and Rhetoric. To be devised by the resident specialists in the teaching of writing, this course will apply the most current theories in the field of composition pedagogy, and its mission will include the teaching of multimedia literacies that constitute an increasing component of the communication skills in the contemporary environment.

The four Humanities courses in Tier One, in addition to introducing students to the traditionally central areas of Religious Studies, Philosophy, History, and Arts & Literature, will all contribute to a Writing Across the Curriculum program. Writing Across the Curriculum [WAC] is based on the
principle that writing should be an integral part of the learning process throughout a student’s education, not merely in required writing courses but across the entire curriculum. WAC programs can take a number of forms. The faculty of the participating departments would work with the director of Core writing, the Center for Academic Excellence, the Director of the Core, and others with experience and expertise in the field to develop a model appropriate to the goals and requirements of our program. It is understood that necessary resources must be made available for the success of this essential component of the Core, including administrative positions, programs for faculty development, appropriate class sizes, and academic support.

Every incoming Freshman will be placed in a Core Orientation Seminar. This will be a section of any one of the Composition or Humanities courses of Tier One, taught in the Fall semester, which will include instruction designed to introduce students to the expectations of college learning and to the design and purpose of the Core curriculum. Since classroom contact with full-time professors has been demonstrated to be a crucial factor in student retention, all Core Orientation Seminars should be taught by full-time faculty members.

All students will take one Mathematics course in Tier One. The course or courses that would be most appropriate for these students will be determined by the faculty of the Mathematics Department.

All students will be required to take two courses in a foreign language, at any level. The Modern Languages Department would work to assure that students continuing a language that they studied in high school are placed in the appropriate level.

Explanation and Rationale: Tier Two

Tier Two of the proposed curriculum allows students to explore the disciplines of the Arts and Sciences with expert teacher-scholars in a variety of fields of inquiry. Employing innovative pedagogy, Tier Two also engages concepts and ideas that underlie the Core as a whole and link its disciplines.

Required courses in Tier Two are distributed among the historical divisions of the liberal arts, which are also reflected in the historical structure of the College of Arts and Sciences: the Humanities, the Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Mathematics and the Natural Sciences. This distribution of requirements will serve to give each student exposure to courses that meet specific learning objectives that have previously been identified for the Core curriculum, including demonstrable abilities in: quantitative reasoning; scientific reasoning; global citizenship; appreciation and critical understanding of cultural and artistic traditions; creative capacities; and written expression and argumentation.

In the Humanities, students will take three courses in three of four areas: Religious Studies; Philosophy; History; and Arts & Literature. In the Social and Behavioral Sciences, students will take 2 courses in two of four departments: Economics; Politics; Psychology; and Sociology and Anthropology. In Natural Sciences and Mathematics, students will take two courses, including at least one in a Natural Science.
All departments will be expected to designate specifically designed Core classes for Tier Two. Interdisciplinary programs can be represented in Tier Two through cross-listing of courses. Collective efforts at enrollment management will be required to assure that enough Core classes are offered each semester, while also assuring that each department is sufficiently represented within the Core. It is hoped that students will engage more thoughtfully with the curriculum and the intentions of the Core when they have clear choices of classes and disciplines to choose from within the Core.

As a hallmark of the Core curriculum as a whole, students will be required to take at least one course or set of courses with an interdisciplinary component: a cluster of two courses in two different disciplines; a team-taught course with instructors from two different disciplines; or, less commonly and with approval, a specially designed interdisciplinary course with a single instructor. Students will complete this component, whenever possible, as part of the Tier Two requirements.

Implementing the Integration component of Tier Two will require faculty members from across the university to look for intersections and commonalities among their specializations and interests. We will encourage students to see interconnections within the Core by requiring faculty to look for interconnections between disciplines. Faculty should develop courses that address ancient or emerging ideas, and that encourage students to make the cognitive connections essential for integrative learning and for exploring pressing issues that call out for a just resolution. These courses should lend themselves to the goal of reflection that is essential to the Jesuit pedagogical tradition, or to the goals of social engagement that define our institutional mission. Since this Integration experience will come for most students near their completion of the Core requirements, these courses will also serve as a point at which to assessment the curriculum and its role in the university’s pedagogical and social goals.

The Integration component of Tier Two also provides the ideal opportunity to integrate many of the university’s goals and initiatives into the Core curriculum, including interdisciplinary programs, Applied Ethics, Jesuit Mission and Identity, the two-year campus-wide “Themes,” Service Learning, and JUHAN. When faculty develop interdisciplinary courses that fulfill Tier Two requirements, further support and encouragement can be provided to foster pedagogical innovation in priority areas.

As noted in the Core Curriculum Task Force report, the Core Curriculum Task Force recognized the need to make the core curriculum a priority area of academic excellence by devoting the energy and expertise of full-time faculty to teach in the Core. While Tier One courses will necessarily require a certain amount of teaching by properly trained instructors at a variety of levels, the Task Force expected that courses in Tier Two, in which students explore the traditional fields of the liberal arts, should be taught, to the greatest extent possible, by full-time teacher-scholars in those disciplines. The College of Arts and Sciences faculty are making a commitment to teaching in the Core curriculum; they, and the members of the Core Curriculum Task Force, expect the university to make an equivalent commitment to the faculty and to the Core.

IV. Implementation and Review
If the Core revision plan is approved by the General Faculty, the process of implementation will require considerable time and resources. Two areas of the proposed Core are certain to require particularly substantial support in terms of labor and resources: the Writing Across the Curriculum program, including the revised Composition and Rhetoric course, in Tier One, and the Core Integration Experience in Tier Two. But these are among the hallmark features of the curriculum, and without sufficient support for development and maintenance the proposed Core cannot succeed.

Provost Lynn Babington has supported the Core revision process continuously through the process, and she has indicated that she will support the implementation of all its provisions and assure that appropriate resources are allocated to assure their success. She has also indicated that she will support initial work on planning for the implementation of elements of the proposal that require more considerable resources for implementation, even before receiving final approval from the faculty.

Therefore, work can begin on parts of the implementation process during the summer of 2016. Interested participants will soon be solicited for a WAC Working Group and a Core Integration Working Group. The WAC Working Group will meet over the summer to evaluate our writing program and plan for a WAC program. It is likely that this group will determine that outside expertise may be needed to help the contributing departments and faculty at Fairfield assess their current writing pedagogy, to identify goals for writing instruction, and to select an appropriate WAC model. There are many possible models, and ultimately the implementation of a WAC program at Fairfield may require support in many areas and in many forms, including: the hiring and hosting of outside consultants on WAC programs; faculty development; curricular development; support staff; staffing levels necessitated by appropriate class sizes; training for faculty teaching the Core Orientation Seminar; administrative staffing, including possible new hires in writing and pedagogy support; a new Director of Core Writing, with responsibility for the Composition and Rhetoric course and its staff; systems and support for regular program assessment. All of these potential budgeting priorities, however, would be contingent on the internal decisions of the contributing faculty and others working on implementation. At the present, the only resources to be directed toward this effort are summer stipends for members of the WAC Working Group who are not already compensated for work on Core approval and implementation. This would be approximately five faculty members.

The Core Integration Working Group, too, would work over the summer to identify goals and resource needs. The implementation of the Integration element of Tier Two is also likely to require support in a number forms, including: sponsorship of events and programs to help faculty identify common interests and promising teaching partnerships; internal and external grants and support for curricular development; instructional funds for additional classes when faculty team-teach a single 3-credit class; systems and support for regular assessment. Again, the resources directed toward these planning and implementation projects at the moment are only stipendiary support for approximately five members of the Working Group.

These initial plans for implementation groundwork have been presented to the Educational Planning Committee. If in the Fall the General Faculty approves the Core revision, more detailed budgetary projections for implementation and support, based on the findings and suggestions of the working groups, will be presented to the EPC.
If this Core proposal is approved by the General Faculty in the Fall semester of 2016, and if it then receives the proper administrative support and concerted effort by faculty and staff, pilot courses and programs could be introduced in the Fall semester of 2017, and the revised Core could be in place for a roll-out in the Fall of 2018, meaning that the Class of 2022 would be the first to be required to complete the new requirements.

After implementation, the entire Core curriculum should be subject to regular review, at least every three years. This process should ensure that the Core is successfully meeting its goals and providing the educational experience to Fairfield’s students for which it was designed.

V. Motion to amend the Journal of Record

To add the following language to the Journal of Record, at the end of Section 3, “The Core Curriculum and related items”:

Beginning with the class of 2022, undergraduate students will complete the following Revised Core Curriculum:

**Tier One: Orientation** (8 courses)

- 1 course in Composition and Rhetoric and 4 courses in Humanities (Religious Studies; Philosophy; History; Arts & Literature), all contributing to a Writing Across the Curriculum program, including one Core Orientation Seminar in the first semester
- 1 course in Mathematics
- 2 courses in Modern or Classical Languages, at any level

**Tier Two: Exploration and Integration** (7 courses)

- **Humanities**: 3 courses in 3 of 4 areas (Religious Studies; Philosophy; History; Arts & Literature)
- **Social and Behavioral Sciences**: 2 courses in 2 different departments (Communication; Economics; Politics; Psychology; Sociology and Anthropology)
- **Mathematics and Natural Sciences**: 2 courses, at least one in Natural Science
- **Core Integration Experience**: 1 team-taught interdisciplinary course or 1 pair of cluster courses in two different disciplines, taken to fulfill any two of the above requirements

Advanced Placement and transfer credits may not be applied to the Writing Across the Curriculum courses in Tier One. Students should be encouraged to complete Tier One before the end of Sophomore Year, but students may take classes the fulfill Tier Two requirements before completing Tier One.

With approval, a specially designed interdisciplinary course with a single instructor may be taken to fulfill the Integration component of Tier Two.
UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES (EXCERPT)

DATE: April 5, 2016
TIME: 3:30-5:00 PM

MEMBERS PRESENT: Lynn Babington, Steve Bayne, Ahmed Ebrahim, Johanna Garvey, Sally Gerard, Joe Harding (FUSA Rep), Bob Hannafin, David Lerner, Margaret McClure, Michael McDonald, David McFadden (Chair), John Miecznikowski, Laura Nash, Michael Pagano, Lawrence Kraig Steffen, Harsha Sundarram, Vishnu Vinekar, Bob Epstein (guest), Dennis Keenan (guest), Amalia Rusu (guest), Christine Siegel (guest)

REGRETS: Terry-Ann Jones, Aaron Perkus, Glenn Sauer

Core Curriculum

D McFadden outlined the core curriculum proposals to be voted on by the UCC Committee. There was discussion on how to vote on the various proposals put forth and the best way to collect the votes.

There was a vote to give the members of the Core Advisory Council speaking rights.

Motion for Core Advisory Council to speak: J Miecznikowski
In Favor: Unanimous

R Epstein explained Academic Council (AC) asked the Core Advisory Council to address the concerns of the UCC and the sub-committee and bring a modified proposal with all questions addressed back to the UCC committee for a vote.

Concerns and responses:
AP and transfer credits: In submitting our proposal, we emphasized that AP and transfer credits could be applied to the Core, but not to requirements in Tier One. But we acknowledge the importance of this question to the UCC. We are proposing, therefore, that AP and transfer credits be applicable to all areas of the Core except the Writing Across the Curriculum courses in Tier One.

The WAC program is one of the hallmark features of the revised Core, and it is to be an integrated program in the teaching of written expression and communication, perhaps the most essential feature of any general education curriculum and certainly fundamental to the Jesuit tradition, so all students should be required to complete all of the courses in this program at Fairfield. But we are proposing that AP and transfer credits may be applied to the Mathematics and foreign language requirements in Tier One.

Natural Science in Tier One: Given that AP and transfer credits would now be applicable to Tier One, and that the proposal includes a requirement that Natural Science be taken in Tier Two, we do not see any necessity of including Natural Science in Tier One. Mathematics is foundational to all other study, including all science, and it is desirable to keep Tier One as concise and manageable as possible.

Arts and Literature in Tier One. We fully recognize the necessity of including Visual and Performing Arts in the Core curriculum, which is why our original proposal includes “Arts & Literature” as a category of the Humanities in both Tier One and Tier Two. An “Arts & Literature” category would include offerings, presumably evenly distributed, in both the Arts (studio arts, performance, and production, as well as
courses in the history of art forms) and Literature (which might include creative writing courses as well as courses in the study of literature.) The UCC’s objection seems to be that there must be a stand-alone requirement in Visual and Performing Arts. We believe that the category “Arts & Literature” is rational and justifiable, and we note that it is represented explicitly in the label of Area V of the current Core curriculum, and it is recognized implicitly in the goals and outcomes identified by the Pathways efforts as “Creative and Aesthetic Engagement.” Furthermore, our proposal included nearly 2 course requirements (1.75, to be exact) in “Arts & Literature,” which strikes us as nearly equivalent to requiring 1 course in Arts and 1 course in Literature.

We have two other major concerns regarding elements of the UCC’s revisions: First, there is broad agreement that it is desirable to limit the revised Core to 15 courses, rather than the 16 proposed by the UCC, both because the goal of a uniform Core puts curricular limits on degree programs with larger sets of requirements, particular those of the professional schools, and partly because a more concise Core with more free electives for most students is a positive end in itself, as students will have more opportunities to engage actively in the selection of their classes and programs. There has also been concerted effort to keep Tier One of the Core from becoming an over-long list of required courses, and assure that most students would be able to complete Tier One in the first two years. Ten courses in Tier One, including five required courses in the Humanities, goes against both of these priorities. Second, the UCC revision has divided “Arts & Literature” into two areas— Visual and Performing Arts and Literature—in the Humanities in Tier Two. As a result, the revised model now requires in 3 courses in 3 of 5 areas of the Humanities, rather than 3 courses in 3 of 4 areas. But the entire rationale for this organization of requirements in Tier Two Humanities was to maintain the prioritized status of Religious Studies and Philosophy in our curriculum. In our model, all students would have to take Religious Studies or Philosophy in Tier Two, and most students would take both. In the UCC’s revised model, no students would have to take a second course in either of these disciplines. It is therefore of paramount importance that there be only 4 areas of the Humanities in Tier Two, and that two of these be Religious Studies and Philosophy.

Motion made to approve the proposal from the Core Advisory Council:
L Babington
Second: S Gerard

Discussion:
M McDonald: Stated that his understanding was that one of AC concerns with the proposal sent forward by the UCC, was that it included changes to what could be considered a negotiated document. He asked if it is ok to change the negotiated document that was submitted by the sub-committee to the Academic Council.
S Bayne: There is a process to governance. The UCC has elected members to make decisions to documents that come to the committee. It is up to UCC to forward their recommendations to the Academic Council.
M McDonald: SOE expressed concern about increasing the core to 16 courses, noting that a 16-course model would only work for SOE if their computer assisted design course could qualify as a VPA course. He asked if departments outside the discipline are allowed to qualify courses as fulfilling requirements for that discipline.
D Keenan: Stated that qualifying courses would reside with the discipline’s departments.
K Steffan: Asked if it would be best to discuss all proposals then vote.
B Epstein: Stated that it may be best to explain the rationale of the new proposals put forth that addresses the UCC concerns before a vote is taken.
The initial motion to approve the proposal from Core Advisory Council was taken off the table until further discussion.

Procedural Motion to table original motion temporarily:
L Babington
Second: S Gerard

A discussion took place regarding the distribution of humanities in tier 1 and 2 and grouping of Arts & Literature.
S Bayne: Why is the UCC’s subcommittee proposal not on the table to cast a vote?
B Epstein: Academic Council did not reject the UCC proposal. They suggested more discussion take place to explore the rationale behind the changes that were made. They suggested that the Core Advisory Council review the changes made by the UCC subcommittee, discuss and see if any of these concerns could be addressed. The Core Advisory Council met and has submitted three proposals that they believe address all of the UCC’s concerns (memo attached). We would like to open this up for discussion and a vote.
J Garvey: Suggested that the UCC reconsider the revisions submitted by the Core Advisory Council.
D McFadden: The Core Advisory Council submitted three revised proposals. He asked if the UCC could look at each one. The first proposal would be discussed first since it was the preferred proposal (page 3 of memo submitted by Core Advisory Council-attached).
Discussion:
H Sundarram: Asked how the core changes would affect part time students.

C Siegel: Explained that consideration for part time student would be addressed at a later date. The new proposal is the baseline for full time students. She explained that the WAC (writing across the curriculum) in tier 1 and interdisciplinary courses in tier 2 are the best part of the Fairfield education. That is why they were incorporated into the model.
L Nash: Expressed her concern about the Arts & Literature being together.

Motion made to reconsider the Core Advisory’s proposal 1:
D McFadden
Second: S Gerard

A Ebrahim: Can a student place out of courses with the permission of the school.
C Siegel: Reiterated that the goal of the Core Curriculum Task Force and Advisory Council has been to design a core that provides a common educational experience for all undergraduate students. The WAC courses in Tier 1 are a distinctive feature of that experience, and therefore the Core Advisory Council’s proposal does not allow for the replacement of one of these WAC courses by either AP credits or transfer
courses. Those credits can appropriately be applied to other aspects of the student’s education – other courses in the core or elective credit.

V Vinekar: Asked if the Composition and Rhetoric course applied to WAC or not.
C Siegel: Replied that the Composition and Rhetoric course in the introductory or foundational writing course upon which the WAC curriculum is built. One could consider the Composition and Rhetoric course as part of the WAC program.
L Nash: Asked if the Composition and Rhetoric course is introductory, then wouldn’t it have to be taken before the other WAC courses.
C Siegel: Replied the Comp and Rhet course is foundational, it is a co-requisite not necessarily a pre-requisite to the other WAC courses.
B Epstein: Added that because of the logistics of scheduling, not all students would take the Comp and Rhet course in their first semester. However, for all students one of the WAC courses – including the Comp and Rhet course and the WAC courses in Religious Studies, Philosophy, History and Arts & Literature – would constitute a core orientation course which would introduce the student to both the core and the central tenants of the WAC program.

J Garvey: Call the question.

A vote was taken on the first revised proposal submitted by the Core Advisory Council.

Tier One: Orientation (8 courses)
- 1 course in Composition and Rhetoric and 4 courses in Humanities (Religious Studies; Philosophy; History; Arts & Literature), all contributing to a Writing Across the Curriculum program, including one Core Orientation Seminar in the first semester
- 1 course in Mathematics
- 2 courses in Modern or Classical Languages, at any level

Tier Two: Exploration and Integration (7 courses)
- Humanities: 3 courses in 3 of 4 areas (Religious Studies; Philosophy; History; Arts & Literature)
- Social and Behavioral Sciences: 2 courses in 2 different departments (Communication; Economics; Politics; Psychology; Sociology and Anthropology)
- Mathematics and Natural Sciences: 2 courses, at least one in Natural Science
- Core Integration Experience: 1 team-taught interdisciplinary course or 1 pair of cluster courses in two different disciplines, taken to fulfill any two of the above requirements

AP and transfer credits may not be applied to the WAC courses in Tier One. Students should be encouraged to complete Tier One before the end of Sophomore Year, but students may take classes the fulfill Tier Two requirements before completing Tier One.

A motion was made to call the question: J Garvey  Second: L Babington

Vote on revised proposal 1 submitted by Core Advisory Council:
In Favor: 8
Against: 7

The first revised proposal (pg 3 of memo) was approved. D McFadden will notify Academic Council.
AGENDA ITEM #2: Core Curriculum Redesign
R Epstein presented a proposal for a Core Curriculum redesign based on the framework that emerged from the Core Curriculum Task Force of the Fairfield 2020 initiative. Interdisciplinary learning is a major component of the new core. That can be achieved through team teaching; however, team teaching is expensive. Teaching cluster courses is proposed as a way of delivering the interdisciplinary learning experience.

The proposal was approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee at its meeting of April 5, 2016. The model includes two tiers: the Writing Across the Curriculum program in Tier One, and the Integration component of Tier Two.

A WAC Working Group will meet over the summer to evaluate the writing program and plan for a WAC program. A Core Integration Working Group will work over the summer to identify goals and resource needs. R Epstein will return to the EPC in the Fall with updates from both working groups and with more specific projections of resources needs. L Babington has supported the Core revision process and is committed to providing the resources.

Discussion
Currently the program does not show numbers, financial information, or faculty slots. R Epstein agreed that it is a black box at this point. C Scheraga noted that rather than discussion any motion at the moment it is understood that as each major component of the restructuring is defined with associated resources, it can be brought to the EPC. In each of these instances formal motions can be made. R Epstein responded that he will provide additional information to the EPC in the Fall, and did not expect a motion at this time.

A discussion arose about the ongoing training process for new adjuncts and replacing old adjuncts. L Babington and M Kazer step out at this time due to another commitment.

J Vernarelli inquired about the integration component and cluster courses. R Epstein explained there are existing courses that could be used as cluster courses. Part of the integration implementation is having professors look for commonalities and overlap in pedagogical approaches. The inspiration for the program comes from the current honors program. Students and faculty involved in the team-taught network have strong positive feedback.

C Scheraga acknowledged R Epstein’s time, effort and hard work in the Core Curriculum redesign. C Scheraga thanked R Epstein, at which point R Epstein stepped out.