Faculty Members Present: Behre, Boquet, Crawford, Epstein, Klug, Kris, Lane, McDermott, Preli, Rakowitz (General Faculty Secretary), Rusu (Executive Secretary), Smith, Steffen, Strauss (Chair), Weiss.

Administrators Present: Babington, Berdanier, Gibson, Hannafin, Kazer.

Guests: Dennin (4a)

Observers: Bayne, Davidson

1. Presidential Courtesy

Students
May 1 was the deadline for student confirmations, however being that it was a Sunday, the admissions dept. is still sorting through emails and snail mail. We have over 1000 confirmations and with the summer melt should achieve our 975 goal for the freshman class.
All of the various student honor society inductions, awards and celebrations have been occurring and will continue over the next couple of weeks. Senior week events are schedule for the week of 5/16. Please join our amazing students in celebrating their accomplishments.
DSB business competition – excellent innovative interdisciplinary projects presented.
Clam Jam was this weekend – over 1100 students and very organized, peaceful and fun for all.

Faculty
Many of our faculty have recently received awards and recognitions for their accomplishments. Be sure to read the Fairfield weekly updates, as there have been a variety of very nice articles recognizing faculty (also ThinkSpace blog and Facebook). At the risk of forgetting one of our amazing faculty who have received awards, a few include: all of the faculty who were tenured and promoted, Michelle Farrell (Franklin Research Grant), Jennifer Adair (Endowment for the Humanities grant), Scott Lacy (Fulbright), Mark Demers (winner of the Wall Award), Nels Pearson (Donald Murphy award), Meredith Kazer (Yale Alumni of the Year), Johanna Garvey (CAS Teaching award), Betsy Bowen (CAS Advising & Mentoring).

Programs
Center for Nursing and Health Studies groundbreaking ceremony
Groundbreaking pilot program on interpersonal skills training for Connecticut police officers - Peter McDermott (Distinguished Visiting Professional in Applied Ethics) along with Diana Hulse
Adjunct faculty of the year awards 4-5pm 5/9 Marion White (undergraduate- core writing/Irish Studies) and Christine Walker (Marriage & Family Therapy)
Faculty Retirement Party on May 8th. Please send anecdotes or stories about the following faculty colleagues who will be retiring: Susan Franzosa, Cinthia Gannett, Hugh Humphrey, Michael Tucker, and Cheryl Tromley.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

Prof. Rakowitz notes that this is a full agenda. We may consider recessing at 5:00 pm and reconvening on Monday, May 9 at 2:00 PM. Two tentative dates for summer faculty meetings have been set as May 24th and June 15th. These dates do not conflict with freshman orientation programs. CAS interim dean term has been extended from 2 to 3 years. AVP Babington will meet with Planning Committee in the fall to discuss forming search committee and beginning the search process. AVP Babington will meet later this week with Profs. Boquet, Keenan, Lakeland, and Phelan to discuss the concerns expressed in their memo on the CAS search.

Prof. Lane asked why the search has been delayed. AVP Babington responded that this was done under advisement of search firms due to the uncertainty surrounding the organization of CAS and the ongoing core curriculum review. Search firms felt the uncertainty would impair the quality of the applicants.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary

a. Prof Rusu presented the minutes of the April 4, 2016 meeting for approval.

   Prof Smith was added as an attendee.

   Prof. Weiss noted the meeting was “recessed” not “adjourned.”

   **Motion to approve the minutes as amended (Rusu/Crawford).**

   The minutes were approved unanimously as amended to reflect the above.

b.

   i. The memo from Professors Boquet, Keenan, Lakeland, and Phelan on the CAS Dean Search was entered on the record.

   ii. The memo from Prof. Huntley on Final Exam Sports Conflicts was entered on the record.

c. There were no oral reports.

4a. Post-tenure review subcommittee

Prof. Smith introduced Prof. Dennin as a guest. Prof. Smith received written feedback from 5 faculty on the previous draft of post-tenure review proposal. This written feedback and oral feedback received at last AC meeting were incorporated into current version of proposal. The subcommittee met again since last AC meeting and had a conference call to agree on revisions to the proposal. Highlights of revisions
are (1) clarification of time intervals (2) deleted examples as inappropriate, and, (3) clarified meetings to be held with the respective Dean. In general, the proposal is not aimed at “accountability” but is intended as “formative.” The post-tenure review proposal is to replace the existing process for “extraordinary merit.”

Prof. Dennin offered that while the proposal is “not perfect” that it does accomplish the end of extraordinary merit which he views as a “huge plus” and the proposal is clearly not a reevaluation of tenure.

Prof. Smith offered that page 12 (Recommendation 1.) of the proposal should read “past academic year” not “past year” as to be distinct from calendar year.

Prof. Weiss offered it is a “great document.” Wanted wording to make clear annual “review” was a “salary review.”

Prof. Boquet wished to highlight the faculty role in the process. Wondered if last sentence on page 14 of proposal was new?

AVP Babington answered no. That sentence was carried over from original document.

Prof. Boquet asked what other schools are doing this? What type of schools? How about AJCU schools specifically? She noted post-tenure review processes are more common in mid-sized to large public university systems; they are rare at private institutions --post-tenure review processes are not as common at private universities, and I'm not sure how common they are at our peer institutions --we should not confuse the support for and interest in mid-career and faculty mentoring with a post-tenure review system --this proposal does not describe anything that does not already fall within the purview of academic deans. It does not provide a process, it does not provide for substantial faculty input in the process (not simply the development of a process) at any point.

AVP Babington responded they reviewed many other schools including Case Western, University of San Francisco, and Seattle University to name but a few.

Prof. Klug stated that the annual review and post-tenure review processes should be separate and distinct in the Journal of Record as is the pre-tenure review process.

**Motion to postpone a vote on the post-tenure review proposal until the first fall 2016 meeting of the Academic Council (Boquet/Lane).**

Prof. Boquet offers 2 reasons for the motion. First, mentoring is an articulated strategic goal of Fairfield 2020. I expect that various task forces and committees are in discussions about how to improve mentoring for all faculty and staff, including mid- and late-career faculty. Those groups should be free to begin developing proposals that meet the needs of faculty, staff, and administrators in this regard. It seems premature to forestall the work on this priority of Fairfield 2020 with a vote on a post-tenure review process. Second, the request to discuss a post-tenure review process came forward from the administration's salary team last year and the faculty have considered the idea in earnest this year. We
have more than met the spirit of the agreement. With thanks to this committee, the Academic Council should recognize the ongoing work of this year's Faculty Salary Committee, who are currently deep in discussions with the administration to reach agreement on salary and benefits. With no rush to vote on this process, we should withhold from a decision on this proposal until a successful conclusion to this year's contract discussions have been reached.

Prof Preli speaks strongly in favor of the motion. Difficult salary negotiations are ongoing. This is part of the salary/benefits discussion. Let’s see how this year falls out. Expressed concern that this could threaten tenure. Why does this have to replace extraordinary merit?

Prof. Crawford likes the proposal in that it gets rid of extraordinary merit. The document is not likely to be supported by the administration. Opposed to giving administration anything at this time.

**Motion to allow Prof Dennin to speak (Lane/Preli).**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

Prof. Dennin does not see this as a mentoring process but rather as a way to get rid of extraordinary merit which is flawed. It is “huge plus” to get rid of extraordinary merit.

Prof. Rakowitz speaks strongly in favor of the motion. Shares concerns related to “limited trust.”

Dean Hannafin has heard no talk of anti-tenure in the administration. He is a strong supporter of tenure.

Prof. Behre speaks in favor of the motion. She recognizes the hard work of the sub-committee. Concerned that post-tenure review process will increase workload for faculty without commensurate benefit. Concerned that proposal is open-ended if faculty member does not meet the plan. Needs more time to study the proposal.

Prof. Kris speaks against the motion. Similar process in School of Nursing works well as a formative process.

Prof. Epstein suggests that if postponed that we consider adoption of wording and sentiment related to “reflection.” View this as an institutional opportunity for faculty reflection. Positive that this is separate from compensation.

Prof. Behre reiterated her concerns about increasing faculty workload.

Prof. Rakowitz noted that this proposal would require the dean to have about 30 meetings with individual faculty a year in CAS alone.

Prof. Dennin suggests a change of title from “post-tenure review” since it is not a review.

Prof. Crawford states it is a problem with the timing not the document.
AVP Babington stated the sub-committee efforts are a response to last year’s MOU with no threat to tenure.

**Motion to call the question (Lane/ Crawford).**

**Motion to call the question passes unanimously.**

**Motion: To postpone a vote on the post-tenure review proposal until the first fall 2016 meeting of the Academic Council.**

**Motion passed 12-1 with 3 abstentions.**

**Motion to reorder the agenda to take up agenda item 7a Proposal for Core Curriculum Revision. (Strauss/ Preli).**

**Motion passes unanimously.**

**7a.** Prof. Epstein reviews the highlights of attached document on Core Curriculum Revision. First recounts history of the process. AC remanded document back to Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to resolve differences with Core Curriculum task Force in their respective versions of the proposal. Specifically, differences related to distribution of Tier I requirements and the policy on accepting AP credits.

Prof. Epstein summarized reasons to change the core. New core is common across the university. New core is smaller (15 vs 20 courses). New core is defined in common experience not competencies. There is a value to a smaller core. Identify core as an area of excellence.

Prof. Epstein outlines the revised proposal. Tier 1 (Orientation) has 8 courses and is intended to be completed during the student’s first two years at Fairfield. Tier Two (Exploration and Integration) has 7 courses. AP courses now allowed in Tier One (except for Writing across Curriculum- WAC).

**Motion to allow Prof. Davidson to speak (Lane/ Preli).**

**Motion passes 8-3 with 3 abstentions.**

Prof. Lane asks if the members of the Core Curriculum Review Committee were elected by the faculty?

Prof. Epstein answers no.

Prof. Lane asks if we know the budgetary implications of the current proposal? What is impact on Honors program?

Prof. Epstein stated that they met with the EPC committee on April 21st. They intend to return to the EPC on the fall with costing of the WAC resources needed to implement the core revisions.
Prof. Lane asks where is the elected committee of the faculty?

Prof. Epstein states although the core revision was administratively initiated, it is faculty executed and faculty approval is necessary - UCC, AC, and eventually General Faculty.

Prof. Rakowitz noted the 2020 sub-committee on the Core was not elected. The 2020 Steering Committee was elected by the faculty. Honors program will need to figure out the implications of core revision.

AVP Babington stated it is difficult to cost out before it starts. Student demand will play a part. It is an evolution. Implementation for next year has been funded. Applying for a Davis grant.

Prof. Klug asks if AP credit will be accepted for the Core integration requirement.

Prof. Epstein answers no.

**Motion to Recess to Monday, May 9th at 2:00 PM (Strauss/ Crawford).**

Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting Recessed.

Respectfully Submitted,

John B. McDermott, Ph.D.
May 3, 2016