Meeting of the General Faculty  
May 9, 2012 from 4:30-5:30 PM  
*****GONZAGA AUDITORIUM*****

NOTE THE LOCATION: GONZAGA AUDITORIUM

AGENDA

1. Announcements

2. Approval of minutes
   a. Approval of minutes of the meeting on April 27, 2012 (attached)
   b. Approval of minutes of the meeting on May 3, 2012 (attached)

3. Pre-presentation of the CT State Conference-AAUP George E. Lang, Jr. Award

4. Address by President Jeffrey von Arx, S.J.

5. Adjournment.

********

Attachments:
For item 2.a: DRAFT Minutes of the General Faculty Meeting on 4/27/2012 (pages 2-17)
For item 2.b: DRAFT Minutes of the General Faculty Meeting on 5/3/2012 (pages 18-20)

This meeting will be followed by the annual Faculty Reception for Retiring Faculty in the lobby of the Quick Center from 5:30-7:30

********
General Faculty Meeting
April 27, 2012
Minutes of Meeting

Not yet approved by the General Faculty

Proxies were held by Prof. Phyllis Braun for Prof. Diane Brousseau
Antonio Grau Sempere for Mary Ann Carolan
Rajasree Rajamma for Arjun Chaudhuri
Cheryl Tromley for Nikki Lee-Wingate
Cheryl Tromley for Michael Tucker
Cathy Giapponi for Sharlene McEvoy
Cathy Giapponi for Lisa Mainiero
Carl Scheraga for Debra M. Strauss
Carl Scheraga for Katya Salavei Bardos
Mark Ligas for Camelia Micu
Joan Van Hise for Milo Peck
Eric Mielants for Scott Lacy
Eric Mielants for Dennis Hodgson
Susan Rakowitz for Linda Henkel
Larry Miners for Roben Torosyan
Ahmed Ebrahim for Michael Coyne
Bruce Bradford for Pat M. Poli
Rick DeWitt for Joy Gordon
Dennis Keenan for Marcie Patton
William Vasquez for Anibal Torres
William Vasquez for Dina Franceschi
Paul Caster for Mukesh Sud
Rona Preli for Nicole O’Brien
James He for Patrick Lee
James He for Valeria Martinez
John Thiel for Ellen Umansky
Don Gibson for Norm Solomon
Alison Kris for Meredith Wallace Kazer
Kate Wheeler for Suzanne Chaplik
Kate Wheeler for Sheila Grossman
Joel Goldfield for Javier Campos
Dawn Massey for Jo Ann Drusbosky
Dawn Massey for Kathi Mettler
Matt Kubasik for Glenn Sauer
Ronald Davidson for Katherine A. Schwab
Ron Salafia for John McCarthy
David McFadden for Elizabeth Hohl
Tod Osier for Jen Klug
Robbin Crabtree for Manyul Im
Rajasree Rajamma for Winston Tellis

At 3:37 PM, the meeting was called to order by the Chair of the General Faculty, Prof. Cathy Giapponi.
1. **Announcements.**

Prof. Rick DeWitt reminded the General Faculty of the Faculty Welfare Committee/AAUP General Membership meeting that would immediately follow today's faculty meeting and of the gala reception that would follow the FWC meeting.

Secretary of the General Faculty, Prof. Irene Mulvey, announced that she had sent a number of emails about General Faculty events: upcoming GF meetings, Faculty Reception for Retiring Faculty, etc. and suggested faculty read her emails for all the details.

2. **Approval of minutes of meeting on March 30, 2012.**

One correction to the minutes of the 3/30/2012 meeting had been emailed to the Faculty Secretary, which Prof. Giapponi read. Insert on page 9 of the packet as a new paragraph 5: “Prof. Naser said, in response to SVP Fitzgerald, that while we must review all academic programs, it is important that the University review all programs in all the other divisions. With regard to the data presented, the key factor is the decline in the yield rate. A large number of students that we invite to attend this University don’t want to come here. This is a serious and long term problem. It is a marketing problem and he doesn’t have confidence that the present senior management team has the ability to address this issue and turn these trends around.”

**MOTION.** [Scheraga/Second] To approve the minutes of the General Faculty meeting on February 3, 2012 as revised.

**MOTION PASSED.**

3. **Report from the Faculty Salary Committee**

Prof. Joe Dennin, Chair of the Faculty Salary Committee (FSC), made the report. In the presentation, the FSC intends to (1) communicate as completely and transparently the details of the collegial discussions, including the administration’s latest offer and its implications for faculty, (2) ask the faculty to support Motion 1 proposed by the FSC in order to send a clear and unequivocal message to the administration that their latest compensation offer is unacceptable, and (3) ask the faculty to support Motion 2 to direct the FSC to return to discussions in order to try to reach agreement on a new Memo of Understanding (MOU).

He reviewed the history of the negotiations this year. In October, the discussions centered around benefit "givebacks". All through those discussions, the administration was committed to maintaining (average) compensation (in each rank) at the AAUP’s 95th percentile. In fact, agreement was reached on how to maintain the commitment if the givebacks resulted in any rank going below the 95th percentile. This is why the FSC was so surprised in March 2012 when, for the first time, the administration announced the intent to do away with the firm commitment on the part of the administration and Board of Trustees to the 95th percentile.

This semester, the FSC tried to begin discussions of a new MOU. The administration was “not eager” to start discussions; VP Dolan saying that they did not yet have budget numbers. Prof. Dennin pointed out that this is backwards in that the compensation numbers should be agreed upon before the budget is set. He raced through highlights of recent meetings:

Feb. 24: The administration brought discussion points for a proposed MOU which contained an increase from 10% to 15% for the faculty's share of health care premiums.

March 23: The administration now said the health care premium would be “up to” 15% and the MOU Section F (on the 95th percentile) was labeled as “TBD”, presumably “to be determined.”
March 29: In an unprecedented occurrence, President von Arx, S.J., Vice President Mark Reed, and Jim the consultant, attended the weekly meeting between the FSC and the administration’s compensation committee. At this meeting, the administration proposed maintaining a commitment to the 95th percentile only for the next fiscal year.

March 30: The FSC reported to the GF that the administration had proposed changing an ongoing commitment to the 95th percentile to a commitment only for the next fiscal year.

April 3: The increase for health care premiums was now at 12%

April 20: The administration presented a proposal labeled “final” with the following components:
- 1% increase in salary
- increased health care premium cost share from 10% to 12%
- increased office visit copays and increased prescription copays
- decrease in the University’s contribution to retirement from 10% to 8%
- decrease in the amount of life insurance coverage from 150K to 50K

Prof. Dennin provided the amount of savings these proposals would provide to the University.
- Each 1% salary increase costs the University 220K
- Each 1% decrease in retirement contribution saves the University 220K
- Life Insurance decrease saves the University 40K
- Increased co-pays (for 6 months, since will take effect in January) will save the University 50K
- Increased faculty health care cost share (for 6 months) would save 120K

Prof. Dennin said that the FSC has reiterated to the administration that the faculty understand the financial concerns. He said that the FSC had proposed numerous proposals to address those concerns and the administration’s response is to say we cannot do that because the budget will not allow it. He asserted again that this is backwards. Despite vigorous discussions with alternatives proposed, there has been essentially no movement on any of the numbers. He noted that the MOU/BPO proposed by the faculty could be funded at a cost of 400K out of a budget of 169 million.

He referred to the handout provided by the FSC at the meeting (attached) that shows, approximately, how the changes proposed by the administration would affect a typical Associate Professor. He paused to ask if there were questions on the numbers and details of the proposal.

Prof. Chris Bernhardt pointed out that health care premiums increasing from 10% of the cost to 12% of the cost means that an individual’s cost increases automatically by at least 20%. In fact, with this proposal, an individual’s health care premium cost will increase by between 25% and 30%, and that is the figure we should understand as our individual increase. Prof. Dennin said this is exactly right.

Prof. Dawn Massey noted that the 1% raise is money we would pay taxes on and the other decreases are pre-tax money. Prof. Dennin responded that the point of the handout is to illustrate, in rough terms, that the proposal is not good.

Prof. Phil Lane asked if the FSC had looked at real wages over the last three years. Answer: No.

Prof. Cecelia Bucki asked if the FSC had provided a counterproposal. Prof. Dennin reiterated that the FSC had provided a “whole bunch” of counterproposals.

Prof. Dennin went on to his second issue: the commitment to the 95th percentile.

He noted that there was no indication of any concern with the commitment to the 95th percentile early on. In fact, the proposed givebacks in compensation discussed in the fall came with agreements on how to meet the commitment if the givebacks caused compensation in any rank to go below the 95th percentile. The first indication the FSC had that the administration wanted to discuss the ongoing commitment was at the March 23 meeting in which documents...
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from the administration referred to section F of the MOU (the section on the 95th percentile) as TBD. At the March 29 meeting, President von Arx and the consultant attended with language maintaining the commitment only for “the coming fiscal year” and with new language that the commitment and its implementation are subject to financial limitations. Prof. Dennin noted that the commitment has always been subject to financial limitations but President von Arx had new language, which he read:

The administration understands “financial limitations” to mean the inability to fund all or part of a salary addition to the 95% [sic] based on the FY 13 unrestricted operating budget. The commitment to faculty compensation, however, is a high priority, although the specific disposition of any unrestricted year-end surplus for this or any other purpose remains at the discretion of the President.

Prof. Dennin summarized that the administration began by removing completely the ongoing contractual commitment to the 95th percentile and now wants it restricted to one more year. One clause in our contract says that the current MOU continues until superseded by a subsequent MOU and so accepting an MOU with the commitment only for fiscal year 2013 would be disastrous. Prof. Dennin read remarks made by Senior VP Fitzgerald from the minutes of the 11/18/2011 General Faculty Meeting:

“SVPA Fitzgerald confirmed the administration’s “firm commitment” to the 95th percentile, he reminded faculty of President von Arx’s public support of this commitment. The MOU guarantees this now in our annual contract. He suggested that the faculty should “stand in solidarity” with the staff as the university works to close the budget gap. He said that the administration has eliminated 65 positions in the last three years (in position eliminations and/or positions left open due to retirements or resignations), while 10 new tenure track faculty lines have been added. Faculty searches have continued, and empty tenure-track lines filled. He argued that the best place for the university’s commitment to the 95th percentile is in the annual MOU.”

He went on to say that the FSC is really puzzled and has no idea where abandoning the commitment to the 95th percentile is coming from. This commitment has been in our contract for about 20 years and it affects three ranks. Given approximately 60 comparisons, only once did meeting this commitment cost a significant amount of money. This year, in particular, we are well above the 95th percentile. Given this history, the FSC doesn’t understand why abandoning the commitment seems to be such a high priority. When the FSC pushed the administrators for a rationale, they would only say, “We can’t do it.” Prof. Dennin said it is difficult to think of many people in the University community who have the authority to tell the University President and Vice Presidents that they can’t do something.

The presentation was paused for questions on the 95th percentile.

Professor David Downie asked if the speculation is that it is the Board of Trustees who are behind abandoning the commitment to the 95th percentile? Prof. Dennin said he has no first hand knowledge but that when high level administrators say they cannot do something, he assumes that is due to the Board of Trustees. He reiterated that when the FSC asked for financial considerations, the administration’s answer is “the budget won’t allow it” and when they talk about the 95th percentile, the administration’s answer is “we can’t do it”.

Prof. Bill Abbott asked if the same conditions were being imposed on administrators. Answer: Yes.

Prof. Vin Rosivach asked if Prof. Dennin knew how much Jim, the consultant, was being paid. Answer: No.

MOTION 1. [Preli/Scheraga] The administration’s language changes and financial conditions in their proposed MOU are unacceptable to the General Faculty.

Prof. Rona Preli, a member of the FSC, spoke in favor of the motion. She said Prof. Dennin had done a great job in outlining what has gone on in the joint meetings. She said the only power we have is if we have a strong cohesive voice among ourselves. The administration’s stated position on the 95th percentile is simply nonsensical. Given all that the
faculty have done in the last 5-6 years based on the ongoing contractual commitment to the 95th percentile, to have it revoked at this point is undermining, suspect and dangerous. She suggested that compromise might be reachable on the financial considerations, but the commitment to the 95th percentile is vital.

Prof. Downie spoke in favor of the motion, saying this is a continuing downward slide in overall compensation for no apparent reason. This will seriously affect our ability to attract and retain high quality faculty. We must convey to the Board, in a positive light, the importance of attracting and retaining faculty in this very expensive area of the country.

Prof. Peter Bayers spoke in favor of the motion. He said he attends all faculty meetings but has never spoken up before. He emphasized the fact that even faculty who are not usually outspoken feel very strongly about this. He noted that he had been one of only 30 faculty member who voted in favor of the givebacks earlier this year since he assumed it would be a temporary thing. He recognized now that he had been naive. To reiterate Prof. Downie’s point, this is not about greedy, selfish faculty. We want Fairfield to be the best it can be; that means recruiting and retaining excellent faculty. If we don’t have the commitment to the 95th percentile to use as a recruiting tool, the quality of the institution will weaken. He concluded that he has always been proud to be a part of this institution, but will look for another position if the University goes down this road. [Applause.]

Prof. Susan Rakowitz spoke in favor of the motion. She pointed out that the FSC has been tying themselves in knots trying to address the administration’s stated concerns. The administration said the 95th percentile could result in an April surprise for the budget and the FSC suggested ways to counter that that were rejected. The administration said we can’t do anything without knowing enrollments and the FSC made proposals that were contingent upon enrollments to which the administration said no. Whatever the FSC proposes, the administration responds with NO. There have been no proposals from the administration, no counter-offers from the administration. All they say is NO. It’s important that we support the motion for all these reasons – the importance of the 95th percentile, the financial terms, and to send the message that we need to be across the table from people willing to compromise.

Prof. Jocelyn Boryczka spoke in favor of the motion. She said the fragile bond of trust between the faculty and the administration has been broken. She noted that the Faculty Welfare Committee/AAUP Action Committee met earlier this afternoon and that they have a list of actions they will share with the FWC members. She said members of the Action Committee were handing out sign-up sheets for faculty to list their non-Fairfield email address.

Prof. Bogusia Skudrzyk spoke in favor of the motion. She noted that she had worked here for 10 years and for the first time, this is heartbreaking. These decisions are counter to what we market. We market men and women for others. This is a social justice issue for faculty and staff. The proposed cuts to compensation will save only 600K; the Board of Trustees could raise that amount of money. She would like to see what kinds of cuts highly paid administrators would be willing to take. She identified herself as a Polish Catholic and said she is truly worried about our future; this smells neither Catholic nor Jesuit.

Prof. Curt Naser spoke in favor of the motion. He said the administration has no strategic rationale for their proposals and they are only reacting to budget problems. The problems were brought on by the administration and they are asking us to save them. The faculty are performing very well. Senior VP Fitzgerald told us that the IDEA data shows that Fairfield faculty are way above appropriate benchmarks. Our scholarship is excellent. And yet, we are being punished. VP Fitzgerald asked us all to work together; he went out on a limb for us in affirming the commitment to the 95th percentile and upper administration or the Board simply negates that commitment.

Prof. Sonya Huber spoke in favor of the motion. In her first year at Fairfield, she noted that she left a tenure-track job in order to work at an institution that would provide security for her and her family. She accepted Fairfield’s early offer because of the commitment to the 95th percentile and because Fairfield has our Faculty Welfare Committee/AAUP, a body where faculty are organized and strong enough to protect themselves.

Prof. Cheryl Tromley spoke in favor of the motion, saying she is distressed by the financial implications. The administrations proposal shows a profound lack of respect and regard for the faculty. When she was a member of the FSC that urged faculty to vote for a reduction in benefits in fall 2009, the Committee believed - apparently
erroneously – that we were in collegial discussions with colleagues who would keep their word. She noted that to fund the FSC’s proposed compensation plan would cost ¼ of 1% or our total budget. Not to fund this is ludicrous as a business decision.

Prof. Kevin Cassidy spoke in favor of the motion. There is no reason, in terms of numbers, to do away with the commitment to the 95th percentile. The financial crisis is an excuse to make decisions that will put them in a more powerful place and the faculty in a weaker position.

Prof. Paul Caster spoke in favor of the motion. He noted that, like Prof. Bayers, he rarely speaks up at faculty meetings, but the administration’s position here is really insulting. We have heard so many times of their firm commitment to the 95th percentile, that this is really insulting. During the governance work that ended in 2009, we were assured of their commitment to the 95th percentile. During the talk of givebacks last fall, we were assured of their commitment to the 95th percentile. Even with the budget crisis, we paid to get into a basketball tournament that students were not really interested in. At a Budget Committee meeting, VP Mark Reed said he didn’t know how much it cost to enter that tournament, but we lost between 5K and 100K to be in it. We have money for a tournament that only the basketball team cares about, but no money for this.

Prof. Kathy Nantz spoke in favor of the motion. She admitted to struggling with the fact that the staff will have to bear the burden of the administration’s decisions in ways that the faculty may not. She noted that the Board needs to understand that when we say we are committed to the 95th percentile, it is our cohort of institutions, Class IIA schools – schools like us. We are asking for fair compensation given that we live in one of the most expensive areas of the country. To build on Prof. Huber’s comments, she noted that she has sat with prospective faculty members and with new faculty members and told them about resources for faculty and about our ongoing contractual commitment to the 95th percentile. Now, she feels like a fool. She had every expectation that the institution meant what it said when they said they were committed to the 95th percentile and told people that they could count on that. She noted that the Economics search was canceled mid-year but that they expect to hire next year. She will not go to the meetings where interviews take place because she could only say we got screwed by our administration. Our administration is dropping an important ongoing contractual commitment. She concluded that she feels like the faculty are being provoked. She feels like we are being poked with a stick and has no idea why the administration and Board would do this.

Prof. Vin Rosivach said he had looked into how many faculty remember what it was like during those nickel-and-dime days before we agreed on the commitment to the 95th percentile. In fact, only about 80 faculty out of 270 go back that far. The commitment to the 95th percentile tells us what kind of a school we are; it ties us to schools outside ourselves and like ourselves. To back away from that commitment says we don't want to be as good as those schools. If we continue, we will be the Chevrolet that former trustee Fay Vincent compared us to. The Board of Trustees do not know how good this faculty is. We need to hold on to this for the kind of school we want to be: a 95th percentile school, not a Chevrolet school.

MOTION. [Lane/Walker] to call the question.
MOTION to call the question PASSED by the required 2/3 vote.

A vote on the main motion was taken by counting raised hands.

MOTION 1 PASSED. 185 in favor, none opposed, 2 abstentions. (185-0-2)

Prof. Dennin returned to his presentation noting that the FSC was not eager but willing to go back to the table. The FSC, with input and support from the FWC/AAUP, drafted a long list of questions for our attorney and they have been sent to the attorney. The FSC plans to meet with him next week and will share appropriate information in an FWC newsletter.

MOTION 2. [DeWitt/Preli] The General Faculty directs the FSC to return to discussions with the administration to work towards an MOU containing the original or equivalent language on
the 95th percentile and financial terms that, in the opinion of the attorney consulted by the FSC with support of the FWC Steering Committee, meet current contractual obligations.

Prof. DeWitt spoke in favor of the motion. He affirmed the comments of Professors Rosivach and Nantz concerning the commitment to the 95th percentile and what it says about what kind of a school we are. Our faculty predecessors worked very hard to make us the institution we are and we have worked diligently to improve our institution. He mentioned the FWC Action Committee and noted that faculty should be prepared to continue working to keep Fairfield strong by whatever means necessary.

Prof. Preli, a member of the FSC, spoke in favor of the motion saying it send a clear message that the faculty expect the administration to discuss with them fairly. In addition to the financial stuff, there is also process. As Professors Rakowitz and Dennin have said, we have gone through iteration after iteration after iterations. All they say is NO. She read from item O in the current MOU, noting that the administration is charged to be “receptive” and “cooperative” to proposals from the FSC.

Prof. Giovanni Ruffini spoke in favor of the motion. He said that to call the current proposal “unacceptable” is too weak; he would have used a string of vulgarities. He noted that many faculty feel the same way.

Prof. Chris Staecker asked about the language in the motion. Does the language mean that a different benchmark might be introduced? Prof. Dennin said not really. They could tweak the language, but it must be equivalent to guaranteeing the 95th percentile.

MOTION. [Davidson/Walker] to call the question.
MOTION to call the question PASSED by the required 2/3 vote.

A vote on the main motion was taken by counting raised hands.

MOTION 2 PASSED. 185 in favor, none opposed, 2 abstentions. (185-0-2)

4. **Handbook** amendments from the AC (for clarity & consistency) for new edition of the **Handbook**

Professor Susan Rakowitz, Executive Secretary of the Academic Council, made the presentation. She went through the information and the seven straightforward amendments in the packet, noting that amendment 6 had been corrected in a handout (attached).

MOTION 1. Amend the Faculty Handbook by replacing fifteen with ten in I.A.3 (on page 1), by replacing twice with “at least once” in I.A.6.b (on page 2), and by replacing “Agendas must be published ten days in advance for the four regularly scheduled meetings, and fifteen days in advance for special meetings.” with “Agendas must be published at least ten days in advance.”

MOTION 2. Amend the Faculty Handbook section I.A.5 (page 2) by deleting, “The Chairperson votes only in case of a tie.”

MOTION 3. Amend the Faculty Handbook section I.C.a.5 (page 8) by replacing the entire paragraph with the following: “No faculty member may simultaneously serve on more than two Standing Committees. Academic Council members may serve on two Standing Committees in addition to serving on the Council. Service by a faculty member on a special committee of the faculty that meets with regularity and carries a continuing responsibility shall be considered the equivalent of service on a Standing Committee.”

MOTION 4. On page 10, insert under 6 and renumber as needed:

7. Voting rights
   “Ex officio Handbook” Committee members are non-voting members unless otherwise indicated in the Handbook.”
Delete the words “non-voting” with regard to ex officio members in the approved amendments to the Faculty Handbook concerning the Library Committee, Faculty Committee on Sustainability, and the Public Lectures and Events Committee.

MOTION 5. On page 22, in II.A.2.a, third paragraph, replace the sentence “Before considering an appeal, the Rank and Tenure Committee shall ask the appropriate faculty in the candidate’s curriculum area and the appropriate Dean to comment in writing on the additional material and to state whether their initial recommendation to grant or withhold promotion has changed.” to “Before considering the appeal, the Rank and Tenure Committee shall receive written comments on the additional material from the appropriate faculty in the candidate’s curriculum area and the appropriate Dean, which will include a statement as to whether their initial recommendation to grant or withhold promotion has changed.”

MOTION 6 (Corrected): On page 32, in II.B.4 revise last two sentences as shown, “Faculty members serving clients in a consulting capacity are retained as individuals and the University takes no responsibility for such service. Records of all such activities of each individual must be kept on file by the person responsible for his or her curriculum area appropriate Dean or the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and be subject to continuing review.”

MOTION 7. On page 32, revise the last sentence in the first paragraph under II.B.5 as shown, “The limited University funds shall be made available within the continental United States and Canada in accordance with the following general principles:

Prof. Dawn Massey asked for the rationale for Amendment 3. Prof. Rakowitz said that none of these amendments were changing current policy or practice, they were to clean up the Handbook prior to the publication of a new edition. Prof. Rosivach provided some rationale from when this was first put into place.

MOTION, [Lane/Humphrey] to approve all seven amendments as written above.
MOTION PASSED.

5. GF consideration of language requirement for DSB passed by Academic Council on April 2, 2012

Prof. Larry Miners took over as chair since Prof. Giapponi had been involved in the matter coming before the faculty. He described the planned presentation as follows: (1) remarks from Prof. Walker who had organized the petition that brought this to the General Faculty followed by informational questions from Prof. Walker, (2) remarks by the DSB Dean Don Gibson, followed by informational questions for Dean Gibson, (3) the floor would be opened for the General Faculty to take action or not take action on the matter. Prof. Miners read from page 6 of the Handbook (I.B.4). “Any decision of the Academic Council may be placed on the agenda of the next regular or called meeting of the General Faculty by a petition signed by not fewer than thirty members of the faculty to request it to be so. Over 40 colleagues believe the current issue of a modification to the university core for Dolan School of Business students - approved by the Academic Council - is an issue important enough to deserve university wide discussion.
While I have been joined by my colleagues as signatories to bring this issue before you, my few remaining comments have not been read or approved of by the signers of the petition. They represent my views and opinions, and I take full credit and/or responsibility for them.

The Academic Council’s decision to approve the Dolan School of Business’ change in the language core requirement should be considered for three primary reasons: 1. These changes, coupled with those that exist for the Schools of Nursing and Engineering, will result in almost 50% of the undergraduates at Fairfield University having a core requirement different than those originally set forth for the university – thus erasing the idea of a “university wide” core. 2. The reasons given for business students wanting and/or deserving said changes, namely a heavy student course load resulting in the inability to complete a double major and/or minor - is not unique to school of business students. 3. Consideration of changes to the core curriculum should not be restricted to only one department that provides instruction in the core.

I bring before the body no official motions on how next to proceed. I simply open the floor to discussion of this issue. Thank you.

The floor was opened for questions for Prof. Walker.

Prof. Caster asked if the petition was based on new information that was not presented to the Academic Council or based on the fact that erroneous information had been presented to the Council. Answer: No.

Prof. Naser asked for clarification about 50% of students not taking the official core. Prof. Walker said that the current exceptions to the language core for SOE and SON represent a small number of undergraduates. By allowing DSB students an exception, we are up to about 50% of the students.

Prof. James He asked if it was Prof. Walker’s intention to have the decision-making procedure reconsidered, or is his concern special to the language requirement for DSB. Prof. Walker said he was bringing the matter to the faculty for consideration.

Prof. Mousumi Bhattacharya asked if the AC had considered Prof. Walker’s concerns. Prof. Walker said that some of them were discussed.

Prof Ahmed Ebrahim asked if Prof. Walker was bringing this to the faculty because he is against the merits of the proposal to allow the students in the professional schools an exception. Prof. Walker said that while we use the term “professional school” for some of our students, the CAS students are equally professional. Prof. Ebrahim followed up to ask if Prof. Walker was against the merits of the change. Prof. Walker said he would like to see the benefit for all students.

Dean Beth Boquet said that with the addition of DSB students, we appear to be at a tipping point. We must think about cross-school collaboration. What about, for example, a student with a double major?

Prof. Bruce Bradford asked where the exceptions for SON and SOE would be if we turned down the exception for DSB?

Prof. Kathy Nantz noted that only a few months ago, we decided to close University College. At the time, the discussion centered around bringing students back into their home schools so we would have a consistent core. She read the motion passed at AC (on page 23 of the packet for Agenda Item 5 for this meeting): “to ask the AC to recommend that the CAS Curriculum Committee take up the question of language requirements in the Core for the undergraduate students in the CAS” and asked, “Is that not sufficient?” Prof. Walker: no.

Dean Don Gibson read the following regarding the proposal that the DSB had sent through the governance structure.
Dolan School of Business Motion on Modern and Classical Language requirements: “To change the Modern and Classical Languages requirement for Charles F. Dolan School of Business undergraduate students from two semesters at the intermediate level to two semesters of the same language at any level.”

I think it’s important to provide some context and history for the DSB’s motion. The motion came about four years ago because there was a change in the Modern Languages placement requirements that had an unintended side effect on DSB students. Indeed, all Fairfield students. The change was made for a good reason: to address an external academic review. We are not questioning the need to make changes in curriculum, only that this change had negative effects on our students. We value the need for our students to have foreign language skills, and we have tried to work with Modern Languages for a solution to this issue for the last four years. Up through the classes of 2009-11, most students—about 60% tested in to Intermediate I foreign language classes, meaning they would have one year of language. With the change, that number is reversed, so for the Classes of 2014-15 about 60% of freshmen tested into Elementary level, meaning they will have to have 2 full years (16 credits) of language. Having two full years required for language makes it difficult for business students (and many Fairfield students, especially those in the natural sciences) to take double majors and minors, because there are too few electives to use for this purpose. With 2 years of language, there are 2 free electives left; too few for a minor. As you know, The DSB is alone among the Fairfield professional schools (Engineering and Nursing) to have this requirement. Engineering has no foreign language requirement at all, and Nursing allows students to substitute two semesters of visual and performing arts for intermediate foreign language. Not surprisingly, most students opt for the VPA option.

Retention. It is important to recognize that the change to placement strategy is potentially a critical retention and enrollment issue for Fairfield University, because of when students find out their placement level. Prior to Orientation, the placement exam is offered online. The exam determines whether a student will be placed into Intermediate and have to take one year of language, or Elementary, and need to take two. Often, students with, let’s say 2 to 3, even 4 years of language will not place well on the test, for a variety of reasons—they don’t take it seriously, or haven’t had the language for a year, etc. –and are essentially told, during Orientation, that they failed the test and will need to take two additional years. This is difficult feedback to hear during a vulnerable time, and may contribute to our summer melt.

We can discuss further the implications of two years of language for students in a moment. The negative feedback from students about this situation prompted the DSB to explore alternatives, and the school met with the Dept. of modern languages, beginning two years ago, but none of the alternatives was seriously considered by the department.

In response to the continued concerns of students and in some cases, parents, the DSB Undergraduate curriculum committee took up this issue in 2010 and extensive discussions occurred in all five DSB departments. In April 2011 the DSB UCC passed the motion: “To change the Modern and Classical Languages requirement for Charles F. Dolan School of Business undergraduate students from two semesters at the intermediate level to two semesters of the same language at any level.”

As we can discuss further, this motion retains an emphasis on language at the same level as before the placement change, matches or exceeds the amount of language at Fairfield’s comparison and competitive schools, gives students the flexibility to try out new critical languages while not committing them to two full years of study, and also makes it easier to align foreign language instruction with Study Abroad. The motion passed the DSB Full Faculty unanimously, and was introduced to the University UCC in May, 2011. The issue carried over into the Fall, and in three separate meetings and over three hours of careful discussion, the motion passed 7 to 6 in UCC in
November, 2011. Typically, issues of this type stop at the UCC. The Journal of Record specifies that “Included here also are those situations where groups of students are to be excused from some part of the Core requirements...” the routing requirements are from 1) Curriculum Area Chair(s) to 2. UCC (see JOR, p. 65 #6). However, ambiguity in the JOR prompted the Academic Council to take up the motion in March of this year. It was recommended by the AC Executive Committee that the DSB meet with the Modern Languages department to see if we could find a mutually acceptable resolution to the DSB’s concerns. We met twice, and proposed different options, but none were acceptable to both departments. At its April 2nd meeting, the issue was again fully discussed at Academic Council. Following discussion, the motion was approved, 10 to 7.

Last week, the General Faculty Secretary determined that in a previous vote of this kind, when the Nursing school was exempted from the language requirement, the vote in Academic Council was the final word.

That brings us to where we are today.

In seeking to address this motion, the DSB has carefully adhered to the Fairfield University governance structure as directed by the Journal of Record. Multiple committees appropriately representing all voices of the University have thoughtfully considered this motion and approved it. We would ask that, if you value the governance structure of Fairfield University, and the time and careful consideration of your elected members, you should respect that governance structure and the outcome that has resulted. We need to have faith in our representative governance structure that it can result in good decisions, particularly for minority groups.

The DSB values a language requirement. Business is global, and in this motion we are advocating a language requirement that is similar or higher than our comparison business schools. The DSB values the core. Indeed, more than half of a business student’s classes, 21 of 41 come from the Arts and Sciences core; the business core consists of 9 classes, plus the major, which is 6 for a total of 15, 37% of classes taken at Fairfield. Our alumni speak about how important the core is, and that it adds a distinctive Jesuit aspect to the business degree. It is a competitive advantage for us. But the change in placement is negatively perceived by students. They view it as limiting their ability to take double majors and minors in a time when they are looking for any element that can help differentiate themselves in the job market. Let’s offer our students the flexibility they deserve. Let’s give them a core that helps them achieve their goals.

We agree with the goals of the statement put forth in the petition, that the core “is intended to be a universal experience for the undergraduates at Fairfield University,” and that “modification of core requirements should be made in a way to insure that a uniform experience be given to all students.” The Academic Council has already passed a motion to have the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee take up the question of the language requirements for its undergraduates, so this initiative has begun. We would urge that committee to consider our motion

Motion, : “To change the Modern and Classical Languages requirement for Charles F. Dolan School of Business undergraduate students from two semesters at the intermediate level to two semesters of the same language at any level.”

Just strike out the words “Charles F. Dolan School of Business.” Let’s have what we are suggesting apply for everyone!

Thank you.

Prof. Cathy Giapponi spoke as the individual chairing the DSB curriculum committee for a number of years. Without the exception for language core, there are problems with advising. DSB students used to have four free electives and
would often choose a minor from another school. Now with only 2 free electives, students are essentially unable to
minor in anything other than business. She noted that studying abroad has become problematic with the new
language standards in that study abroad courses typically do not count towards core or major. Having only 2 free
electives makes it hard to study abroad.

The floor was opened up for informational questions to Dean Gibson.

Associate Dean Aaron Perkus said he supported Prof. Walker bringing the matter by petition to the GF, but the UCC
spent three meetings on this topic and the DSB made a compelling presentation. Faculty are only getting a snippet of
the information here. Deciding something now runs counter to the deliberative and thoughtful procedure of our
routing processes.

Prof. Don Greenberg asked Dean Gibson whether he had any actual data on the summer melt or was it a scare tactic.
Dean Gibson said that it’s only been two years and when the students do melt away, they don’t come back to tell us
why.

Prof. Giapponi said that the students are upset. In addition, there are problems with placement and there weren’t
enough courses for the language requirement, so the students were doubly upset.

Prof. Jerelyn Johnson said that this has not been under discussion for four years with the Department of Modern
Languages and Literature, as claimed. She began discussing concerns she had heard about the vote at UCC where this
passed 7 in favor, 6 opposed with two abstentions. This was ruled off-topic.

**MOTION.** [McFadden/Lippman] that the General Faculty reverse the decision of the Academic
Council and return to a unified language core requirement for DSB and CAS.

Prof. David McFadden spoke in favor of his motion. He said this passed by the UCC in a close vote and passed in the
AC by a close vote and has been brought to the General Faculty by petition. For these reasons, he signed the petition.
We must maintain our high and universal core; we should reverse all core exceptions.

**MOTION.** [Rosivach/Lane] to table the pending motion to the next General Faculty meeting.

**MOTION TO AMEND.** [Preli/Second] to amend the motion to table by replacing “next General
Faculty meeting” with “first General Faculty meeting in the Fall.”

**MOTION TO AMEND PASSED.**

**MOTION.** to table the pending motion to the first General Faculty meeting in the Fall.

**MOTION PASSED.**

**MOTION.** [McFadden/Simon] to hold in abeyance the AC decision on DSB core language
requirement until this is sorted out by the General Faculty in the fall.

Associate Dean Aaron Perkus said he is uncomfortable with this motion. Students won’t know what their core will be
and we’ll have a one-year limbo class.

Prof. Preli spoke against the motion. To make a decision like this, without being privy to all the information, is a knee-
jerk reaction. We have deliberated and passed a motion to table which will give people an opportunity to consider
things more fully.

Dean Boquet noted, for informational purposes, that information on the core is already out. We already printed what
we knew in February.
Prof. Joan Van Hise spoke against the motion, saying it sends a bad signal to question governance decisions when we are facing governance issues with the administration.

Prof. Thiel spoke against the motion, calling it sloppy and noting that we are not questioning governance decisions. This is part of our governance process; the GF is the last court of appeal and is an important part of our governance process.

**MOTION.** [Rosivach/Steffen] to call the question.
**MOTION to call the question PASSED** by the required 2/3 vote.

A vote on the main motion was taken by counting raised hands.

**MAIN MOTION FAILED.** 54 in favor, 88 opposed.

6. **Adjournment.**

At some god-awful late hour, a **MOTION TO ADJOURN** was made, seconded and **PASSED** without objection.

Respectfully submitted,
Irene Mulvey
Secretary of the General Faculty

________________________________________

Not yet approved by the General Faculty
Revisions to page 13 of the packet:

**Two motions from the Faculty Salary Committee.**

The FSC has decided against bringing an MOU to the faculty at this time. The MOU says we will bring one that is mutually agreed upon and we do not have that. Instead, we ask the faculty to support the following 2 motions:

**Motion 1:** The administration’s language changes and financial conditions in their proposed MOU are unacceptable to the general faculty.

**Motion 2:** The General Faculty directs the FSC to return to discussions with the administration to work towards an MOU containing the original or equivalent language on the 95th percentile and financial terms that, in the opinion of the attorney consulted by the FSC with support of the FWC Steering Committee, meet current contractual obligations.
Correction to page 16 of the packet:

Motion 6 (on page 16 of the packet) is not what was passed by the Academic Council. The correct Motion 6 is below.

MOTION 6 (Corrected): On page 32, in II.B.4 revise last two sentences as shown, “Faculty members serving clients in a consulting capacity are retained as individuals and the University takes no responsibility for such service. Records of all such activities of each individual must be kept on file by the person responsible for his or her curriculum area appropriate Dean or the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and be subject to continuing review.”

The corrections are that the words “Dean or the” are also deleted and a misspelling was corrected.
Associate Professor - Average Salary $88,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1% raise</th>
<th>$880</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2% drop in retirement</td>
<td>-$1,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Premium Option 1- 2 person</td>
<td>-$470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Copay 4 visits per year</td>
<td>-$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription Copay 2 per month</td>
<td>-$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>-$1,510</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health premium for 2013 - 2 person option 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propose for 2013 current assumptions (increase 1000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propose for 2013 12% overall cap; then 6% per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAme with overall increase of 1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proxies were held by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proxy Holder</th>
<th>Proxy for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marcie Patton</td>
<td>Kevin Cassidy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Grau Sempere</td>
<td>Mary Ann Carolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Mulvey</td>
<td>Vera Cherepinsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Hulse</td>
<td>Anne Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Hulse</td>
<td>David Zera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Bayne</td>
<td>Jim Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Pagano</td>
<td>Sallynnne Ryan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Grossman</td>
<td>Jacyn Conelius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Walker</td>
<td>Shelley Phelan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Fitzgerald, S.J.</td>
<td>Joan Overfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Scheraga</td>
<td>Mukesh Sud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Dennin</td>
<td>Ben Fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Dennin</td>
<td>Joan Weiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Schmidt</td>
<td>Chris Huntley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Rakowitz</td>
<td>Don Greenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Rakowitz</td>
<td>Ron Salafia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Van Hise</td>
<td>Jo Ann Drusbosky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Wheeler</td>
<td>Diane Mager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Rafalski</td>
<td>Steve Sawin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Rafalski</td>
<td>Matt Coleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Tromley</td>
<td>Norm Solomon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Tromley</td>
<td>Mike Tucker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajasree Rajammasa</td>
<td>Camelia Micu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajasree Rajammasa</td>
<td>Gerald Cavallo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Ligas</td>
<td>Arjun Chaudhuri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Ligas</td>
<td>Mousumi Bose Godbole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Bradford</td>
<td>Pat Poli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Bradford</td>
<td>Patrick Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen Klug</td>
<td>Tod Osier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Gordon</td>
<td>Curt Naser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Simon</td>
<td>Sally O’Driscoll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Simon</td>
<td>Gita Rajan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Thiel</td>
<td>Ellen Umansky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Thiel</td>
<td>Martin Nguyen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Davidson</td>
<td>Katherine Schwab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katya Bardos</td>
<td>Gregory Koutmos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katya Bardos</td>
<td>Nick Laopodis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Massey</td>
<td>Kathi Mettler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Massey</td>
<td>Sharlene McEvoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredy Maldonado, S.J.</td>
<td>Jiwei Xiao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Lyon</td>
<td>Jack Beal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Lyon</td>
<td>Vagos Hadjimichael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Siegel</td>
<td>Marsha Alibrandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Munden</td>
<td>Jerry Sergent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen Goldberg</td>
<td>Hyun Uk Kim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edrik Lopez</td>
<td>Shannon Kelley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At 10:05 AM, the meeting was called to order by the Chair of the Faculty, Professor Cathy Giapponi

1. **Announcements.**

   Secretary of the General Faculty, Professor Irene Mulvey, thanked the Faculty Welfare Committee for the gala breakfast.

   Prof. Jocelyn Boryczka, co-Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee’s Action Committee invited all faculty to an organizational meeting on the Action Committee on Monday, May 7 from noon to 1:00 in the Faculty Dining Room. This meeting of the FWC Action Committee is open to all faculty members and will be an organizational meeting to plan actions in response to recent events related to compensation, benefits, and our University’s future.

2. **Academic Council Report; Academic Council elections**

   Professor Rona Preli, Chair of the Academic Council, reported for the AC, reminding the faculty that the AC is the executive arm of the General Faculty and the minutes and membership of the Council are available on the Faculty Secretary's website. She had very kind words to say about the Faculty Secretary who is not running for re-election after serving three consecutive three-year terms.

   The Committee on Committees ran the election for vacancies on the Academic Council, which are held by school. Election results are:

   CAS: David Downie, Roxana Walker-Canton, Shawn Rafalski, Bob Epstein  
   DSB: James He, Chris Huntley  
   GSEAP: Wendy Kohli, Ginny Kelly

3. **Handbook Committee Reports and Elections.**

   The Chair of each Handbook committee was called upon to give a brief report of the committee’s activities this year and answer questions from the floor. The written annual report from each committee will be posted on the Secretary of the General Faculty's website at www.faculty.fairfield.edu/gfs. After each report, an election was held by the Committee on Committees to fill the vacancies on each committee. Election results follow.

   **ELECTION RESULTS:**

   General Faculty Secretary: Susan Rakowitz

   Committee on Committees: Cheryl Tromley, Joan Van Hise

   Rank and Tenure Committee: Johanna Garvey, Mark LeClair, Chris Bernhardt

   Research Committee: Matt Kubasik, Marcie Patton

   Undergraduate Curriculum Committee: Bruce Bradford, Rajasree Rajamma, Shah Etemad, Shannon Reckinger, Kathy Nantz

   Admissions and Scholarships Committee: Ryan Drake

   Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees: Marti LoMonaco, Phil Lane

   Student Life Committee: Sonya Huber, William Mazariagos
Library Committee: Gayle Bogel, Amanda Harper-Leatherman

Public Lectures and Events Committee: Tom Murray

Athletics Committee: Kris Sealey, Tom Murray

Faculty Committee on Sustainability: Kraig Steffen, Mike Cavanaugh

University Advancement Committee: Katya Bardos

Educational Planning Committee: Evelyn Lolis, Qin Zhang, Mark Scalese, S.J.

Faculty Salary Committee: Dennis Keenan, Marcie Patton

Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee: Gwen Alphonso, Cinthia Gannett

Committee on University College: Nikki Lee-Wingate, Yohuru Williams

Educational Technologies Committee: Amalia Rusu, Vishnu Vinekar

Budget Committee (faculty representatives): Joe Dennin

At 12:20 PM, a **MOTION**: to adjourn was made, seconded and **PASSED** overwhelmingly.

Respectfully submitted,
Irene Mulvey
Secretary of the General Faculty

Not yet approved by the General Faculty.