General Faculty Meeting
Friday March 20, 2015
Gonzaga Auditorium, 3:30-5 pm

Agenda

1. Announcements

2. Approval of the minutes of November 21, 2014 (pages 2-12)

3. Proposed Handbook amendment creating a Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty (pages 13-24)

4. Proposed Handbook amendment deleting the University College Committee (page 25)

5. Informational presentation from the Associate Vice President of Marketing and Communications

6. Update from the Faculty Salary Committee
   The FSC will report on the status of the collegial discussions, including all proposals and counter-proposals. Materials will be sent in advance of the meeting.

7. Adjournment

The meeting will be followed by a Gala Reception hosted by the Faculty Welfare Committee/AAUP
Prof. Terry-Ann Jones, Chair of the General Faculty, called the meeting to order at 3:34 pm.

Announcements

Prof. Jones reminded the faculty about the gala reception sponsored by the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) following the meeting.

Prof. Rona Preli, President of the FWC, announced that in addition to the gala reception, there will be an emergency meeting of the FWC. She asked members to attend in order to discuss critical issues about the failure of shared governance and the imposition of health care premiums.

Motion [Wheeler/Rosivach]: That Azize Atli Ozbas, a faculty member visiting from Turkey, be allowed to attend this year's General Faculty meetings as an observer.

Motion passed.

Approval of minutes

Motion [Miecznikowski/Walker]: to approve the minutes of 9/12/14 as circulated.

The motion passed unanimously.

Prof. Sonya Huber was recognized and said, given the barrage of emails from the administration about healthcare costs, and given the serious difficulty the Faculty Salary Committee is encountering in its collegial discussions with the administration and in its attempt to get information to support the reasons for these compensation changes, I move to reorder the agenda in order to take up the report from the FSC at this time.

Motion [Huber/McFadden]: to reorder the agenda to take up the report from the Faculty Salary Committee at this time.

Motion passed.

Report from the Faculty Salary Committee on 2015 health insurance cost-shares and the year ahead

As copies of the slides (attached to these minutes) were distributed, Prof. Irene Mulvey, Chair of the Faculty Salary Committee (FSC), expressed her appreciation for the faculty's support of the motion to reorder the agenda. She noted that the FSC typically doesn't need to report in the fall, but this year there are some seriously bad things to talk about. They are important enough to pre-empt our other business.
On one level, the issue is the 2015 cost-shares, but the real concern is with process and the fact that the administration is ignoring our contractually and Handbook-mandated governance structures. The first 3 slides present language from the Handbook, Memo of Understanding (MOU), and Journal of Record, all describing the role of the FSC in discussion of faculty benefits.

She asked why the administration bypassed our processes in this way. At the moment it's to impose the 2015 cost-shares, but we should be concerned about the future. She noted that the behavior she's seen in the last 12 months from the administration is unlike anything she's seen in her 29 years at Fairfield.

She went on to review the timeline that was also presented in the recent FWC newsletter. For years we paid nothing for healthcare. Then for the first 3 years of cost-sharing, we paid 10% of premiums and had a cap limiting how much the cost-shares could increase each year. In 2013 we reached a one-year agreement without a cap and there was an 11% increase. For 2014, the administration wanted us to pay more than 10%, specifically 20%. They offered an offset to cover half of the increase. The administration calculated that offset based on a projected increase in premiums of 7%. That projection was from their long-term, trusted consultant. The FSC survey of faculty showed that faculty would not accept an effective increase to 15%, but by a slim majority, would accept an effective increase to 12%. The FSC therefore offered to go to 20% with an offset to cover 4/5ths of the increase so that the average increase was effectively to 12%. The FSC used the same assumptions as the administration had in calculating the offset.

This year, no one communicated with the FSC about next year's cost-shares. VP for Administration, Mark Reed, told the FSC that there had been a lot of discussion about the 2015 cost-shares, with many points of view raised, but the FSC wasn't in the room. In other words, the faculty committee charged with discussing faculty salary and benefits with the administration was excluded from discussions of faculty benefits.

Prof. Mulvey went on to discuss the premium. We pay 20% of the premium, but without a cap on the increase in cost-shares, we're paying 20% of a number that the administration gets from their paid consultant (Mercer) and we have no control over. Without a cap it's vitally important to know how the premium is calculated- is it calculated fairly? Is it calculated accurately? We and the administration get the premium from Mercer through their "proprietary calculations," or, as we've come to think of it, the "special sauce".

Last year, in collaboration with the current administration, we developed the Trigger Committee. As can be seen in the slides, its duties include understanding how the rates have been calculated. That hasn't happened. And from the data we've seen, the premiums from Mercer appear to be inflated.

At this point Prof. Michael Tucker reviewed the data on the next few slides. Looking at the data from October for the previous 12 months, our actual costs are 6.1% below the budgeted costs. On aggregate, employees paid 19.9% of projected costs while the administration paid 80.1%. In terms of actual costs, employees paid 21.4% while the administration paid 78.6%. Looking at the calendar year 2014 data, costs are 10% below projections. The 2015 projections represent a 5% increase over the budgeted amount rather than a 5% increase over actual costs.

Prof. Mulvey retook the podium and emphasized that the slides don't tell the whole story. They're presenting the big picture for why we're so unhappy. The bottom line is we agreed to pay 20% of the premium for Option 1 and the HSA, but we have no idea how the premium has been calculated. It seems to be inflated and it seems to have changed only when we changed consultants. We're willing to pay our fair share of the premium as long as we're convinced the premium is accurate.

But so much more than cost-shares, the real story here is about governance and process. Over the last 3 days we've seen a full court press of email blasts from the administration. On Monday President von Arx emailed the University, on Tuesday VP Reed emailed the University, and on Wednesday President von Arx emailed the faculty. The first of these emails included some great news- those earning less than $50,000 per year will get a salary increase of $1000, and the retirement contribution for staff is going to 9% from 8%. (Prof. Mulvey noted that faculty were already at 9% retirement contribution because we gave up a 1% raise that the staff received.) The President's memo included the statement, “one spending priority that cannot and will not be deferred is making necessary enhancements to the financial security of those in our community at the lower end of the compensation range”. Prof. Mulvey said that the FWC has already heard from a number of
part-time faculty members who are the "the lower end of the compensation range" and yet were left out of these changes. With regard to Wednesday's email just to the faculty, Prof. Mulvey asked VP Reed why the President was bypassing the FSC. VP Reed replied that it's the President's prerogative to communicate with faculty. Prof. Mulvey noted that the President has the right to do this, but he shouldn't insert himself between the elected members of the FSC and the constituents who elected them. She further pointed out that he is a member of this body, so if he wanted to provide additional information to inform our discussion, he should come to this meeting and talk with us.

With regard to some of the specifics in his memo, he says that the 2015 rates were determined through a "complex algorithm". Prof. Mulvey insisted that the FSC can understand complex algorithms, but can't understand this one. In addition, he points out that the rate increase for 2015 includes 2 components- one addresses increases due to medical inflation, and the other gets us to the agreed upon 80/20 cost share formula. Prof. Mulvey rejected the latter point. She said every time the administration told the FSC that faculty weren't at the 20% that they had agreed to, the FSC pointed out that the faculty are exactly where we agreed to be, and exactly where we should be, based on the carefully calculated offset. If the assumptions underlying the offset radically changed (following the hiring of a new consultant), then faculty need an additional offset to make up for the non cost-based increase in the premium.

Prof. Mulvey acknowledged that the FSC had had a number of meetings with the administration and has been given a good deal of information. But we haven't been given everything we need. For example, AAUP has a transparent system for comparing faculty shares of health care costs across schools. To make these comparisons, we asked for additional data that Aetna and Mercer would have about co-pays and deductibles paid by members. VP Reed's response was, "The data you are requesting is and was not part of the forecasting and determination of rates for 2015, nor do I have it to provide. Therefore, the request appears to be beyond the purview of the Trigger Committee." Prof. Mulvey argued that the administration cannot unilaterally decide which data the Trigger Committee is allowed access to.

Prof. Mulvey then described the apparently deliberate and insufficient timing of the data sharing. The FSC got the rates on 10/17 and they were distributed to employees on 11/6. Initially the FSC was given the rates with no data. The FSC made 2 proposals which were never discussed or acknowledged. The decision was made without us and before we saw any information. The President asserts that rates are set by the administration, but we've only had rates for 5 years. For the first 3 we had a jointly determined cap on increases so the rates were effectively jointly determined. Without a cap, we set up the Trigger Committee so that faculty would have meaningful input into the rates. This year we were denied the opportunity for the meaningful input that our documents require.

Moving on to the reference in the President's memo to the 95th percentile commitment, Prof. Mulvey explained that it is the FSC's understanding that the administration reports their budgeted contribution to healthcare premiums (not actual expenditures) as part of our compensation. If the premiums are inflated, then the administration's 80% inflates the compensation figures that are compared to the 95th percentile benchmark.

Before getting to her concluding points, Prof. Mulvey offered some late-breaking news. The Health Care Review Committee (HCRC) is charged with looking at the growth in health care costs "on an ongoing basis". The FSC wrote to the administration suggesting that an administrative member of the HCRC serve as chair. This morning, VP of Finance, Mike Trafecante, responded without explanation, that they would prefer that a faculty member chair. Furthermore he said, "in order to avoid redundancy, we suggest it only operate in those months the FSC is not meeting". Prof. Mulvey noted that that suggestion would make the HCRC useless, just what you would want if you were looking to avoid all this messy shared governance stuff.

In summary, the FSC's positions are:

- Without an additional offset into the base, cost-shares should only increase with increased medical costs.
- Faculty need to be able to confirm that the premiums are being calculated fairly and accurately.
- Faculty need to stand in solidarity around the importance of process and respect for faculty's appropriate role.
After Prof. Mulvey urged faculty to stay for the FWC meeting, the floor was opened for questions.

Prof. Paula Gill Lopez asked whether administrators have the same healthcare benefits and cost shares as we do. Prof. Mulvey said that they do. In fact, the Handbook specifies that if a different healthcare plan is ever offered to any group of employees, faculty have to be given that option as well.

Prof. Cheryl Tromley asked about the last line of the President's memo, specifically that we work together on reducing healthcare costs. She found it particularly frustrating that we have reduced healthcare costs and instead of benefitting from that, we're going in the other direction- it's Orwellian.

Prof. David McFadden asked whether the FSC had any motions that would be helpful for the faculty to pass. Prof. Mulvey said that FWC members should stay for the FWC meeting, when faculty would be able to talk without administrators present. She said they did not anticipate any motions from the General Faculty meeting; they just wanted to inform the faculty and urge them to stay for the FWC meeting.

Prof. Preli asked whether it's true that the new calculations are from a new company and whether the FSC was consulted regarding the change in companies. Mulvey said that the FSC was not consulted about the switch to Mercer in the summer of 2013, and yes, shortly after the shift, Mercer proposed a 22% increase in cost shares. The faculty argued against that jump, and the cost shares were lowered to the pre-Mercer projections for last year. Prof. Tucker added that the costs of Mercer's services are part of our healthcare premiums.

Prof. Jocelyn Boryczka asked whether Prof. Mulvey could confirm that this is the first time since the establishment of the FSC that the administration has completely circumvented the General Faculty's elected representatives on the FSC. Prof. Mulvey said that she has been on the FSC for the last 3 years, was General Faculty Secretary for 9 years prior to that, and was on the FSC for 3 years before that. In those 16 years, there was nothing like this.

Prof. McFadden spoke of the need to underline the faculty's solidarity around the governance issue. This is not about the cost shares, but about governance. These remarks were greeted with applause.

Prof. Joe Dennin agreed that the primary issue here is governance, but money is also involved. He argued that one of the crucial things going forward is some sort of cap on increases. We can't be signing a blank check when we agree to an MOU/BPO before the following year's rates are set.

Prof. Marcie Patton said that a while back there was some discussion about having a vote of no confidence in President von Arx. She wondered whether that was again being discussed as a possible course of action. Prof. Mulvey said that that was a great question, but she would prefer to discuss it at the FWC meeting.

Prof. Kathy Nantz reminded the faculty that at the President's address to the General Faculty last spring, she begged him to move toward multi-year contracts in order to end the annual constant focus on contract negotiations. Noting that she was a labor economist, she said she had never seen an institution that encouraged employees to spend so much time thinking about compensation. She is especially puzzled by this happening at an institution whose mission is education. Every year the life gets sucked out of the institution around February or March because of these conversations. And here we are in November. We're supposed to be working on long term strategic planning, focusing on our students, our upcoming finals, next semester's curricula, etc., but again the administration has put us in the position of having to worry about compensation. And, she reiterated, it's November. A round of applause followed.

Prof. Ron Salafia suggested an answer to Prof. Nantz's implied question- the administration does this because when faculty focus on compensation, we look bad in the eyes of the Board of Trustees, and the administration loves that.

Prof. Marti LoMonaco, Chair of the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees, sought advice- does the General Faculty want us to raise these issues, especially regarding a multi-year contract, at the next Board meeting? Prof. Mulvey said that it might not be appropriate given that the faculty committee meets only with the Academic Affairs subcommittee of the Board. With regard to multi-year contracts, she noted that last year the administration did offer a multi-year contract but refused to index salary increases to inflation, so their offer was unacceptable.
Prof. Nantz said that she appreciated Prof. LoMonaco's sentiment, but we don't want the Board micromanaging healthcare. We want our administrators acting in good faith when they engage in collegial discussions with us around salary and benefits.

With the questions concluded, Prof. Mulvey thanked our colleagues on the FSC, HCRC, and Trigger Committee by name: Bryan Crandall, Joe Dennin, Bob Epstein, Sonya Huber, Chris Bernhardt, Walt Hlawitschka and Michael Tucker.

**Proposed Handbook amendment regarding counting maternity leave toward tenure**

Prof. Preli, Chair of the Academic Council, drew the Faculty's attention to page 14 of today's packet. The AC formed a subcommittee to draft language around counting time spent on maternity leave toward tenure. They recommended that faculty members taking maternity leave be able to choose, shortly after the completion of their leave, whether the year during which they were on leave would count as part of the probationary period toward tenure. There were no questions.

Motion [Patton/Boryczka]: to recommend that the Faculty Handbook [II.A.3.c] be amended as follows (new language underlined; items following insertion to be renumbered):

**c. Other Matters**

(1) The normal maximum probationary period shall be...

(2) Time spent on leave from Fairfield University will not ...

(3) Upon return from an approved maternity leave, an untenured faculty member may choose that the time of her probationary period toward tenure not include the academic year in which the maternity leave was taken. This declaration will be made in writing to the SVPAA by the 15th of October subsequent to a spring maternity leave or the 1st of March subsequent to a fall maternity leave. The faculty member will send copies of this letter to her department chair and Dean.

(4) A candidate may be required to spend up to …”

The motion passed unanimously.

**Proposed Handbook amendment updating the membership of the Educational Technologies Committee**

Prof. Ron Salafia presented on behalf of the Chair of the Educational Technologies Committee (ETC), who had a teaching conflict. He explained that for more than a year the *ex officio* membership of the ETC has been a problem because it includes positions that no longer exist. The proposal includes the following *ex officio* positions: SVPAA or designee, University Librarian or designee, Chief Information Officer, and the Directors of Academic Computing and the Media Center. He said that the holders of these positions currently attend ETC meetings as invited guests and work well with the faculty membership. He described the committee as remarkably efficient. At this point the floor was opened for questions.

Prof. Gisela Gil-Egui asked about the point of including both the Chief Information Officer (CIO) and the Director of Academic Computing. Prof. Salafia said that these are different offices with different responsibilities. Academic Computing interacts most with faculty while the CIO is in charge of all information technology on campus and works with the technology subcommittee of the Board of Trustees.

There were no further questions.

Motion [Salafia/Nantz]: to recommend that the Faculty Handbook description of the membership of the Educational Technologies Committee be amended as follows (deletions struck through, insertions underlined):

Seven members elected from the faculty for three-year overlapping terms; one member to be elected from each of the following electoral divisions: Behavioral and Social Sciences; Natural Sciences, Mathematics and Engineering; the Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions; School of Business; and School of Nursing; and two members from two different departments in the Humanities. The Directors of Library Services, Distance
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Education for University College, Administrative Computing, Media Center, and Computing and Network Services. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs or designee, the University Librarian or designee, the Chief Information Officer, and the Directors of Academic Computing and the Media Center shall be ex officio members.

The motion passed with 1 opposed and 1 abstention.

Informational presentation from the Core Curriculum Task Force

Profs. Dennis Keenan and Shannon Harding presented on behalf of the core curriculum task force. Prof. Keenan explained that this presentation was the first opportunity for people to hear about the proposal the task force is developing. It's intended to be informational; this isn't the time or place for debate. He said that the committee has met 16 times so far and has 3 more meetings scheduled before their report to the 2020 Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will then make their own report, but, of course, any recommendations regarding changes to the core will have to go through faculty governance structures.

Prof. Keenan then turned to the powerpoint presentation (attached to these minutes), which begins with a listing of the committee membership. As indicated on the next slide, the committee has reached consensus on a number of issues. They want a common educational experience for all undergraduates. They are concerned that faculty need to see how the core is integrated and convey that information to students. Faculty development might include an annual core curriculum workshop. There is also consensus that the core should include some rigorous interdisciplinary study opportunity, for example, cluster courses, team taught courses, or courses using guest lecturers. Students who have had these types of experiences offer positive feedback about them. Other areas of consensus are to eliminate: the third course in Area III (Religious Studies, Philosophy, Applied Ethics); one course in Area II (History, Social and Behavioral Sciences); one first year English course. Also, the core should be tiered, with writing and discourse integrated across tier 1. And the language requirement should be 2 courses across schools.

The next slide lists points of continued discussion, namely the required number of math and natural science courses, how to organize the 2 language courses and how to give the core pathways more prominence.

At this point, Prof. Keenan turned to the draft proposal. Tier One, entitled Orientation, includes introductory courses in English, History, Philosophy, and Religious Studies, along with language and math courses. Tier Two, Exploration, consists of courses in English, History, Math, Natural Science, Philosophy, Religious Studies, Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Visual and Performing Arts. The integration component would consist of a cluster of courses in Tier Two, or a team-taught course, or an individually taught course with a guest lecturer for at least 5 classes, or a course taught by an individual with broad enough expertise to be recognized by two different departments.

Ultimately, this proposal envisions a core of 15 or 16 3-credit courses (depending on how the student fulfills the integration component). The goal would be for students to complete Tier One by the end of their sophomore year. Furthermore, departments would be encouraged to offer US and World Diversity courses and service learning courses in Tier Two.

Prof. Harding concluded the presentation with a request for feedback at the 2020 site on the University webpage. She noted that all feedback will be forwarded to all members of the committee.

At this point, the floor was opened for questions.

Prof. Betsy Bowen observed that there is currently no one in charge of the core. She wondered if the task force had recommendations in this regard. Prof. Harding said there was some discussion of creating a Director of the Core position, or of making due with the current structure in which the UCC is in charge of the core.

Prof. Joan Lee asked whether they had considered integration within the major rather than just the core. Prof. Keenan said yes, that possibility had not been ruled out. He encouraged her to offer feedback in that vein on the website.
Prof. Boryczka wondered, given the report we just had from the FSC, and the way governance was circumvented, how confident is the task force that all of this work won't be overruled by the administration? Prof. Harding said that different members of the committee might give different responses—some are skeptical, some are optimistic, and the committee includes faculty and administrators. Prof. Keenan added, but whether we change the core or maintain the current core, the administration can't do it without us, we're the ones who offer the curriculum, we're in charge of it.

Prof. Doug Peduti, S.J. asked whether there had been any examination of how the current core and/or proposed changes compare with cores at other Jesuit schools. Prof. Harding said yes, we're on the high end in terms of number of courses required. That information is available on the website as well.

Prof. Vin Rosivach asked whether discussions had included consideration of part-time faculty. To do this seriously, we need more full-time faculty lines. Prof. Keenan said yes, we have discussed this issue, it's a huge concern of ours, and should be part of our formal proposal.

Prof. Liz Hohl added to the full-time/part-time discussion, a question about stabilizing part-time faculty who've been here for a number of years. She also asked whether the CAE was part of this discussion. Prof. Nantz is on the task force and part of the CAE.

Prof. Peter Bayers asked whether the task force has been talking about the reverberations vertically. Interdisciplinary majors and minors especially tend to rely on other departments and certain numbers of courses being offered in the core. Prof. Keenan said they had discussed these issues a little.

Prof. Mary Ann Carolan asked for a sense of timeline. Prof. Keenan said the report to the Steering Committee is due in mid December. He wasn't sure about the timeline after that. SVPAA Lynn Babington explained that the Steering Committee, including elected faculty members and the chairs of all of the task forces, will look at and rank order all recommendations. Some, like those concerning back office operations, can be directly implemented. Others, including those about the core, need to go through full committee structures. It's not clear how long that process will take.

Prof. McFadden asked whether the task force had been in contact with the task force on innovative pedagogy. Prof. Harding said that the core task force had 21 members and lots of issues to address, so they haven't had the opportunity to meet with others.

Prof. Dallavalle asked whether there would be a follow-up email about how to send feedback and Prof. Harding said yes.

Prof. Phil Lane asked whether they had the current core and proposed changes on a spreadsheet. Prof. Keenan said they didn't, but the proposal was to change from 60 credits to 45 or 48.

There were no further questions.

**Adjournment**

Before entertaining a motion to adjourn, Prof. Jones invited Prof. Shah Etemad to make an announcement on behalf of the Admissions and Scholarships Committee. They are holding a brown bag lunch on Monday, December 1, at 12:30 in the Faculty Dining Room. Dean of Enrollment, Karen Pellegrino, will be there to offer information and answer questions about the current freshmen class and upcoming admission goals.

**A motion to adjourn [Bowen/Patton] was uncontested at 4:53 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,
Prof. Susan Rakowitz
Secretary of the General Faculty
Faculty Salary Committee

Presentation to the General Faculty
November 21, 2014

Faculty Handbook

Faculty Salary Committee

General Purpose
To engage annually in collegial discussions regarding faculty salary and benefits with an administrative team appointed by the President.

[IC.1h.14 page 17]

2014-15 Memo of Understanding

In the spirit of collegiality, and in furtherance of the President’s directive for a more collaborative system of governance, the Administration agrees to work with the Faculty Salary Committee to discuss salaries as well as any and all benefits, to provide pertinent information; to receive recommendations concerning benefits and any substantive changes to benefits; to discuss salary and benefit changes; to be receptive to faculty participation in a cooperative process with the intent of arriving at a mutually agreed upon Memo of Understanding for 2015-16.

[Item O, page 4]

Trigger Committee

Specific Duties:
1. To receive from the administration in a timely manner data, assumptions, trends, and other information that underlie the annual health care contribution rate calculations;
2. To understand through reasonable inquiry and discussion with the administration how the rates have been calculated;
3. To ensure that the rates have been developed accurately and are consistent with prior years;
4. To report their findings to the faculty through the Faculty Salary Committee before the rates take effect.

Costs are below budget in AY 13-14

Employee portion in AY 13-14 Budget
Employee portion of actual AY 13-14 costs

Pctge Paid of Actual Costs
2013-14

21.4%

78.6%

Health Care Review Committee

Purpose
The purpose of this committee is to address on an ongoing basis the growth in the total cost of health care, which is of concern to both the faculty and the administration. Using all relevant and reasonably available data, including data on projected as well as actual health care costs in the aggregate, changing demographics, employee usage patterns and changes in stop-loss insurance costs, and with the help of the University’s consultant and other consultants as mutually agreed to and needed, the Committee is charged to:

1. Consider and make recommendations to the FSC and administration on ways to make plan participants more economically efficient users of health care;
2. Consider and make recommendations to the FSC and the administration on ways to reduce the increases to the cost of health care, and to monitor developments regarding the health care excise tax and make any recommendations deemed necessary and appropriate.
3. In any year when cost-sharing of health care premiums increase at any rate, consider and make recommendations to the FSC and the administration as to the appropriateness of said increases.

Summary

• Without an additional offset into the base, health insurance cost-shares should only increase for medical escalation.
• The FSC/Trigger Committee/HCRC must confirm that the “premium” is calculated accurately and fairly.
• Faculty need to stand in solidarity, and insist that governance be respected - in this instance and in every instance.
Core Curriculum Task Force

November 2014

Task Force Members

- Christine Siegel
- Mary Frances Malone
- Bob Epstein
- Shannon Harding
- Paul Lakeland
- Kathy Nantz
- Marice Rose '92
- Jonathan Stott
- Janet Struili
- John Thiel '73
- Audrey Beauvais
- Shah Etemad
- Walt Hlawitschka
- Valeria Martinez
- Joyce Shea
- Jocelyn Collien (Campus Ministry)
- Curtis Ferree (Library)
- Daniel Grazynski '10 (Alum)
- Mary Ross '78 (Alumna)

Points of Continued Discussion

1. Required number of mathematics courses
2. Required number of natural science courses
3. How to organize the two language courses
4. How to give the Core Pathways more prominence

Areas of Consensus

1. Common educational experience
2. Disposition of faculty with respect to the core curriculum
3. Core Curriculum Workshop
4. Rigorous interdisciplinary study
5. Eliminate the third course in Area III
6. Eliminate one course in Area II
7. One first year English course
8. Tier the Core Curriculum
9. Commit to integrating writing and discourse across Tier 1
10. Language requirement of two courses

Tier One: Orientation

- English: Writing as Craft and Inquiry
- History: Origins of the Modern World
- Language (two courses)
- Mathematics
- Introduction to Philosophy
- Exploring Religion
Tier Two: Exploration

- English
- History
- Mathematics
- Natural Science
- Philosophy
- Religious Studies
- Social and Behavioral Sciences
- Visual and Performing Arts

Integration Component

- Option I: A cluster of two courses in Tier Two
- Option II: One course taught in one of the following formats:
  1. A team-taught course
  2. An individually-taught course with a single guest lecturer for 5 classes
  3. An individually-taught course for which the Professor has expertise in two academic disciplines (as approved by the departments representing the disciplines)

Final Notes

- TOTAL: 16 courses / 48 credits*
  - *Students satisfying the integration component with cluster courses in Tier 2 would have a total of 15 courses / 45 credits
- It is highly recommended that students complete Tier One by the end of their sophomore year
- Departments are encouraged to offer courses in Tier Two that satisfy the requirements of a U.S. Diversity course, a World Diversity course, and service learning courses.

Written Feedback

1. Enter Fairfield 2020 site from the University webpage [http://www.fairfield.edu/](http://www.fairfield.edu/)
2. Click on "Core Curriculum comments should be submitted here"
3. Type your comments in the box provided and hit submit
4. Comments will be sent directly to the e-mail of the Core Curriculum Task Force chair who will forward them to all members
Proposed *Handbook* amendment creating a Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty

**Motion forwarded from the Academic Council to the General Faculty**

recommend that the General Faculty amend the *Faculty Handbook* (Eleventh edition 2013) by inserting on page 12 before the Committee on Student Life (and renumbering accordingly here and in the Table of Contents) the following text:

5. Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty

**Membership**

Three members of the General Faculty, at least one with tenure, elected for three-year overlapping terms in the usual manner, and three non-tenure track faculty members elected for three-year overlapping terms by the non-tenure track faculty in an election overseen by the Secretary of the General Faculty each spring. The SVPAA or his/her designee shall be an *ex officio* member. The election of the three non-tenure track members will take place before the election of members from the General Faculty, and committee membership shall include at most three members from the College of Arts and Sciences. Non-tenure track faculty members serve for three years as long as they are employed at Fairfield. Members with part-time faculty status receive a stipend equal to 1/8 of their stipend for one course for each semester they serve on this committee.

**General Purpose**

To study and make recommendations on issues regarding non-tenure track faculty.

**Specific Duties**

1. To draft or review policies on matters pertaining to non-tenure track faculty.
2. To receive suggestions from any source on matters pertaining to non-tenure track faculty.
3. To facilitate interaction between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty.
4. To promote professional development of non-tenure track faculty.

**Chronology**

1. September 9, 2013: AC created a subcommittee “to consider developing a general purpose for a *Faculty Handbook* committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty employment, roles, and conditions.”
2. May 13, 2014: Subcommittee reported to the AC (report attached, pages 14-16)
3. May 13, 2014: AC voted to recommend creation of a Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty (excerpt of minutes attached, pages 16-19)
4. August 19, 2014: Per the *Handbook*, the GFS asked the President to “report in writing to the Academic Council either agreement or disagreement with the proposed amendment”.
5. September 15, 2014: President von Arx reported disagreement with the proposed amendment, “I am not agreeing to the second motion regarding the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty until the administration and the Executive Committee of the Academic Council agree to the parameters of the committee – composition, charge to the committee, responsibilities, deliverables. SVPAA Lynn Babington will work with the Executive Committee and the Academic Council on this matter.”
6. October 6, 2014: AC discussed the President’s response (excerpt of minutes attached, page 19)
7. October 27, 2014: SVPAA Babington sent a memo to the ACEC regarding the President’s concerns (attached, pages 19-21)
8. November 10, 2014: AC discussed the SVPAA’s memo (excerpt of minutes attached, pages 21-22)
9. December 1, 2014: AC approved a revised description of the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty (excerpt of minutes attached, pages 22-23)

10. January 7, 2015: Per the Handbook, the GFS asked the President to report his agreement or disagreement with the revised proposed amendment.

11. January 8, 2015: The President responded with disagreement, asking that the General Purpose, “To study and make recommendations on the employment conditions of non-tenure track faculty” be changed to “To study and make recommendations regarding non-tenure track faculty.”

12. February 17, 2015: AC approved a revised description of the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty (excerpt of minutes attached, page 24)

13. February 26, 2015: Per the Handbook, the GFS asked the President to report his agreement or disagreement with the revised proposed amendment.

14. March 1, 2015: The President reported agreement with the revised proposed amendment (shown above).

Report from AC subcommittee on Handbook Committee for non-tenure track faculty:

MEMORANDUM
Fairfield University

TO: Academic Council
FROM: AC Subcommittee on consideration of a Handbook Committee for Non-Tenure Track Faculty
DATE: April 25, 2014
RE: Subcommittee Report

At its meeting on September 9, 2013, the Council passed the following motion:

MOTION. That the AC empower the AC Executive Committee to appoint a subcommittee composed of administrators, tenure-track faculty, non-tenure track faculty, and staff to consider developing a general purpose for a Faculty Handbook committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty employment, roles, and conditions. The subcommittee shall also provide a membership requirement and specific duties for such a Handbook committee. The subcommittee will report back to the Academic Council at the March 2014 meeting.

Following a call for volunteers, the Executive Committee appointed the following individuals who were all willing to serve: Paul Fitzgerald, Elizabeth Hohl, Sonya Huber, Christina McGowan, Irene Mulvey, Cliff Price and Margo Ramlal-Nankoe. At the first meeting, the Subcommittee elected Irene Mulvey as Chair. The Subcommittee met in person a number of times and completed some of its work by email.

Discussions within the Subcommittee were engaging and extremely productive. In particular, the three non-tenure track faculty members were able to articulate the concerns and problems faced by non-tenure track faculty at Fairfield as well as to communicate very clearly the enormous value our non-tenure track faculty colleagues bring to our community.
The Subcommittee is unanimous in its strong recommendation that a Faculty Handbook Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty be established. In the rest of this report, we present the rationale for our recommendation and we propose draft text for such a Handbook committee.

Rationale for the Subcommittee’s Recommendation.
Thirty years ago, non-tenure track faculty members were hired because of their expertise in a particular area or because of the need to cover classes due to sabbaticals and temporary enrollment surges. This is simply no longer the case – now non-tenure track faculty are hired routinely and in abundance; they are an essential part of our higher educational system. In particular, they are an essential component of the instructional faculty at Fairfield and will be for the foreseeable future. The Subcommittee’s position is that it is well past time for the University to establish a Handbook committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty.

Currently, hiring and evaluation of non-tenure track faculty members are accomplished on an ad hoc basis depending on the department or program. Hiring and evaluation of instructional faculty are of the utmost importance to our educational mission, and a Handbook Committee will draft policies to provide structure and clarity.

Hiring and evaluation are pressing concerns, but the Subcommittee’s position is that there is a policy vacuum when it comes to non-tenure track faculty. Unilaterally drafted contract letters (also known as letters of agreement), limited library privileges and truncated email access were discussed as examples where policy initiatives are needed. Without clearly stated policy, the working conditions of non-tenure track faculty become a concern. The Subcommittee is certain that this list is not exhaustive. Our strong recommendation is that a Handbook Committee is needed in order to draft, vet and approve policies on a variety of matters affecting non-tenure track faculty and, ultimately, our core educational mission.

To our specific charge, the Subcommittee strongly recommends the establishment of a Handbook Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty because such a committee will support our core academic mission by making visible and more protected our non-tenure track faculty colleagues and this will, ultimately, benefit non-tenure track faculty, full-time faculty, the University, our educational mission and our students.

Draft language for a Faculty Handbook Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty.

MOTION to amend the Faculty Handbook (Eleventh edition 2013) by inserting on page 12 before the Committee on Student Life (and renumbering accordingly here and in the Table of Contents) the following text:

5. Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty.

Membership
Three members of the General Faculty, at least one with tenure, elected for three-year overlapping terms in the usual manner, and three non-tenure track faculty members elected for three-year overlapping terms by the non-tenure track faculty in an election overseen by the Secretary of the General Faculty each spring. The election of the three non-tenure track members will take place before the election of members from the General Faculty, and committee membership shall include at most three members from the College of Arts and Sciences. Non-tenure track faculty members serve for three years as long as they are employed at Fairfield. Members with part-time faculty status receive a stipend equal to 1/8 of their stipend for one course for each semester they serve on this committee.

General Purpose
To study and make recommendations on the employment and the employment conditions of non-tenure track faculty, and to represent non-tenure track faculty.
Specific Duties

1. To draft or review policies on any matter pertaining to non-tenure track faculty;
2. To receive concerns and suggestions from any source on matters pertaining to non-tenure track faculty;
3. To facilitate interaction between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty;
4. To promote the professional development of part-time faculty;
5. To receive from the Office of Human Resources each semester a list of non-tenure track faculty with contact information.

Other Matters.
Items came up during our discussion that went beyond our charge but that we would like to bring to the attention of the Academic Council.

Generally, non-tenure track faculty members have limited venues for resolution of professional concerns. Our discussions led us to consider whether or not this Handbook Committee should play a role in such matters for our contingent faculty colleagues. If the Handbook Committee is established, we recommend that the committee take up the matter of establishing a well-defined, independent position of ombudsperson for non-tenure track faculty.

We also recommend that the Handbook Committee, if approved, consider taking up the matter of non-tenure track faculty participation in faculty governance. We include as an appendix an AAUP Report, “The Inclusion in Governance of Faculty Members Holding Contingent Appointments” approved by the AAUP in November 2012. The recommendations in the report go well beyond our charge, but we include the report here since the report does support our recommendation and could be the basis for further progress.

Note that our Handbook language includes a stipend for non-tenure track faculty serving on the Handbook Committee. We think it is absolutely essential to compensate non-tenure track faculty who volunteer and are elected to take on this task.

Excerpt from AC minutes of 5/13/14:

4. g. Subcommittee to consider Faculty Handbook committee on NTT Faculty

Prof. Mulvev, chair of the subcommittee, thanked Prof. Hohl and the other members of the subcommittee for their great work on the subcommittee. She briefly reviewed the subcommittee’s three-page report, which had been included in the packet of materials, noting that the report included the subcommittee’s unanimous recommendation that a Faculty Handbook Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty be established, along with its detailed rationale for this recommendation, and other matters that came up but were considered beyond the charge of the committee. The floor was opened up for questions.

Prof. Dennin asked about the committee’s view of how the elections for the non-tenure track faculty members would be conducted.

Prof. Mulvex responded that this item was deliberately left out of the proposal. The principle is that the contingent faculty representatives should be elected by the contingent faculty members and that this should be arranged by the Secretary of the General Faculty.

Prof. Hohl noted that once Human Resources comes up with list of potential adjunct representatives, several names could be forwarded and voted on. She further noted that it is important to routinize the establishment of the members.

Prof. Rakowitz praised the process as long overdue, but asked if the committee had considered eligibility limitations for the committee members.
Prof. Mulvey said the committee did not see a need for eligibility limitations, but she did note that the committee was concerned that contingent faculty members might need to be replaced (by our usual process) if they weren’t teaching at Fairfield for their entire terms.

Prof. Hohl added that the committee members hoped there would be a self-selection process.

Dean Crabtree responded that many of Handbook committees have ex officio members and asked if this option had been considered.

SVPAA Fitzgerald supported this suggestion, explaining that, though this option was not discussed within the committee, having a mix of full-time and part-time and administrators would be a good idea.

Prof. Thiel thought that item 2 under Specific Duties needed clarification. A contingent faculty member with a problem should go to their chair and then their Dean, but given the language under Item 2, a contingent faculty member might feel that it would be appropriate to take a personnel problem to this committee.

Prof. Mulvey explained that, under other matters, the committee members were considering setting up an ombudsperson for problems that might require independent mediation. They did not anticipate this subcommittee receiving individual or personnel complaints, and intended that the chair or dean should still be the first stop for a contingent faculty member with those kinds of concerns.

Prof. Mulvey recommended that we remove the word “concerns” to make it suggestions. Prof. Crabtree explained that it is a Dean’s responsibility to tell people where they need to turn to have an issue discussed. If the word “concerns” came out, it might imbue any issue with an affective dimension.

Chair Rafalski thanked Profs. Hohl and Mulvey for the report and opened the floor to entertain motions about the proposal.

MOTION (Mulvey/Fitzgerald): To recommend that the General Faculty amend the Faculty Handbook (Eleventh edition 2013) by inserting on page 12 before the Committee on Student Life (and renumbering accordingly here and in the Table of Contents) the following text:

5. Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty.

Membership
Three members of the General Faculty, at least one with tenure, elected for three-year overlapping terms in the usual manner, and three non-tenure track faculty members elected for three-year overlapping terms by the non-tenure track faculty in an election overseen by the Secretary of the General Faculty each spring. The election of the three non-tenure track members will take place before the election of members from the General Faculty, and committee membership shall include at most three members from the College of Arts and Sciences. Non-tenure track faculty members serve for three years as long as they are employed at Fairfield. Members with part-time faculty status receive a stipend equal to 1/8 of their stipend for one course for each semester they serve on this committee.

General Purpose
To study and make recommendations on the employment and the employment conditions of non-tenure track faculty, and to represent non-tenure track faculty.

Specific Duties
1. To draft or review policies on any matter pertaining to non-tenure track faculty;
2. To receive concerns and suggestions from any source on matters pertaining to non-tenure track faculty;
3. To facilitate interaction between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty;
4. To promote the professional development of part-time faculty;
5. To receive from the Office of Human Resources each semester a list of non-tenure track faculty with contact information.
SVPPAA Fitzgerald endorsed as a healthy suggestion the motion to include General Faculty members as well as part-time faculty members, who teach 40% of courses at the University. He offered an amendment to give the SVPPAA or her designee voting privileges, since faculty and administrators often work together to solve problems and should have equal status. Although the SVPPAA has veto power, he noted that it’s helpful to have an equal voice.

**MOTION TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION.** (Fitzgerald/Downie): To insert into the original motion “The SVPPAA or his/her designee shall be a voting, ex officio member.”

**MOTION TO AMEND THE AMENDMENT.** (Mulvey/Dennin) To replace “a voting” with “an” in the motion to amend.

Prof. Steffen asked about the frequency of committees on which the SVPPAA sits without voting power, since the person’s presence is designed to provide expertise.

Prof. Mulvey said that administrators being given voting privileges on committees has been haphazard and does not have any underlying principle about expertise.

Prof. Thiel spoke against amendment, since he agreed that an administrator should be allowed to vote. He noted that Deans should not have the opportunity to vote, since they and SVPPAA would vote as a block. In this case, however, the administrator should have a vote.

Prof. Greenberg spoke in favor of the motion against allowing administrators to vote, pointing out that we have shared input, not shared governance. Giving the vote to administrators is not warranted. SVPPAA Fitzgerald contended that faculty members make decisions about our most important issues. Prof. Greenberg referred the SVPPAA to the Yeshiva case and Justice Brennan’s dissent, which points out that faculty are employees, whereas administrators in fact make more fundamental decisions about faculty welfare.

Prof. Dennin spoke in favor of not giving the administrator voting privileges. Since it is haphazard, we should probably remove the voting privilege for administrators.

**MOTION (Thiel/Fitzgerald). To call the question.**
**MOTION PASSED**

**MOTION TO AMEND THE AMENDMENT PASSED:** 12 in favor, 3 opposed, 1 abstaining

**MOTION TO AMEND (AS AMENDED).** To insert into the original motion “The SVPPAA or his/her designee shall be an ex officio member.”

In returning to the revised amendment, Prof. Mulvey explained that the Subcommittee had omitted putting an administrator on the committee, and was in favor of allowing the SVPPAA or his/her designee to serve.

**MOTION (Fitzgerald/Downie). To call the question.**
**MOTION PASSED**

**MOTION TO AMEND (AS AMENDED) PASSED:** 16 in favor, none opposed and none abstaining.

Prof. Mulvey added that she would like to remove the words “concerns, and” from the revised motion to clarify what should be brought to the committee.

**MOTION TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION.** (Mulvey/Steffen) To remove the words “concerns and” from specific duties number 2.
**MOTION PASSED** 15 -1- 0

Prof. Downie spoke in favor of the revised motion as an example why we need to review all the committee structures in Handbook Committees.
MOTION AS AMENDED: To recommend that the General Faculty amend the Faculty Handbook (Eleventh edition 2013) by inserting on page 12 before the Committee on Student Life (and renumbering accordingly here and in the Table of Contents) the following text:

5. Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty.

Membership
Three members of the General Faculty, at least one with tenure, elected for three-year overlapping terms in the usual manner, and three non-tenure track faculty members elected for three-year overlapping terms by the non-tenure track faculty in an election overseen by the Secretary of the General Faculty each spring. The SVPAA or his/her designee shall be an ex officio member. The election of the three non-tenure track members will take place before the election of members from the General Faculty, and committee membership shall include at most three members from the College of Arts and Sciences. Non-tenure track faculty members serve for three years as long as they are employed at Fairfield. Members with part-time faculty status receive a stipend equal to 1/8 of their stipend for one course for each semester they serve on this committee.

General Purpose
To study and make recommendations on the employment and the employment conditions of non-tenure track faculty, and to represent non-tenure track faculty.

Specific Duties
1. To draft or review policies on any matter pertaining to non-tenure track faculty;
2. To receive suggestions from any source on matters pertaining to non-tenure track faculty;
3. To facilitate interaction between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty;
4. To promote the professional development of part-time faculty;
5. To receive from the Office of Human Resources each semester a list of non-tenure track faculty with contact information.

MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 16 in favor, none opposed, none abstaining.

Excerpt from AC minutes of 10/6/14:

a. Discussion of AC approved amendment to the Faculty Handbook for Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Prof. Mulvey reminded the Council that the Motion on p. 10 is what the Council already approved. Page 11 is the President’s objections. What he is asking for, Mulvey suggested, (composition, charge, responsibilities) is already in the approved amendment.

SVPAA Babington said that she’d speak to the President about this motion. She explained that the president wants to clarify some language to bring back to the Council, mainly related to the responsibilities of the Committee. In addition, SVPAA Babington recommends taking out duty #5, which implies that HR can provide lists of adjunct faculty, because their lists are not necessarily up to date. SVPAA Babington said that her adjunct lists are more accurate. Further, SVPAA Babington feels that this should be an advisory committee to AC, not to anybody else. These two items are the type of thing that SVPAA Babington will speak about with the President. She does not think this will be a problem—just a few language tweaks. She will work with the President and bring proposed revisions to our next meeting.

Memo from SVPAA Babington to ACEC (10/27/14):
Dear Colleagues,

This is the President von Arx’s response to the Academic Council’s request to form a committee on non-tenure track faculty. Father von Arx welcomes the development of a committee on non-tenured track faculty. One of the first requests he will make of this committee is to foster development of a new employment category for non-tenure track faculty that provides greater job stability and professional development.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Best regards,

Lynn

Lynn Babington, PhD, RN
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs
Robert Wood Johnson Executive Nurse Fellow

AS APPROVED BY THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL ON MAY 13, 2014

MOTION to recommend that the General Faculty amend the Faculty Handbook (Eleventh edition 2013) by inserting on page 12 before the Committee on Student Life (and renumbering accordingly here and in the Table of Contents) the following text:

5. Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty.

Membership

Three members of the General Faculty, at least one with tenure, elected for three-year overlapping terms in the usual manner, and three non-tenure track faculty members elected for three-year overlapping terms by the non-tenure track faculty in an election overseen by the Secretary of the General Faculty each spring. The SVPAA or his/her designee shall be an ex officio member. The election of the three non-tenure track members will take place before the election of members from the General Faculty, and committee membership shall include at most three members from the College of Arts and Sciences. Non-tenure track faculty members serve for three years as long as they are employed at Fairfield. Members with part-time faculty status receive a stipend equal to 1/8 of their stipend for one course for each semester they serve on this committee.

General Purpose

To study and make recommendations on the employment and the employment conditions of non-tenure track faculty, and to represent non-tenure track faculty.

Specific Duties

1. To draft or review policies on any matter pertaining to non-tenure track faculty;
2. To receive suggestions from any source on matters pertaining to non-tenure track faculty;
3. To facilitate interaction between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty;
4. To promote the professional development of part-time faculty;
5. To receive from the Office of Human Resources each semester a list of non-tenure track faculty with contact information.

WITH CHANGES PROPOSED BY THE PRESIDENT SHOWN
AND RATIONALE FOR THOSE CHANGES PROVIDED

New language in boldface and underlined.

[Deleted text in brackets and strikethrough]

5. Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty.
Membership

Three members of the General Faculty, at least one with tenure, elected for three-year overlapping terms in the usual manner, and three non-tenure track faculty members elected for three-year overlapping terms by the non-tenure track faculty in an election overseen by the Secretary of the General Faculty each spring. The SVPAA or his/her designee shall be an ex officio member. The election of the three non-tenure track members will take place before the election of members from the General Faculty, and committee membership shall include at most three members from the College of Arts and Sciences. Non-tenure track faculty members serve for three years as long as they are employed at Fairfield. Members with part-time faculty status receive a stipend equal to 1/8 of their stipend for one course for each semester they serve on this committee.

General Purpose:

To study and make recommendations to the Academic Council on the employment and the employment conditions of non-tenure track faculty, and to represent non-tenure track faculty.

Change: Eliminate "employment and"
Rationale: Faculty do not make recommendations on employing non-tenure track faculty.

Change: Eliminate "and to represent non-tenure track faculty"
Rationale: Non-tenure track faculty are not represented by the general faculty.

Specific Duties:

1. To draft or review policies on any matter pertaining to non-tenure track faculty;
Change: Eliminate “any”
Rationale: There are University policies (HR, employment) where faculty do not have input.

2. To receive suggestions from any source on matters pertaining to non-tenure track faculty;
3. To facilitate interaction between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty
4. To promote professional development of part-time non-tenure track faculty;
5. To receive from the Office of Human Resources each semester a list of non-tenure track faculty with contact information.

Change: Eliminate it’s entirety
Rationale: A list of employees (including faculty) with contact information is not publicly available. Such requests are evaluated on a case by case basis.

Excerpt from AC minutes of 11/10/14:

6a. Discussion of AC approved amendment to the Faculty Handbook for Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Referring to page 31 of the packet, Prof. Rakowitz explained that both A and B are amendments the AC approved for the Handbook. The President was asked to report his agreement or disagreement; for these two he reported he disagreed. We can do one of three things: send to the GF as the AC passed; we can amend in light of the President's response; or we can rescind them. She wants guidance on what to do with these items. The items that were passed appear on page 30 and pages 31-32 show the changes on what the Council passed.

Prof. Preli asked whether this is more than minor tweaking. In a previous meeting we said it would come back to the AC if more than minor tweaking.

Prof. Thiel commented I don’t know why sending our version to the GF would be sensible because the President has offered a counterproposal. I think we have to understand and discuss it but that won’t happen before the next GF meeting.

Prof. Mulvey added, unless we are okay with these suggestions.

Prof. Thiel said I think there are issues to discuss and we are not going to be able to do it in ten minutes.
Prof. Rakowitz agreed, adding that she did not want to send forward the one we passed and have the BOT overturn it. She also has problems with the counterproposal and doesn’t know what other people think of it.

Prof. Mulvey stated, I don’t have problem with the first part and removing “rep” is not a big deal either. Item 5 is a huge problem because people on the committee said we need this but maybe having a Handbook committee would take care of this. I could live with these in order to move this forward.

Prof. Crawford said I sort of agree with Prof. Mulvey. My concern was with number 5 but if HR isn’t the place to get it and if it’s the first charge of this committee then ok.

SVPAA Babington offered, if this committee is formed and there is a request to send this information from the SVP’s office, that’s no problem but HR can’t send it as a privacy issue.

Prof. Yarrington agreed with moving this forward. This committee can get the information it needs and not involve HR.

**MOTION [Yarrington/Wheeler]: To accept the President’s revisions and move this forward to the General Faculty.**

Prof. Thiel is against the motion as too precipitous, observing he doesn’t know what the rush is and why it has to be the next GF meeting. For Item 1 under general purpose, this is not in the genre of Handbook language and it’s a very intentional change—the charge to the other committee doesn’t say this. He would like to ask what’s behind this particular language. In addition, “to study” is not grammatically correct. This needs to be more deliberative.

**MOTION FAILED 7 in favor; 9 opposed; 0 abstentions**

Prof. Preli explained that this will come back at the next meeting of the AC to discuss.

---

Excerpt from AC minutes of 12/1/14:

b. *Discussion of the Academic Council Approved Amendment to the Faculty Handbook for a Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty*

Prof. Rakowitz introduced this matter by detailing the history of the Council’s approved text for a Handbook amendment constituting this committee and the President’s proposed revision of the text, which was now under consideration.

Prof. Thiel asked SVPAA Babington why the President’s revision made a specific issue of the committee’s making recommendations specifically “to the Academic Council.” All *Handbook* committees do so when making formal policy recommendations. It seemed as though this specific language, which is not typical of *Handbook* committee descriptions, has the intention of restricting the workings of the committee. SVPAA Babington replied that there was no such intention in the revised language and, given the understanding of the workings of the governance structure, she imagined that eliminating the words “to the Academic Council” would be acceptable to the President.

Prof. Mulvey **moved that the Council extend speaking privileges to Prof. Elizabeth Hohl**, who was attending as an observer; seconded Prof. Steffen.

The motion **PASSED**: 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

Prof. Hohl stated that initially she had concerns about the President’s revised language but that now, in light of administrative clarifications, her concerns have been addressed. Prof. Hohl stated that the proposed committee would provide visibility to non-tenure track faculty, as well as the prospect of constructive change.

Prof. Mulvey observed that if the phrase “to the Academic Council” in the revised language carries no specific meaning, since all *Handbook* committees make recommendations to the Academic Council for the formal approval of policy on the part of the Council, then it should be eliminated. She noted that any committee may make appropriate recommendations to other quarters of the university.
Prof. Rakowitz asked why the SVPAA intended to bring the issue of new non-tenure track faculty categories to this proposed committee, as she has stated she would. Given the fact that the administration had narrowed the scope of the committee’s work to addressing the “employment conditions” of non-tenure track faculty it was unclear to her how the creation of new professorial categories was a matter of employment conditions. SVPAA Babington replied that she understood the creation of new professorial categories to fall under the auspices of employment conditions. Prof. Thiel asked why the SVPAA had not come to the Academic Council this year to raise the question of new professorial categories. SVPAA Babington replied that she had been advised not to do so by other members of the Council’s Executive Committee. Prof. Mulvey said that she disagreed with the rationale for the elimination of the words “and to represent non-tenure track faculty” in the President’s revised language, to wit, that non-tenure track faculty, the President holds, are not represented by the General Faculty. They may be represented by the General Faculty, Prof. Mulvey claimed. Yet, she stated, the approval of the revised language does not at all entail the approval of particular rationales for that language and she saw no problem with the revised language on this point.

Prof. Mulvey moved that the Council approve the revised Handbook language for the creation of a Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty on pp. 31-32 in the packet for the Council meeting of November 3, 2014, with the elimination of the phrase “to the Academic Council” under “General Purposes” and changing the word “matter” to “matters” under the first of the “Specific Duties”; seconded Prof. Steffen. The text set forth in the motion is:

5. Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Membership
Three members of the General Faculty, at least one with tenure, elected for three-year overlapping terms in the usual manner, and three non-tenure track faculty members elected for three-year overlapping terms by the non-tenure track faculty in an election overseen by the Secretary of the General Faculty each spring. The SVPAA or his/her designee shall be an ex officio member. The election of the three non-tenure track members will take place before the election of members from the General Faculty, and committee membership shall include at most three members from the College of Arts and Sciences. Non-tenure track faculty members serve for three years as long as they are employed at Fairfield. Members with part-time faculty status receive a stipend equal to 1/8 of their stipend for one course for each semester they serve on this committee.

General Purpose
To study and make recommendations on the employment conditions of non-tenure track faculty.

Specific Duties
1. To draft or review policies on matters pertaining to non-tenure track faculty.
2. To receive suggestions from any source on matters pertaining to non-tenure track faculty.
3. To facilitate interaction between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty.
4. To promote professional development of non-tenure track faculty.

Prof. Petrino spoke in favor of the motion, noting the need for this committee. There are issues in the relations between non-tenure track faculty and administration, she said, that go beyond the purview of Deans and department chairs.

In response to a question from Prof. Rakowitz regarding faculty contact information, SVPAA Babington stated that the President was unwilling to include in the Handbook anything that appeared to be a mandate to provide personnel information to a third party. She said that in practice her office could and would supply contact information for non-tenure track faculty to the constituted committee.

The motion PASSED: 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions
Excerpt from AC minutes of 2/17/15:

**Discussion of AC approved amendment to the Faculty Handbook for Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty**

Faculty Secretary Rakowitz stated that the President disagreed with the HB amendment as passed by the AC and recommended the following changes to the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty’s charge (see Correspondence in the packet for today’s meeting):

**From:** To study and make recommendations on the employment conditions of Non-Tenure Track Faculty  
**To:** To study and make recommendations on Non-Tenure Track Faculty

SVPAA Babington stated that that word “employment” limited the expansiveness of the committee. Prof. Thiel states that the language we put forward was good. SVPAA Babington stated previously that she thought the President would have little concern but seeing his suggested changes now thinks that the employment conditions as noted is very limiting. It involves all sorts of issues and concerns. Prof. Thiel stated we could not accept the President’s language because it was not grammatical. The "study and recommendations" have to target something. Prof. Thiel suggested we could do one of two things, either put our language forward and then be turned down or collaborate on appropriate language. AC Chair Preli asked if there was any further discussion. Prof. Crawford asked about making a motion concerning the language.

**MOTION [Thiel/Mulvey]:** revise the language to read: to study and make recommendations on all issues regarding non-tenure track faculty.

**MOTION [Mulvey/Steffen]:** amend the pending motion to delete the word “all”.

**Discussion on Amendment:** Prof. Dennin asked if the wording means “all issues” or just what the committee decides to take up. Executive Secretary Mulvey stated that for instance the Salary Committee approved adjunct salary increases earlier this year and she would not have wanted to be required to have this committee also approve. She said she would hate to see us move forward with something ambiguous. Prof. Thiel states the wording does not imply that the committee has to adjudicate on these issues, that it’s not necessarily a funnel. Their charge is to study an issue and make recommendations. Prof. Steffen: if we delete “all”, if we just say “on issues”, that would leave it open to any issue that might come up. It might alleviate the fuzziness. Prof. Thiel thinks the President is concerned about the wording “employment conditions” because it’s not legal language. It might be good language, but the new wording is inclusive and does not necessarily alleviate the discussion of employment. Prof. Dennin mentions that this issue would have to be studied by the committee. Prof. Greenberg states that the committee can make recommendations to Academic Council and the body can reject any recommendations they make. It does not HAVE to go to this committee.

Chair Preli asked that the members speak for or against the current motion or vote to amend.

Executive Secretary Mulvey speaks in favor of the motion because it does not include “all”. Prof. Greenberg speaks against the amendment stating that this could give a loophole to administration trying to short circuit an appropriate faculty issues. Faculty Secretary Rakowitz speaks against the amendment because the ambiguity is there anyway. She states that the same ambiguity is in the former language. Executive Secretary Mulvey does not understand Greenberg’s objections. Prof. Crawford does not see where the discussion is going since we were originally trying to clarify the language. He states that if you are making recommendations then how could the committee be precluded from doing that. Prof. Steffen states that he feels from the initial language to the present, the language opens up. He is for the amendment. Prof. Nguyen is in favor for the motion and thinks that the language clears up the ambiguity.

**MOTION TO AMEND PASSED:** 17 in favor; 1 opposed; 0 abstentions  
**MOTION (as amended) PASSED** 18 in favor; 0 opposed; 0 abstentions
Proposed *Handbook* amendment deleting the University College Committee

On March 2, 2015, the Academic Council passed the following motion:

recommend that the General Faculty amend the *Faculty Handbook* (Eleventh edition 2013) by deleting the following entry and renumbering the committee that follows:

**University College Committee**

**Membership**

Six members elected from the faculty for three-year overlapping terms as follows: three from the College of Arts and Sciences to include one each from the areas of Humanities, Natural Sciences, Mathematics and Engineering, Behavioral and Social Sciences; one from the School of Business; one from the School of Nursing; and one from the Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions. The Dean of University College or the Dean’s delegate shall be a voting member.

**General Purpose**

To act as a formal communications link between the faculty and the undergraduate and graduate components of University College on matters of educational and administrative policies.

**Specific Duties**

i. to study and make recommendations on academic policies for the undergraduate and graduate programs.

ii. to maintain liaison with the standing committees on Undergraduate Curriculum, Educational Planning and Student Life.

iii. to advise the Administration on policies.

Background:

On November 4, 2013, the Academic Council passed a motion to dissolve the Committee on University College, followed by a motion directed to the Committee on Committees:

Given the vote to dissolve the Committee on University College, that the Committee on Committees bring to the Academic Council language for the *Handbook* and the Journal of Record to implement the dissolution.

The Committee on Committee’s report, dated 10/15/14, was taken up by the AC on 3/2/15.

Excerpt from draft AC minutes of 3/2/15

a. Report from Committee on Committees re language for Journal of Record and *Handbook* to implement the dissolution of University College (Pending G; materials in November AC packet)

Professor Rakowitz reported that University College closed two years ago. At that time Committee on Committees was charged to suggest revision of language of the Journal of Record and *Faculty Handbook* removing University College. The Committee on Committees has now recommended these changes, as given on page 16 of the November 2014 Academic Council Meeting packet. The proposal is to clean up the language after closing University College.

Professor Preli requested a motion covering all changes. Professor Rakowitz said two separate motions will be needed- one for Journal of Record and one for the *Handbook*.

**Motion 1 (Rakowitz/Greenberg): Move to recommend deletion of entry for University College Committee in the *Faculty Handbook* and renumbering of the committee that follows.**

**Motion passed unanimously 15-0-0**