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 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

General Faculty

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

[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

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.

Employee portion in AY 13-14 Budget

Pctge Paid of Projected Budget 2013-14

19.9%
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 cost, 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-shares 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.
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

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 Striuli
- John Thiel '73

- Audrey Beauvais
- Shah Etemad
- Walt Hiawitschka
- Valeria Martinez
- Joyce Shea
- Jocelyn Collen (Campus Ministry)
- Curtis Ferree (Library)
- Daniel Grazynski '10 (Alum)
- Mary Ross '78 (Alumna)

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/
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