Fairfield University
General Faculty Meeting
October 23, 2015
Minutes of Meeting

These minutes were approved by the General Faculty on January 22, 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proxies were held by</th>
<th>for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Murray</td>
<td>Phil Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Schwab</td>
<td>Marice Rose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chair Alison Kris called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

1. **Update on the Capital Campaign from President Jeffrey von Arx, S.J. and VP Wally Halas**

President Jeffrey von Arx, S.J. began with a few comments about the difficulties of being a lifelong Mets fan meeting with alumni in Chicago during the recent Mets/Cubs playoffs. That was one of the many road trips he has been on since the public phase of the campaign launched with a dinner with the Board of Trustees and other donors on September 30. He felt this was a good time to review where we are and how we got there. Today's presentation would be very similar to the presentation given to the Board.

At this point Vice President Wally Halas began going through the attached presentation. Noting that advancement means improving, moving forward, getting better, he said that that's what the campaign tries to do. It allows a tuition dependent school to do the kind of things we can't always get done. For example, past campaigns have given us the Dolan School of Business, Egan Chapel, and the Walsh Athletic Center.

The campaign, named Fairfield Rising, has a goal of $160,000,000. The silent phase began in July of 2011 and the hope is that the goal will be exceeded by the time the campaign ends in December of 2017.

There are three funding priorities. One is investing in people i.e., scholarships, financial aid, and faculty. The next priority is innovative leading edge programs like Integrated Health Studies. The third priority is facilities including Rafferty Stadium, where a concert will be held tomorrow, the renovation of the Rec Plex, and the new nursing and health sciences building.

As of September 30, $115,014,103 has been raised. There are an additional $5,500,000 in verbal commitments and currently $4,995,000 in asks. The campaign is on target for the interim goal of $140,000,000 by June 30, 2016. As can be seen in figure 5, when the nursing/health sciences building was added, the allocation goals were revised to increase the funds for facilities within the $160,000,000 overall goal. The university has even greater needs, so the plan is to exceed that overall goal by December 31, 2017.

VP Halas went on to review the academic priorities: a health sciences center, endowments for deans and faculty, naming opportunities for schools, endowments for centers and programs, and current use funds. He explained the faculty's role in this process. He meets regularly with the Advancement Committee. Last year he appointed Chris Pates to develop formal advisory boards for each school. These boards should provide both advice and funding, and they are all up and running. He has been presenting to each of the schools, and there is a direct liaison from his division to each of the schools.

He emphasized that faculty and Advancement can help each other, citing the recent Egan gift as the result of a complete team effort. Faculty can help by providing names of alumni, foundations or corporations with relevant interests that Advancement might not be aware of.

He then provided a list of recent campaign events, noting the great receptions and excitement at these events. He said that Assoc. VP of Marketing and Communication Jenn Anderson has been doing a fabulous job of promoting the campaign. He concluded with the in-house slogan for the campaign: we can, we will.

There were no questions.

2. **Approval of minutes**

   **Motion [Caster/Bowen]:** to approve the minutes of 9/18/15. The motion passed unanimously.

3. **Update on the Core Revision Process**
Prof. Bob Epstein prefaced the attached presentation by noting that he has been visiting departments and schools, so most people have seen this information already. Today is intended to provide an update on an ongoing process. The current core has been in place for a long time. As part of the 2020 process, there was a core curriculum task force with broad representation. They had many meetings, with the whole process being faculty driven. Any proposed changes are coming from faculty and will have to be approved by faculty, ultimately by the General Faculty.

The task force developed a set of common goals. Their primary concern was not to shrink the core, but to have a core that was uniform, clear, simple, and had more rationale than a checklist. They agreed that there should be a sense of progression through the curriculum and some sort of integrative experience. These features are consistent with many core conversations happening at other schools. Finally, the core should clearly indicate what a liberal arts education is and does.

The task force recommended that a director of the core be appointed and charged with setting up an advisory council, and shepherding the proposal for core revision through the faculty. The routing is Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to Academic Council to General Faculty. He listed the members of the Advisory Council and noted that he has been meeting weekly with Assoc. VPAA Christine Siegel and every other week with the full Advisory Council.

The proposal consists of a first tier- orientation, and a second tier- exploration. There is also an integration component that would not entail additional coursework. Currently students in the School of Engineering have the smallest core requirement, with 15 core courses outside of engineering. The goal of uniformity led the task force to design a 15-course core.

Tier one includes 2 semesters of language, 1 English, 1 Math, 1 Religious Studies, 1 Philosophy, 1 History. Unlike the current core, there would be no place outs and tier one would have to be completed by the end of the sophomore year. One goal is to create a sense of a cohort moving through the curriculum together, though students wouldn't have to complete tier one prior to beginning tier two. In tier one, the EN course would be a writing course and the RS, PH and HI courses would contribute to writing across the curriculum (WAC). He explained that WAC can be many things. If the proposal moves forward, it would need to be defined for Fairfield; that's an exciting opportunity. The tier one Math course is still to be determined by the Math Department. The language requirement would be 2 semesters at any level, but with no place outs.

Tier two includes 1 course in each of the following: Literature; Visual & Performing Arts; Religious Studies; Philosophy; Natural Science; Social/Behavioral Science; Math or Natural Science; Social/Behavioral Science or History. The integration requirement could be addressed through a cluster course, team-taught course, or an individually taught course. These elements would require additional resources and faculty development.

Prof. Epstein explained that when he agreed to be the Core Director, the understanding was that he would have to work with the proposal from the task force. He can improve the proposal within its framework, but he can't simply discard the work and start from scratch. He noted that tier two could be reorganized to look more like a reconceptualization of the core. As it emerged from the task force, it looks more like a negotiated reduction in courses without inherent logic. He suggested grouping the tier two elements by the traditional divisions. The resulting tier two would be: 4 humanities courses from 4 different departments; 2 science or math courses from 2 different departments; 2 social/behavioral science courses from 2 different departments. This rearrangement also eliminates the grouping of social/behavioral science with history, though it did so by moving ½ course away from the humanities and to the social/behavioral sciences.

Prof. Epstein said that he has heard concerns about the loss of a specific literature course and a guaranteed course in visual and performing arts. The humanities, as the largest part of the current core, was taking the biggest decrease in this proposal. He is still talking with the Advisory Council about how to address these concerns and find ways to make the reconceptualization work. He's trying to find ideas with as much support as possible going forward. He's continuing to meet with schools and departments. He hopes to go to the UCC in the Spring. Implementing the proposal will need a commitment to resources and reorganization. He will be going to the Educational Planning Committee with a strategic plan for resource needs.
At this point, the floor was opened for questions. Prof. Kathy Schwab said that she thought that the task force proposal called for the history course in tier two to include the possibility of a history course within VPA. Someone from the back of the room confirmed that that was so. Prof. Epstein said he would look into that.

Prof. Ron Davidson read the following statement:

I wish to thank Professor Epstein for his efforts at core revision, which is a difficult, nay thankless task. But the situation is now one in which the overall agenda for Core Reform is set by the administration, and that is not acceptable, particularly as the plans to date propose dramatic revisions of the core by 25%, with the burden falling unequally on some departments while leaving others unscathed. Neither plan in its architecture or language takes fully into account either the university Mission Statement or the Journal of Record overall goals for the core.

Let us acknowledge, however, that in some measure the current state of affairs is the fault of the faculty, for not providing a mechanism for regular core review and revision. Instead, we have a continual series of piecemeal revisions that are all dissatisfactory in some measure, and there is no long-term continuity of purpose.

The Journal of Record, if I understand it correctly, assigns core oversight to the UCC, but makes no provision for a faculty committee, either a standing committee or a subcommittee of UCC, that is charged with revision of the core on a regular basis. That means we go for decades between core revisions, guaranteeing unnecessary recrimination over great sweeping changes, ones imagined to survive for the next several decades, even though all our disciplines—as well as student aptitudes—are swiftly changing.

This unhappy state of affairs within faculty governance has allowed the administration to fill the void in the Fairfield 2020 Core Curriculum Task Force Final Report. By Epstein’s admission, that model is the basis for the administration’s charge to the Director of the Core to refine the Fairfield 2020 core proposal. While Professor Epstein has done so, he has not acknowledged the many aspects of both the Fairfield 2020 model or of his own model that are quite problematic. Some of them, in his own words, would involve “Considerable administrative oversight” of the core offerings in every department involved in delivering the core. For those of us who service the core, any model that requires departments to surrender their academic authority and intellectual integrity to an outside appointed entity is unacceptable, yet the plans to date expressly involve this.

Moreover, these plans have been entirely formulated outside of the parameters of faculty governance. Indeed, I am astonished that this has not come up to the degree it should have so far, but I can say that most faculty have expressed patience and wished to listen to the proposals prior to any other response.

But now it appears time to respond. The core is the academic statement of cura personalis, for it is through the core that Fairfield University commits to the care of our students as intellectual, social, physical and spiritual beings, in the language of the Journal of Record. As such, it needs to be handled in an intentional a manner as we have done for all our other academic efforts. Consequently, I believe it is now time for the UCC to embrace the business of core review, revision and renewal, rather than allow the agenda to continue to be set by the administration.

UCC should be charged to form a subcommittee on core review and revision. Such a subcommittee would be able to have regular, ongoing meetings to hear ideas, express opinions, and so forth. Most particularly, a regular system of faculty governed review would allow incremental changes on a regular basis, grounded in real needs, not simply because of the argument that time has elapsed or that we need to regress to the AJCU mean because everyone else has done so.

A subcommittee of the faculty could establish and revise the core learning outcomes and investigate burning issues: team-taught courses, interdisciplinary courses, the mechanism for core cluster core courses, to name but a few that have been mentioned in the documents circulated to date.

So, I would like to make a motion:

Motion [Davidson/Nash]: In light of the centrality of the core to the Fairfield University undergraduate experience—and given the need for a regular mechanism of core review,
revision and renewal—the General Faculty charges the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee with developing a committee or subcommittee dedicated to that purpose.

Depending on what UCC wishes to do, this committee or subcommittee could act in a manner similar to the World and US Diversity subcommittees, with membership drawn from the larger faculty and invested in a constant review of the core.

Be that as it may, the core plan established by Fairfield 2020, or the plan moved forward by the appointed Director of the Core, neither seem to mesh well with the stated goals of the Fairfield faculty, the Mission Statement or the Journal of Record.

Prof. Beth Boquet spoke against the motion. She said that she appreciated Prof. Davidson’s point, and as a number of 2020 recommendations move forward toward implementation, we might craft a broader motion for the Committee on Committees to consider proposing regular review processes for all Handbook committees. She didn't see a need to single out the UCC in this way. She also reminded the faculty that Prof. Epstein's presentation included a clear routing procedure.

Prof. Vin Rosivach suggested that Prof. Davidson's proposal raised two issues, both of which were valuable. One was the process issue, which was addressed by Prof. Boquet. The second is the broader question of what we're doing- what is the philosophy and purpose of the core? He noted that one of the slides said that the core requirements should "manifest what the College of Arts & Sciences does and what a liberal arts education is meant to provide," but felt that that issue was missing from today's presentation. So it was valuable that Prof. Davidson raised the issue, but this motion is a surprise to most in the room right now. He therefore suggested tabling the motion to the next meeting so that people could come prepared to discuss it.

Motion [Rosivach/Caster]: to table the Davidson/Nash motion to the next meeting.

Motion to table passed: 55-12

Prof. Chris Staecker asked whether computer science had been considered as a way of filling the tier two math/natural science requirement. Prof. Epstein said that it was not his call. If a proposal with a math requirement goes through, it will be up to the math department to consider which courses would satisfy it.

Prof. Walt Hlawitschka asked whether the Advisory Council was meant to be representative. Prof. Epstein said that it was meant to be representative of the College of Arts & Sciences, where the core resides. There is one representative from outside of the College. Prof. Hlawitschka suggested that there should be representatives from all schools. Prof. Epstein apologized for the lack of wider representation and noted that though he is trying to meet with all schools, he has not yet been able to meet with the School of Business.

Prof. Joan Lee pointed out that programs were also not represented. She spoke specifically of applied ethics, suggesting that it was a problem that a Jesuit school doesn't have an ethics requirement in this proposed new core. Prof. Epstein said that ethics had been discussed a lot in the task force and continues to be discussed in the Advisory Council. He met with Prof. David Schmidt in the Spring to discuss the relation between applied ethics and the liberal arts. He said that much of the discussion has been about the difference between ethics and applied ethics. Far from being ignored, the question of the place of ethics is ongoing.

There were no further questions

4. Announcements

Prof. Kris reminded faculty of the gala reception hosted by the FWC/AAUP immediately after the meeting.

5. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn [Rosivach/Miecznikowski] was uncontested at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Prof. Susan Rakowitz
Secretary of the General Faculty
Advancement Presentation to the
Members of the Faculty
October 23, 2015

Wally Halas
VP for University Advancement

ADVEMENT DEFINED

• The definition of “advancement” is... 
...to move forward
...to improve and grow

• Makes Fairfield better for today...and tomorrow

• Encourages donors to make possible that which other sources of revenue cannot do alone

• Creates the extras that transform our campus

FAIRFIELD RISING: A CALL TO ACTION

Working Goal: $160,000,000

Timing: 

Key Funding Priorities:

INVESTING IN PEOPLE
- Provide opportunity for students through scholarships and financial assistance
- Attract and retain the best faculty and visiting scholars

INVESTING IN PROGRAMS
- Establish innovative, leading-edge academic programs

INVESTING IN FACILITIES
- Articulate and create new, world-class facilities

FAIRFIELD RISING: CAMPAIGN UPDATE

Progress Against FY16 Benchmark

Endowment (Student) $60,000,000
Endowment (Academic) $30,000,000
Current Use $35,000,000
Facilities $35,000,000

ACADEMIC PRIORITIES

• Health Sciences Center
• Endowments for Deans and Faculty
• Naming opportunities for each school
• Endowments for Centers and Programs
• Current use funds
ADVANCEMENT OUTREACH TO FACULTY

- Regular meetings with University Advancement Committee
- Academic Year 2015: appointed Chris Potes to develop formal advisory boards for each school
- Presented collaborative overview to 3 of the 5 schools
- Academic Year 2016: appointed direct liaison to each school

HELPING EACH OTHER

How can Advancement help Fairfield Faculty?
- Identify prospects within our alumni/parents/friends community
- Research foundations and corporations that might be receptive to faculty goals
- Create presentations outlining faculty and academic needs
- Travel with the Dean or Faculty member to execute solicitations
- Serve as liaison to Advisory Boards
- Identify qualified candidates for Advisory Boards

How can Fairfield Faculty help Advancement?
- Provide Advancement with the knowledge and materials that help our team understand current challenges
- Share faculty goals and objectives
- Identify and engage former students who have done well and may be prospective donors for our team to cultivate and engage
- Suggest foundations, corporations or other organizations that might be embraced Fairfield as a philanthropic priority

Current Core Curriculum

- Area I: Mathematics and Natural Sciences
  - 2 Math
  - 2 Natural Science
- Area II: History, and Social and Behavioral Sciences
  - 2 History
  - 2 Social / Behavioral Science
- Area III: Philosophy, Religious Studies and Applied Ethics
  - 2 Philosophy
  - 2 Religious Studies
  - 1 Philosophy, Religious Studies or Applied Ethics
- Area IV: English and Visual and Performing Arts
  - 3 English (2 Writing and 1 Literature)
  - 2 Visual and Performing Arts
- Area V: Modern and Classical Languages
  - 2 Foreign Language at the intermediate level

Common Faculty Goals for Core Revision

- A uniform set of Core requirements for all schools
- Clarity and simplicity
- An inherent rationale that is more than a checklist
- Levels to the Core, to give a sense of progression through the curriculum
- Integrative experience
- Requirements that manifest what the College of Arts & Sciences does and what a liberal arts education is meant to provide
Routing Process for Changes to Core Curriculum

- Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
- Academic Council
- General Faculty

Core Advisory Council

- Dennis Keenan (Philosophy)
- Paul Lakeland (Religious Studies)
- Laura McSweeney (Math)
- Shelley Phelan (Biology)
- Shannon Harding (Psychology)
- Anna Lawrence (History)
- Laura Nash (VPA)
- Audrey Beauvais (Nursing)
- Christine Siegel (ex officio)

Tier One: Orientation

1 English
1 Math
1 Religious Studies
1 Philosophy
1 History
2 Foreign Language

Tier One: Orientation *

1 English
1 Math
1 Religious Studies
1 Philosophy
1 History
2 Foreign Language

* No place-outs
* All courses completed by the end of sophomore year

Tier One: Orientation

1 English
1 Math
1 Religious Studies
1 Philosophy
1 History
2 Foreign Language

Tier Two: Exploration

- 1 Literature
- 1 Visual & Performing Arts
- 1 Natural Science
- 1 Social / Behavioral Science
- 1 Religious Studies
- 1 Philosophy
- 1 Math or Natural Science
- 1 Social Science or History

Total: 8 courses / 24 credits

Integration:

Option 1: Cluster courses in Tier Two
Option 2: Team taught course (1 course / 3 credits)
Option 3: Individually taught course (1 course / 3 credits)

Writing Course
Writing across the curriculum courses
Tier One: Orientation

1 English
1 Math
1 Religious Studies
1 Philosophy
1 History
2 Foreign Language

Tier Two: Exploration

1 Literature
1 Visual & Performing Arts
1 Natural Science
1 Social / Behavioral Science
1 Religious Studies
1 Philosophy
1 Math or Natural Science
1 Social/Behavioral Science or History

Tier Two: Exploration (Alt.)

- **Humanities:** 4 courses in 4 different departments (PH; RS; HI; VPA; EN)
- **Natural Sciences and Mathematics:** 2 courses in 2 different departments (MA; BI; PS; CH)
- **Social and Behavioral Sciences:** 2 courses in 2 different departments (SO & AY; EC; PO; PY; CO)

Tier Three: Integration

- Option 1: Cluster courses in Tier Two
- Option 2: Team taught course (1 course / 3 credits)
- Option 3: Individually taught course (1 course / 3 credits)

- Not additional requirements: to be taken within Tier 2
- Can be used, with appropriate incentives and support, to provide intentionally devised offerings connected to themes and mission
Tier Two: Exploration & Integration

- **Humanities**: 4 courses in 4 different departments (PH; RS; HI; VPA; EN)
- **Natural Sciences and Mathematics**: 2 courses in 2 different departments (MA; BI; PS; CH)
- **Social and Behavioral Sciences**: 2 courses in 2 different departments (SO & AY; EC; PO; PY; CO)
- **Integration**: 1 pair of cluster courses, or 1 team-taught or individually taught interdisciplinary course

Moving forward:

- Continued discussion
- Visits to departments and schools
- UCC
- Commitments to resources and reorganization
- Educational Planning Committee
- Academic Council
- General Faculty

Tier One: Orientation

- 1 English
- 1 Math
- 1 Religious Studies
- 1 Philosophy
- 1 History
- 2 Foreign Language
- Total: 7 courses / 21 credits

Tier Two: Exploration

- 1 Literature
- 1 Visual & Performing Arts
- 1 Natural Science
- 1 Social / Behavioral Science
- 1 Religious Studies
- 1 Philosophy
- 1 Math or Natural Science
- 1 Social Science or History
- Total: 8 courses / 24 credits

Integration:

- Option 1: Cluster courses in Tier Two
- Option 2: Team taught course (1 course / 3 credits)
- Option 3: Individually taught course (1 course / 3 credits)