

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

AGENDA

Monday, March 1, 2021

3:30 to 5:00 PM: Zoom

1. Presidential courtesy
2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty
3. Report from the Executive Secretary
 - a. Approval of minutes
 - i. Meeting on February 1, 2021 (attachment)
 - ii. Meeting on February 8, 2021 (attachment)
 - b. Correspondence
 - i. Memo from the GFS regarding 2019-2020 changes to the Journal of Record
 - c. Oral Reports
4. Council Subcommittee Reports
 - a. Standing Calendar Review Subcommittee
 - b. Working Group on the Academic Commons (AC 5/31/19)
 - c. Subcommittee on Reconciling Sexual Misconduct Policies (AC 4/1/19)
 - d. Subcommittee on Guidelines for Non-Tenure Track Faculty Practices (AC 5/11/20)
5. Petitions for immediate hearing
6. Old Business
7. New business
 - a. Update from Public Health Advisory Team (attachments)
 - b. UCC Proposal for Credit/No Credit Policy (attachments)
 - c. Committee on Conference with the Board- preparation for March Board meeting
 - d. Establishment of membership on the Subcommittee on Dual Degree Graduate Programs per AC motion of 2/8/21
 - e. Proposal to revise MPA (attachments)
 - f. Proposal for minor in Public Administration (attachments)
 - g. Proposal to amend JOR re: approval of courses taken abroad (attachments)
 - h. Request from International Studies/Business Program (attachments)
 - i. ACEC Proposal for Subcommittee to explore forming Graduate Curriculum Committee (attachment)

Lists of Attachments, Pending Items, and Ongoing Items are on page 2.

List of Attachments and other materials:

- For item 3.a.i.: Minutes of the meeting on February 1, 2021 (pages 3-10)
- For item 3.a.ii.: Minutes of the meeting on February 8, 2021 (pages 11-18)
- For item 3.b. Memo from the GFS regarding 2019-2020 changes to the Journal of Record (pages 19-23)
- For item 7.a.: Notes from Public Health Advisory Team meetings of February 3, 2021; February 10, 2021; and February 17, 2021 (pages 24-38)
- For item 7.b.: UCC proposal for Credit/No Credit policy (pages 39-60)
- For item 7.e.: Proposal to revise MPA (pages 61-78)
- For item 7.f. Proposal for a minor in Public Administration (pages 79-102)
- For item 7.g. Proposal to amend Journal of Record regarding approval of courses taken abroad (pages 103-108)
- For item 7.h. Request from International Studies/Business (109-117)
- For item 7.i. ACEC Proposal for Subcommittee to explore forming Graduate Curriculum Committee (page 118)

Pending Items:

- A. Faculty Data Committee (AC 12/3/07).
- B. AC revisits the accessibility of teaching evaluation data, Due spring 2012. (AC 4/19/10)
- C. AC review of Merit Appeals Policy, once one or more have been adjudicated. (AC 11/1/10 & 5/13/14)
- D. AC three-year review of Intellectual Properties Policy, spring 2014. (AC 3/7/11)
- E. MPA, five-year review in 2017-2018 (AC 9/10/12)
- F. Revisit report from ACSC on Mission Statement re non-tenure track faculty in fall 2014 (AC 9/8/14)
- G. Review and evaluate the Pass/Fail option in fall 2020 (AC 12/1/2014)
- H. Five-Year Review of MA and SYC in Remedial Reading and Remedial Language Arts in 2022 (AC 2/6/17)
- I. Every five-year review of AC and UCC seat allocation (done AC 5/1/17; GF 10/17), next due Spring 2022 (AC 2/7/200; GF 3/4/2000)
- J. Consider revising charge to Library Committee (AC 5/31/19)

Ongoing Items:

- 1. Report by SVPAA to AC each semester to inform the council of any approved exceptions to the Athletic Department's policy of not scheduling athletic events that conflict with final exams.
- 2. Report from the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees after each meeting with board members. At the end of each academic year, discuss items for the Conference Committee to put on the agenda for their meetings with members of the board the following year
- 3. Standing Calendar Review Subcommittee: A subcommittee of two people will be elected by the AC each September from its elected membership. The subcommittee's charge is to review all Fairfield academic calendars before their publication and make any necessary recommendations for changes to the Academic Council and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
Draft Minutes of Meeting
February 1, 2021 3:30-5 pm
via Zoom

FACULTY Attendance: Professors Katya Bardos, Uma Balaji, Cynthia Bautista, David Downie, Bob Epstein, Johanna Garvey, Shannon Gerry, Erica Hartwell, Jerelyn Johnson (Chair), Evelyn Bilius Lolis, Dave McFadden, Camelia Micu, Kathy Nantz, Shawn Rafalski, Susan Rakowitz (General Faculty Secretary), Carl Scheraga, Linda Roney, Adam Rugg (Executive Secretary), Aaron Van Dyke

ADMINISTRATORS in Attendance: Deans Andres Carrano, Richard Greenwald, Laurie Grupp, Meredith Kazer, Zhan Li, Provost Christine Siegel

Student Observer: Mr. Vincent Gadioma

Guests: Prof. Kim Doughty (7a); Profs. Philip Maymin and Mousumi Bhattacharya (7c)

1. Presidential courtesy

Provost Siegel shared with AC members that Stag Alert system is suspended campus-wide and campus facilities will be back and operational by noon tomorrow. She informed the Council that employee testing for tomorrow, Wednesday, and Thursday will start at noon and provide extended hours on Wednesday and Thursday.

Provost Siegel further relayed that residential students have moved into their residencies with the exception of approximately 100 who were scheduled to move in today but will do so later in the week. There are currently 335 students fully remote this spring semester, which is up from fall semester.

Provost Siegel also discussed plans to put up tents across campus again and this will likely occur in mid-March. The university is working to place them where there is Wifi already accessible. Faculty desiring larger on campus spaces during this interim period should reach out directly to the space reservation system on my.Fairfield.

With regard to admissions and enrollments, Provost Siegel next reported that we are seeing a record number of applicants whose GPA is as strong if not stronger than previous year. Further, SATs are up considerably but a smaller group of students have submitted SATs. There is also a decrease in the diversity of the applicant pool, a trend that is not unlike what other institutions are seeing.

GFS Rakowitz asked if the increased number in remote learners is in line with what typically occurs in spring semester with students abroad (usually 250-260 study abroad).

Provost Siegel replied that yes and dorms are at 95% capacity.

Prof. Scheraga asked if the Provost thinks the decrease in diversity of the pool relates to the discount rate. Provost Siegel replied that yes there needs to be a balance but the general number of diverse applicants who have applied is down. Academic Affairs is working with financial aid from that applicant pool to see who can be drawn in and supported.

Prof. Bardos inquired about how faculty find out which students are fully online.

Provost Siegel relayed that IR has a repository. Further, faculty should refer to the COVID Faculty Resource Page and well as the Provost's page. For any further questions faculty are encouraged to reach out VP Ligas.

AC Chair Johnson confirmed that students have the continued ability to choose to go remote at any point in the semester.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

GFS Rakowitz reported that the 1st general faculty meeting of the semester is this upcoming Friday.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary

a. Approval of minutes

- i. Meeting on November 30, 2020 (attachment)
- ii. Meeting on December 7, 2020 (attachment)

Motion (Scheraga/Bautista): to approve both sets of minutes.

Passed 19-0-0

b. Correspondence

- i. Memo from the GFS regarding NTT faculty distribution (attachment)

GFS Rakowitz shared that the attached memo is self-explanatory and that if members wish to make it an agenda item for future to inform the executive committee.

c. Oral Reports

4. Council Subcommittee Reports –NONE

5. Petitions for immediate hearing: History Department

Chair Johnson referred to the memo submitted by the History Department re: the reconsideration of P/F policy and discussed that the committee needed to vote as to whether or not to take it up.

Motion (Downie/Scheraga): to take up this item in today's meeting.

Discussion:

GFS Rakowitz argued against taking it up as making any policy more restrictive once a semester has gotten under way can't be done.

Provost Siegel spoke against the motion and shared that the AC devoted a lot of time last fall on this matter; that the petition raises good points better to be taken up when we discuss UCC permanent policy proposal at the March meeting. At this point she did not see the need for immediate hearing but rather recommended that the History department's proposal be brought before the AC in March.

Prof. Rafalski asked whether we consider it now for a specified time limit/duration.

Professor McFadden requested that the department be extended the courtesy to explain the petition before shutting it down.

Prof. Van Dyke agreed that the department is owed a courtesy. He stated that this might be more of a matter of academic exploration and not about academic disruption to learning which is the scope of this semester's policy. Prof. Van Dyke further shared that he is in favor of hearing this issue at the end of the agenda.

Professor Nantz agreed with Prof. McFadden.

Vote: 10-7 opposed-1 abstention
Motion passes

Motion (Van Dyke/Epstein): to put it at the end of this agenda.
Vote : 17-0-1 Motion carried.

6. Old Business--none

7. New business

a. Update from Public Health Advisory Team (PHAT)

Prof. Doughty provided an update/overview since the time of her last report to this committee. Prof. Doughty shared that the PHAT has held four meetings since last update to this committee. The Dec 17th meeting focused on enforcement of community standards and discipline and the committee invited the Dean of Students Will Johnson to the meeting. Some members were concerned the consequences are not deterring enough for students. Dean of Students Will Johnson shared that 500 were students on probation and that 10-15 were removed from housing while a few were fully moved. No students were suspended and very few violated the directive twice. The PHAT felt that more should be done for spring and that grace period is now done. Strategies to further educate students not just penalize them were discussed including the sharing of a few documentary films to make the impact of COVID more real.

The January 7th meeting focused on plans for repopulation and further discussion of strategies for preventing the outbreaks that we saw in fall including increased monitoring at the beach and a larger emphasis on education and outreach.

The January 30th meeting discussed vaccine distribution. The question arose about whether faculty who were receiving accommodations could be vaccinated as part of 1B. There was further discussion about the plan for the spring dashboard.

The January 29th meeting had guest Jen Anderson from marketing discuss how to share information internally and externally as well as the decision to not include repopulation stats in the dashboard. Faculty on the committee felt this expressed a lack of transparency. Discussion resulted in the recommendation to provide some kind of basic information about repopulation testing with options to be discussed at their next meeting.

Professor Scheraga thanked the committee for their work. He asked if faculty who are teaching graduate courses but have to be on campus frequently because of research and to support these need repopulation testing.

Provost Siegel confirmed that repopulation testing includes all those coming on to campus. Also, the university needs to know what our metrics and case rates are prior to the start of in person learning--a formal message will come from the Office of the Provost at the end of the week.

Chair Johnson asked if this means that next week we will not have updated information. Provost Siegel replied that there will be an update this week regarding repopulation testing and that next week the COVID resource page will share info internally but not to external audiences. The daily COVID dashboard for the spring semester will begin on February 15th.

Prof. Bardos asked if there has been any consideration given to scaling back on extra cleaning and directing those resources towards testing/vaccines since COVID-19 is not transmitted via surfaces.

Prof. Doughty shared that this hasn't come up and it is an interesting question. She stated she cannot remark on the cost savings nor does she feel comfortable making recommendations to decrease deep cleaning efforts.

Prof. McFadden asked if once employees are tested twice, do they still need to be tested weekly?

Prof. Doughty replied yes and that faculty will receive an email with a link to sign up for testing with multiple days for testing.

Provost Siegel added that these are the guidelines from the CT State Department of Health and in line with practices of the Connecticut Conference on Independent Colleges; that everyone be tested weekly at least through February 2021.

Prof. Rafalski asked if this potentially more contagious strand has led to any discussion regarding mandating double masking.

Prof. Doughty remarked that yes it was discussed but that the state is not issuing a mandate and that such a mandate may decrease morale. There will be communication about the type of masks that are no longer recommended, for example, vented masks and gaiters. Added to this recommendation is that a minimum of a two-layer cotton mask is the best bet.

Prof. Nantz asked about registering and the time table for repopulation testing, if second tests need to count back from the first day expected to be on campus.

Prof. Doughty stated that this process is on the agenda for next meeting including the discussion of issues related to the link, scheduling, and precise feedback.

GFS Rakowitz asked if vaccination clinics will be available on campus once we get to 1B.

Prof. Doughty stated that there are no plans for clinics on campus.

b. Access to the General Faculty Secretary website (attachment pg 25-27)

Provost Siegel referred to the attachment in this meeting packet. She stated that the GFS website has been maintained since 1998 and has a lot helpful information and is an important tool for shared governance. However, in 2021, having this website fully open to the general public is problematic. Concerns included that it goes against common practice to share so much info about faculty government to the general public; that in governance there is an assumption of an internal audience. The Provost further relayed that increasingly often we invite other administrators to this meeting and we never tell them about the scope of what is shared. Recently, there has been an instance where faculty members who assumed they were speaking to one another at a conference on campus had their words taken out of context and placed on social media.

Provost Siegel further discussed the raised risk of legal liability and that this body discusses sensitive issues and that such matters do not need to be available openly. Some information shared is proprietary. One example includes point #5 on pg. 27—in the current context having the minutes of the meetings and proceedings available to public has the potential to undermine governance and can qualitatively alter participation in our meeting. The most easy solution is to make this website password protected and open to all members of our community only.

GFS Rakowitz stated that the Provost brought this request for a change to her directly but that she can't make this determination unilaterally; she recommended coming to the Council. She argued that academe is about transparency. Our policy documents should continue to be public, but she would be open to putting minutes behind password protection. The arguments in the Provost's memo are all about the problems of having minutes be public. Currently the only part of the website that is password protected is the directory because that includes personal contact information. Access to the directory is limited to members of the General Faculty. Presumably

we would want wider access for the minutes- faculty, staff, retired faculty. She asked about students.

Provost Siegel added that she appreciates the compromise and that more time and broader discussion needs to occur on what is not password protected now and that we need to determine who has access in our community.

Professor Nantz stated that currently the GFS controls this website and that it needs to remain that way. The key is offering easy access to faculty who needs this information.

Dean Greenwald shared his experiences from different institutions where things are private. Many times minutes reflect faculty thinking through an issue and make pointed questions with the purpose to problem solve and then students and parents can find names and troll those individuals.

Prof. Epstein asked for clarification as to whether password protected materials will now be considered confidential. He further asked whether we are saying that we aren't going to allow any elements of our work to be public or if we are going to be more deliberate about what we make publically available. Regardless, the public face needs to be available and accessible.

Prof. Lolis stated the scope of the minutes is to capture a discussion related to collective problem solving and we want to preserve the integrity of such discussions and not risk qualitatively changing the robustness of our conversations for fear of unintended audiences.

Prof. Van Dyke stated that the information that is already posted is already out there. Holy cross and Fordham have great examples of alternate model. Our page needs to be easily accessible and managed by the GFS and needs to articulate the long history of work.

Dean Greenwald added that other Jesuit institutions are not confidential but that they delineate what is for internal consumption vs. what is for external consumption.

GFS Rakowitz recommended that we approach this via links; the face can look like it looks like now and then when you click on a link some would require password for access.

There were some discussion and agreement that the access should include students.

Motion (Rakowitz/Lolis): Links on the GFS website that include minutes of any meetings be password protected and access be restricted to members of the Fairfield university community.

18 -0-0 Motion carries.

- b. Proposal for Dual Degree in Masters of Business Administration and Masters of Science in Business Analytics (attachments)

Profs. Maymin and Bhattacharya summarized the proposal for a dual MA/MS in the DSB. They shared that are both complementary degrees and that MBA provides candidates with strategic vision to be a business leader (breadth) and the MSBA gives an in depth view and specialization in data management and analytics (depth). They relayed that this dual program is not new and is offered elsewhere. They also stated that this proposal is an enhancement of growing graduate programs by offering students both depth and breadth in their training. Further, there are other dual degrees (MBA/MS in Nursing). Prof. Bhattacharya stated that the MSBA requires at least 10 courses (30 credits) MBA requires 12 course if business background is not met (42 credits). If students want both degrees and they do it combined it can require fewer credits. Faculty can refer to the table of required courses for both programs on pg. 30 in packet.

Prof. Maymin added that a lot of students start with MBA and then discover MSBA or vice versa and that many want to do both.

GFS Rakowitz noted that the EPC was hung up on the 48 credits and even if it is legitimate she pointed out that the other dual degree MBA/MSN is 62 credits.

Prof. Bhattacharya stated that this has been an ongoing conversation. The 48 credits is for those who are already doing high level courses and referred members to the table in the proposal which explains it's not always 48—it depends whether students have checked the prerequisite courses. She stated that this was an added modification to the revised proposal for EPC; for students who have to go through all prerequisites their studies will require a long list of courses.

GFS Rakowitz asked if the prerequisite courses are undergraduate courses.

Prof. Bhattacharya replied that if they have taken them at undergraduate level then those courses are waived for them. MSBA prospective candidates can pass out of these courses, not waived.

Provost Siegel shared that VP Rankin has been working closely on this proposal and that there is no policy in place for the number of credits required for graduate programs. She added that we need to come up with a policy as we anticipate more of such proposals coming through. The Provost further stated that we need to have a separate conversation about this and that a subcommittee of AC will need to take a look into these questions. She recommended that we should keep these two separate and that because a lot of work has gone into this proposal; and recommended we vote on this proposal now.

Dean Li added that he supports his faculty and their advising for this dual program.

Prof. Hartwell shared that she is struggling with a dual masters degree that can potentially be 30-48 credits and asked whether there are different ways to structure this offering. Can it be better parceled out into a 5th year program and a Masters?

Prof. Bhattacharya replied that this is a great idea but that a lot of their students come into the program with 5th year MS.

Prof McFadden stated that he disagreed with Provost Siegel that we should not be dealing with this in the absence of a university dual degree policy. We need to postpone.

Prof. Epstein shared that he has a lot questions especially related to setting a precedent before the policy. He added that for these two degrees he feels nervous about too much overlap and there is a need for more expertise before we approve.

Prof. Bardos shared that competitive schools and landscapes were already assessed and that this proposal is in line with the strategic need to grow grad programs. We need to make programs that are attractive to students.

Prof. Micu spoke in favor of the proposal and added that this is what we need and that it is a natural extension of what students already do.

Dean Li added that students can get the dual degree without a program.

Prof. Hartwell added that she thinks more time needs to be devoted to exploring the degree routes and that there is no rush for something like this; it should be done intentionally and done well. She asked if credits are able count towards more than one degree as this is not the case in GSEAP.

Provost Siegel shared that student's can't just do these two Masters on their own now because credits can't be counted for two different degrees. The structure of a dual degree program allows for this type of double counting.

Prof. Lolis added that this proposal is indeed a very desirable trend in the field of business and that we need to trust our colleagues that they have not proposed something to dilute their candidate's preparation and training—that our school of business has an excellent reputation.

Prof. Micu shared that this is about the knowledge student can obtain and benefit their career. She asserted that a dual degree gives more depth than a concentration and that concentration won't cut it.

Chair Johnson relayed that since there is more to discuss the committee needs to determine whether to recess and reconvene next Monday or adjourn until March.

Prof. Epstein moved to recess and reconvene, especially because the committee has agreed to take up the memo from the History Department.

Prof. McFadden seconded the motion.

Vote: 16-0-1 Motion to recess and reconvene on 2/8 carries.

**Respectfully submitted,
Evelyn Bilius Lolis, PhD**

**Academic Council Meeting Monday
February 8, 2021
Draft Minutes of Meeting**

Faculty Members Present: Profs. Alphonso, Balaji, Bardos, Downie, Epstein, Garvey, Gerry, Hartwell, Johnson (Chair), Lolis, McFadden, Micu, Nantz, Rafalski, Rakowitz (GFS), Roney, Rugg (Executive Secretary), Scheraga, Van Dyke

Administrators Present: Deans Grupp, Li; Provost Siegel

Student Observer: Mr. Gadioma

Guests: Profs. William Abbott (5) and Laura McSweeney (7d)

Prof. Johnson called the meeting to order at 3:31.

7.c. Proposal for Dual Degree in Masters of Business Administration and Masters of Science in Business Analytics (cont'd)

Dean Li: Although we won't expect many students to pursue the dual degree, having such a program will provide Dolan with a point of differentiation and may persuade people to come to Fairfield rather than going to the competition.

Prof. Bardos: Someone who pursues a dual degree needs to complete a concentration in a non-business analytics field in addition to completing the MBA core courses and the MSBA required courses.

Prof. Nantz spoke in favor of the dual proposal, which she considers very innovative not just for Dolan, but for Fairfield University. Students have come to learn very precisely what it is they want from a graduate program, what particular set of skills, knowledge, and experiences they need to move up in a corporate ladder and develop themselves as leaders (training provided in the MBA program). And given the importance of analytics in the business world, they may pursue a concentration in Business Analytics as part of the MBA program, but that won't provide the same level of depth in analytics as the dual degree given that a concentration in the MBA program includes only four courses.

Prof. Micu: In the dual degree, the learning outcomes of each individual program are accomplished due to the dual degree including the required MBA courses, the required MSBA courses, as well as a concentration that is outside of business analytics. In addition, to address a point that was raised at the last meeting about the number of credits, although it's possible for someone to graduate from the dual degree with 48 credits (if all prerequisites are waived), in general students need about 60 credits, which is similar to what our competition is doing.

Prof. Lolis spoke strongly in favor of this proposal. The MBA was a hot commodity for a long time, but there has been a shift in the culture where more specialized skills are targeted. In this dual program, there is a blending of both of those things, so students get a wide-angle lens of

leadership with a very stratified lens for specific skill set in business analytics. Thus, the program is very timely and it offers the current and the new students a real opportunity to do this in a packaged time frame, so that they're able to have more options into the business world. Given that a new program takes time to promote and recruit students, Prof. Lolis recommends to support the program now, and not wait until a policy at the university level related to dual program offerings is developed.

Prof. Downie: There are legitimate uncertainties about the number of credits, so if we pass this, it should be done with the understanding that, if a policy is set that requires more credits, then the dual degree will re-visit the number of credits as well.

Prof. Epstein is in favor of establishing a policy at the university level with regard to dual degree programs' credit requirements before approving the dual degree program. In addition, in the proposal's appendix, the competition seems to offer similar degrees with much more credits, which raises the question whether this dual degree constitutes sufficient academic achievement.

Prof. McFadden is concerned that some of our competitors require more credits than what we are calling for, which raises a whole range of issues that need to be solved through a policy for dual degree programs before moving forward with the review of this proposal.

Prof. Nantz supports a program review after a certain number of years if we were to approve this today in order to assess whether some of these concerns raised at these meetings are significant. We do program reviews for many of our graduate programs and would do it for this program as well. But there is no doubt that the dual degree would be a valuable offering as there is a need in a marketplace for leaders that have quantitative skills.

Prof. Micu – we're not comparing apples to apples when we look at the number of credits, as the appendix in the proposal is listing the highest number of credits in the dual programs offered by our competitors. Without any waivers, our dual degree would be 69 credits, which is very similar to our competition.

Prof. Johnson asked why we do not advertise the highest number of credits (if prerequisites are not met).

Dean Li argued that the prerequisites were not included to avoid information overload and because the program's goals and learning outcomes are achieved through core / required courses, not pre-requisites.

Prof. Nantz mentioned that in our promotional materials for other business graduate programs, we tend to list the range of credits (from least to most) and oftentimes students may bring into the program significant work experience that would allow them to waive some prerequisites.

Prof. Bardos added that our MBA program was redesigned recently to be more streamlined and innovative and thus it may not compare directly to other MBA programs offered by our competitors. She also argued that the proposal should be voted on now, as a university-wide policy on dual degree programs may take a significant amount of time to establish, given the

differences between schools and even within a school between different degree programs. Similar to how we passed a policy on Pass-Fail last semester without having a university-wide policy for it, we could do it for the dual degree.

Prof. Lolis: Is this program incomplete? She doesn't feel comfortable making the assumption that there are not enough courses in this program at this current time. She agrees that the language could have been more precise ("at least" X number of credits), but currently there are no policies in place for us to follow and creating such a policy may take a long time. It would be unfair to penalize this program because we don't have the body in place to establish this policy.

Prof. Alphonso is supportive of the proposal, but is wondering whether we should have a body to work on a university-wide policy about dual degree programs.

Provost Siegel argues that any university should follow its own internal policy and a committee should be developed to establish this policy. NECHE specifies that a dual degree should be fewer credits than the individual degrees put together, but it also says that any dual degree should follow the university's internal policy for dual degrees. It is not about whether or not we want to do it, it is something that we need to do because, at the next accreditation, these dual degrees will be verified against the university's policy and standards. This policy should allow each academic area to have some flexibility in order to offer a competitive program, but we should have a policy nevertheless. Also, given that the university does not have a Graduate Curriculum Committee (similar to the UCC committee at the undergraduate level), a sub-committee of this body should be formed to propose this policy. But we should not hold back this proposal because it is not the fault of the proposers that we don't have that policy in place now. Instead, to David Downie's point, this dual degree program can be revisited once we have a policy in place.

Prof. Alphonso asked if we should be proposing to form a sub-committee to take on this matter and offered to come up with a proposal (to form this committee).

Prof. Nantz: We already have at least one dual degree program (MBA and MSN), so to hold this up because we don't have a curriculum committee or a procedure for dual degrees seems particularly unfair. She makes the following motion:

Motion (Nantz/ Scheraga) to approve the MBA/MSBA dual degree program in Dolan as proposed, with the addition of a stipulation that the program be reviewed in 5 years.

Prof. Epstein mentioned that there are things that he still does not comprehend enough to comfortably approve the dual degree. On one hand, the proposal is indicating that students can get this dual degree with many fewer credits and faster (which is how we will most likely promote it), but on the other hand, it is being argued here that we are similar to the competition. However, we are not. Only Suffolk and Bentley have a similar number of credits, whereas the other universities listed in the appendix require much more (for example, UConn has a 79-credit requirement for the dual degree). So he is asking for some clarity on the issue.

Prof. Rakowitz mentioned that an apples-to-apples comparison would have been helpful because, the way in which the dual degree is presented, it looks like we are out of line with the other schools. Although there is no policy, we do have another dual degree program that we approved, which has more than 30 credits per degree. So one possibility would be, while we wait for a policy, to require at least 30 credits per degree for a total of 60 credits. The argument against that would be that students don't need 60 credits because there is overlap. So it seems that the selling point is "two degrees for the price of one and a half." But an alternative selling point would be that, because of these inter-related programs, because of the overlap in the curriculum, there is now an opportunity to do even more breadth and/or depth by taking other courses to get up to 60 credits, while still getting all the basics from the individual programs.

Prof. Nantz added that the proposal was vetted by experts in business (at the department level, school level, and curriculum committees) and they have carefully examined this curriculum to make sure that important pieces from the program are not trimmed, but redundancies are eliminated. It's hard to compare this dual degree to MBA-MSN given that the latter combines two different fields: nursing and business. That's why it's important to allow for flexibility in the dual degree programs.

Dean Li spoke about the difference in the number of credits between our dual degree programs and our competition's. Whereas we don't know what other programs waive (as they may not disclose that on their website), we know what we can waive in our program and presented that in the proposal. Without waivers, our program would require 69 credits, which is comparable to other schools. But it's very unlikely that someone will complete 70+ credits for such a degree. There must be a waiver policy for those programs as well, it is just not disclosed on the website. In addition, credit hours have been historically the criteria used to measure the effectiveness of programs, but credits hours cannot measure how well students learn. In fact, many schools offer now competency-based programs that reach a set of specified learning objectives, but have zero credits. Our integrated curriculum delivers the learning outcomes of each individual degree by including the required MBA courses, the required MSBA courses, and a non-BA concentration.

Prof. Bardos mentioned that the idea of getting two degrees while completing one and a half is misleading, as students in the dual program complete the program requirements of each individual program and only count courses from the other program towards their program's electives. In addition, our MBA program has been redesigned recently, being more flexible and leaner now than in the past, which makes it harder to compare with other programs.

Prof. Nantz called the questions. Prof. Alphonso seconded. 17 in favor of calling the question, which represents more than the necessary two thirds.

The motion passed: 14 in favor- 4 opposed- 2 abstentions

Prof. Nantz made the motion put in the zoom chat by Prof. Alphonso:

Motion (Nantz/ Alphonso) for the Academic Council to convene a Graduate Curriculum Program sub-committee to determine a university-wide policy for dual degree graduate programs and report back to the Academic Council in September 2021.

Prof. Hartwell said that, given that our graduate programs are growing, we should perhaps consider having a graduate curriculum committee, similar to the UCC at the undergraduate level.

Prof. Johnson added that she would like to see this item added to the next month's agenda.

Prof. Rakowitz: we can form the sub-committee right after passing the motion, whereas to set up a proposal for a graduate curriculum committee would be a much longer process, as it will need to go through the Council, the General faculty, and the Board of Trustees. But she agrees that the process should be started.

Prof. Bardos would like to have a friendly amendment added to the motion, stating that each school should be represented in the committee because of the differences in the graduate programs. Thus, the new motion would add that language:

Provost Siegel added that Walter Rankin, the Vice Provost for Graduate, Professional, and Continuing Education should also be part of the committee.

Prof. Nantz agrees to add Walter Rankin as a member, but not necessarily as the chair of the committee. Provost Siegel confirmed that he doesn't need to be the chair. He can serve ex-officio from the Provost's Office.

Motion (Nantz/Alphonso): The Academic Council should convene a Graduate Curriculum Program sub-committee comprised of members from each school and Walter Rankin, the Vice Provost for Graduate, Professional, and Continuing Education, to determine a university-wide policy for dual degree graduate programs and report back to the Academic Council in September 2021.

Prof. Alphonso: Maybe the subcommittee can also consider the guidelines for the formation of a more permanent GCC. The subcommittee could be the start of determining what this university-wide policy should be for the dual degree, but also come up with few guidelines for the formation of a permanent graduate committee.

Prof. Rakowitz: The subcommittee is probably going to be made up of members of the Council, people informed by this conversation, whereas we can bring people outside of AC to serve on a subcommittee proposing GCC.

The motion passed: 20 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstentions

An email will be sent later to ask for volunteers to form this subcommittee.

7.d. Proposal for minors in Applied Statistics and Mathematical Statistics

Prof. Laura McSweeney presented the proposal for the two minors. The Applied statistics minor (5 required courses + 1 elective) is primarily targeted to humanities, social science students, and business students. The mathematical statistics minor (5 required courses) is aimed at students

with a stronger math background, such as math majors, physics and engineering, and some science majors.

Prof. Rakowitz: A math major could potentially do a mathematical statistics minor by taking just one additional course. But to be consistent with other programs, a statement should be added that students cannot double count more than two courses towards their math major and the minor. Prof. McSweeney agreed to add that statement.

Prof. Van Dyke asked about the rationale of labeling some courses as STAT and others as MATH (for example “Statistics I” is a MATH course).

Prof. McSweeney: Because we don't have a STAT department, all of the courses right now are MATH courses. However, moving forward, any new course designed for the stats minor will be designated as STAT unless it has enough math content. The introductory Statistics course will retain the MATH designation because they're often taken to fulfill the core requirement in Math.

Prof. Rakowitz: Can math majors pursue the applied stats minor?

Prof. McSweeney: if they want to do it, there is nothing to prevent them, but the applied stats minor courses do not count toward their major requirements at all.

Prof. Van Dyke: If a student wants to double minor in math and stats, would that create problems?

Prof. McSweeney answered that, with the exception of the calculus course and Statistics I, the other courses do not count for the math minor.

Provost Siegel: if someone outside of the math department proposes a stats courses, what's the vetting process?

Prof. McSweeney: the math department would approve these courses because the stats minor is housed in the math department. That explanation is also in the package (p. 61 in the AC packet).

Motion (McFadden/ Lolis): to approve the minors in Applied Statistics and Mathematical Statistics with the proviso that no more than two courses in the Mathematical Statistics minor can also count for the math major.

Prof. Rafalski, Prof. Van Dyke, and Prof. Nantz spoke in favor of the motion.

The motion passed: 20 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstentions

5. Petition for immediate hearing from the History department regarding the pass-fail policy.

Prof. William Abbott, on behalf of the History department, discussed the petition, which has two parts that the department would like to see changed in the policy approved in November, 2020.

1) As the policy stands, a student may choose the pass/fail option as late as May 4th, the last day of classes. The department would like to see that moved considerably earlier in the semester (beginning of March). The purpose of pass-fail policy was to allow students to explore more freedom in their education. Students choosing pass/fail for this reason would logically do so prior to the beginning of the semester or at least, early in the semester.

2) Secondly, the department would like to eliminate the option for magis core courses to be eligible for pass-fail. To say, as the current policy does, that the pass-fail option applies to the magis core courses, but not to major courses, it is to send out a message to the students that the magis core courses do not have to be as intellectually rigorous and should not require as much effort as the major course.

Prof. Rakowitz appreciates that the department has concerns and wanted to have them on record, but the policy cannot be changed in the middle of the semester, especially given that all students have already been informed of the policy.

Prof. McFadden added that perhaps the only thing to do at this point is appeal to the UCC to consider these materials in a permanent policy.

Prof. Van Dyke: the policy proposed in November by the Academic Council was not created to address the “academic exploration” issue mentioned before, but to address the disruption due to Covid, so it was more of a management policy. Did the History department consider this difference in scope?

Prof. Abbott: Yes, but the assumption was that things will be very different in the Spring than in the Fall.

Provost Siegel: The petition from the history department conflates issues of exploration with issues of accommodation, and this year’s policy was created to accommodate learning in the current situation. So my question is on what grounds do you expect that this semester will be better given the unpredictable situation we are in?

Prof. Abbott: we learned much from the Fall semester, so the university should manage the situation better in Spring

Prof. Alphonso: is the History department more concerned about the permanent policy than the Spring 2021 policy? Did the department present these informative materials to the UCC, which is working on the permanent policy?

Prof. Abbott: We are more concerned about the permanent policy in light of the new information that the policy for Spring cannot be changed at this point. We also wanted to present this to UCC, but have been told that they already presented their proposal to AC

Prof. Johnson: the proposal was sent to AC, but not presented yet. It is on our agenda for March 1.

Prof. Nantz: Academic Council will consider that proposal from the UCC, but there could be changes made by the Council before a policy is adopted, and the Council will certainly take into account this petition when making the decision.

Prof. Abbott left the meeting.

Prof. Alphonso asked if it's possible to ask UCC to consider the materials from the history department before our meeting in March.

Prof. McFadden moves to send the materials to UCC and ask them to consider them before their presentation to AC in March.

Prof. Johnson: perhaps the policy that UCC suggested already includes some of the concerns raised by the History department.

Provost Siegel: The Academic Council gave the UCC a deadline to report back on a permanent pass/fail policy. UCC met their deadline, so it would not be fair to ask them to re-consider it at this point. But AC can consider that recommendation from UCC in light of these materials that AC has received from the History department, as well as all other discussions on this topic that the AC has had over the past year, when making the final decision about the pass-fail policy.

Prof. Rafalski favors a friendly notification to UCC that we received these additional materials from the history department.

Prof. McFadden withdraws the motion.

Motion to adjourn (Rafalski/ Nantz). Meeting adjourned at 5:17 pm.

Respectfully submitted
Camelia Micu

Date: February 19, 2021
To: Members of the Academic Council
From: Susan Rakowitz, Secretary of the General Faculty
Re: Changes to the Journal of Record approved in Academic Year 2019-2020

Policy additions/revisions are entered into the Journal of Record (JOR) upon the approval of the Academic Council or General Faculty and approval of the Provost. The JOR also includes lists of approved and eliminated programs. This memo is to inform the Council of all 2019-2020 changes that will be incorporated into the JOR. This memo is divided into three parts. The first section concerns a set of motions that cannot be incorporated exactly as written. I explain the issues below and how I intend to proceed if the Council has no objections. The second section includes other motions to be entered as approved. Note, I have not included any Covid-specific, time-limited, policy changes. The third section lists newly approved or renamed programs.

I. Committee on Free Expression Resolution:

The following three motions were approved by the Council on 5/11/20:

MOTION #1: That the *Principles that Guide Free Expression* should be included in (and figure prominently in) all relevant handbooks and policy statements, including (but not limited to):

The University Website.

Exempt Employee Handbook^[SEP]

Non-Exempt Employee Handbook^[SEP]

Student Handbook^[SEP]

Event and Conference Management Website

MOTION #2: That the following sentences be appended to the “Principles that Guide Free Expression”:

In the event that students, staff, faculty, or administrators think that the spirit of the Principles that Guide Free Expression have not been upheld, they should contact any member of the Executive Committee of the Academic Council (which consists of the Chair of the Academic Council, the Executive Secretary of the Academic Council, the Secretary of the General Faculty, and the Provost). The names of the Executive Committee of the Academic Council can be found at: <http://www.faculty.fairfield.edu/gfs/academiccouncil.htm>

The Executive Committee of the Academic Council will make a recommendation in writing to all the members of the “Committee on Free Expression Resolution” on whether to convene.

MOTION #3: That a committee (the “Committee on Free Expression Resolution”) be formed to resolve issues that may arise regarding free expression. This committee will consist of:

- a. the Chair of the Academic Council
- b. five tenured members of the General Faculty (not currently serving as administrators)
- c. the President of FUSA
- d. the Provost (or a designee)
- e. the Vice President for Mission and Ministry (or designee)
- f. the Vice President of Student Affairs (or a designee)
- g. the Vice President of Marketing and Communications (or a designee)
- h. the Vice President of Human Resources (or a designee)

i. the President of Fairfield University

The Chair of the Academic Council will serve as chair of the committee.

The committee will be convened when a majority of the committee members calls for a meeting.

The chair of the committee will have a vote on all decisions. Votes by the committee will be anonymous. Committee decisions will be determined by a majority vote of its members.

Any decision of the committee will be communicated in a timely manner and in writing by the chair of the committee to all relevant parties.

The five tenured members of the General Faculty (not currently serving as administrators) will serve a five-year term. They will be appointed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Council. In the first year, one tenured member of the General Faculty will serve a one-year term, one will serve a two-year term, one will serve a three-year term, and one will serve a four-year term. Thereafter, the Executive Committee of the Academic Council will annually appoint another tenured member of the General Faculty (not currently serving as an administrator) to the committee. If a tenured member of the General Faculty moves to the role of an administrator while serving a term on the committee, then the Executive Committee of the Academic Council will appoint another tenured member of the General

My proposal (approved by the Provost) for how to incorporate these motions into the JOR is complicated by two issues. First, while the Faculty Secretary has the right and responsibility to insist that policy statements in a variety of documents be consistent with Journal of Record policy, I don't believe I have the right to insist on the inclusion of the Principles and appended statement in any of the documents listed in motion 1. Therefore, the task of enacting motion 1 should fall to the administration. Second, the "Principles that Guide Free Expression" were endorsed, not approved by the Academic Council, and we were told that they were not amendable. If they go into the JOR, they become amendable subject to agreement between the AC or GF and administration. I therefore suggest the following text (a combining and slight revision/reordering of motions 2 and 3) for inclusion in the JOR:

The following statement is to be appended to the "Principles that Guide Free Expression" (endorsed by the Academic Council on 4/8/19): In the event that students, staff, faculty, or administrators think that the spirit of the Principles that Guide Free Expression have not been upheld, they should contact any member of the Executive Committee of the Academic Council (which consists of the Chair of the Academic Council, the Executive Secretary of the Academic Council, the Secretary of the General Faculty, and the Provost). The names of the Executive Committee of the Academic Council can be found at: [current link]

The "Committee on Free Expression Resolution" will be formed to resolve issues that may arise regarding free expression. This committee will consist of:

- a. the Chair of the Academic Council
- b. five tenured members of the General Faculty (not currently serving as administrators)
- c. the President of FUSA
- d. the Provost (or a designee)
- e. the Vice President for Mission and Ministry (or designee)
- f. the Vice President of Student Affairs (or a designee)

- g. the Vice President of Marketing and Communications (or a designee)
- h. the Vice President of Human Resources (or a designee)
- i. the President of Fairfield University

The Chair of the Academic Council will serve as chair of the committee.

If any member of the Academic Council Executive Committee is contacted by students, staff, faculty, or administrators who think that the spirit of the Principles that Guide Free Expression have not been upheld, the Executive Committee of the Academic Council will make a recommendation in writing to all the members of the “Committee on Free Expression Resolution” on whether to convene.

The committee will be convened when a majority of the committee members calls for a meeting.

The chair of the committee will have a vote on all decisions. Votes by the committee will be anonymous. Committee decisions will be determined by a majority vote of its members.

Any decision of the committee will be communicated in a timely manner and in writing by the chair of the committee to all relevant parties.

The five tenured members of the General Faculty (not currently serving as administrators) will serve a five-year term. They will be appointed by the Executive Committee of the Academic Council. In the first year, one tenured member of the General Faculty will serve a one-year term, one will serve a two-year term, one will serve a three-year term, and one will serve a four-year term. Thereafter, the Executive Committee of the Academic Council will annually appoint another tenured member of the General Faculty (not currently serving as an administrator) to the committee. If a tenured member of the General Faculty moves to the role of an administrator while serving a term on the committee, then the Executive Committee of the Academic Council will appoint another tenured member of the General Faculty (not currently serving as an administrator) to complete their term.

II. Motions to be incorporated as approved

Course Numbering (approve 2/10/20)

Available Numbers 1001-1899	Reserved Numbers 1900-1999	Introductory Undergraduate Courses Introductory and elementary courses that are appropriate for first year students and others with no special background. Courses in this series will have few if any prerequisites.	Former Numbers 0010-0199
Available Numbers 2001-2899	Reserved Numbers 2900-2999	Intermediate Undergraduate Courses These courses typically build on materials and knowledge from the 1000-series courses and may have 1000-level prerequisites. They are introductory in nature but at a higher level than 1000-level courses.	Former Numbers 0200-0299
Available Numbers 3001-3899	Reserved Numbers 3900-3999	Upper-Level Undergraduate Courses Appropriate for upper-level undergraduate students, builds on knowledge or skills from 1000- and 2000-level courses and generally includes them as prerequisites. Begins to prepare students for employment in their field or for graduate-level studies.	Former Numbers 0300-0399

Available Numbers 4001-4899	Reserved Numbers 4900-4999	Advanced Undergraduate Courses Advanced upper-level undergraduate courses, including senior seminars and capstones, advanced independent study courses, and honors thesis work, and may have prerequisite 3000-level coursework. These courses are generally restricted to students with senior standing and provide a bridge between advanced undergraduate and early graduate work or employment in their field. May be reserved for future use.	
Available Numbers 5001-5899	Reserved Numbers 5900-5999	Introductory Graduate Level Courses Primarily for entry-level graduate students and may be taken by qualified undergraduate students in their last year of an undergraduate degree program.	Former Numbers 0400-0499
Available Numbers 6001-6899	Reserved Numbers 6900-6999	Advanced Graduate Level Courses These courses are for advanced master's degree candidates. They are restricted to graduate students only.	Former Numbers 0500-0599
Available Numbers 7001-7899	Reserved Numbers 7900-7999	Primarily for professional doctoral students. Qualified master's degree candidates may enroll provided they have the requisite foundational knowledge and have obtained permission from the program offering the course.	Former Numbers 0600-0699
Available Numbers 8001-8899	Reserved Numbers 8900-8999	Reserved for Future Use	
Available Numbers 9001-9899	Reserved Numbers 9900-9999	Reserved for Future Use	

Study Abroad (approved 3/2/20)

Students studying abroad for a full semester are expected to (1) enroll in a minimum of the equivalent of 15 credits at the appropriate level of instruction (i.e. beyond elementary instruction) and (2) be academically engaged at least 4 days per week. Students enrolled in semester-long study abroad programs should typically enroll in two Core courses and two major or minor courses. Additional selections may be electives or courses specifically required for a particular study abroad program. Selection of courses will be approved by an academic advisor.

Professors of the Practice (approved 5/11/20)

Replace the sentence, "In any school, professors of the practice would normally constitute no more than 10% of the full-time faculty." in a motion approved 3/9/09 with "The percentage of full-time faculty who are tenured and tenure track should not go below 75%."

Report to AC regarding Distribution of Tenure Track and Non-Tenure Track Faculty (approved 5/11/20)

The faculty secretary will report updated distribution numbers for each school and the university to the Academic Council every fall.

Faculty Involvement in Academic Decision Making (approved 5/11/20)

Any non-emergency decision that would significantly impact teaching or advising or research must have faculty input through the appropriate Faculty Handbook Committee. If there is not a

specifically relevant committee, the Academic Council Executive Committee is to be consulted and will determine what, if any, further faculty input is needed.

III. Programs approved/modified in Academic Year 2019-2020

CAS

- Change "Liberal Studies" to "Liberal and Professional Studies" (10/17/19)
- Add major and minor in Sports Media (11/4/19)
- Add minor and post-Bac certificate in Spanish-English Translation and Interpreting (2/10/20)
- Add Emergency Management track to MPA (2/10/20)

DSB

- Add MS in Marketing Analytics and Strategy (2/3/20)
- Add concentration in Fashion Marketing at FUA (2/3/20)
- Add major in Business Analytics (3/2/20)

DSB and EGAN

- Add MSN/MBA dual degree (2/10/20)

EGAN

- Add Master's Entry to Practice Nursing Program (5/11/20)

GSEAP

- Add concentration in Sexual and Gender Minority Mental Health (2/10/20)

SOE

- Add concentrations in Social Analytics, Bioinformatics, and Behavioral Analytics to Applied Data Science MS (10/7/19)
- Add 5-year programs in Psychology/Sociology/Biology/Bioengineering with MS in Applied Data Science (2/3/20)
- Add MS in Cybersecurity (4/16/20)
- Rename MS in Applied Data Science to MS in Data Science (5/11/20)

**FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY
PUBLIC HEALTH ADVISORY TEAM**

February 3, 2020

Notes by Kim Doughty

Members:

Kevin Lawlor, Executive Vice President

Susan Birge, Associate VP for Health & Wellness

Julia Duffy, Director of the Student Health Center

Joanna Wynne, MD, Medical Director for the Student Health Center (Chair)

Diana Mager, DNP, RN-BC, Associate Professor of Nursing

Shelley Phelan, Chair and Professor of Biology Department

Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch, Assistant Professor of Public Health

Kim Doughty, Visiting Assistant Professor of Public Health

Amy Boczer, Director for Institutional Research

In attendance: Susan Birge, Julia Duffy, Diana Mager, Shelley Phelan, Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch, Kim Doughty, Amy Boczer

Repopulation testing updates and data sharing: Julia Duffy shared that there have been 3 new student cases, and each had a number of contacts (one had 4-5, others 2-3 each). All had completed at least one test at home previously.

Susan Birge shared that she, Julia Duffy, and Amy Boczer were at a Task Force meeting and Christine did mention that faculty had requested interim information regarding testing and she was going to follow through. Susan asked why only faculty should have this information.

Amy Boczer explained that this probably came from this group's request to Jennifer Anderson at our last meeting. Jenn would have communicated that to Christine Siegel.

Shelley Phelan asked Amy Boczer whether she knew what data Christine Siegel was planning to send out. Amy did not know but mentioned that Christine gets daily updates about the numbers of positives.

Shelley mentioned that the faculty representatives of the group should probably find out before the general faculty meeting. Kim Doughty said she would follow up on that. She also agreed that Susan Birge brought up an important point about only faculty having access to the faculty resource page.

Susan Birge suggested that maybe there is a way to revisit taking repopulation out of the dashboard. She noted that some other universities have started their dashboards already. The decision to wait until surveillance testing started was intended to avoid confusion and to keep the presentation clean, which made sense, but this approach may need to be reconsidered.

Amy Boczer shared that Institutional Research has been tracking what other schools are doing, both in Connecticut and at peer institutions across the country. Some schools have started their dashboards (QU, SHU, Wesleyan), but others have not. There's a mix.

Diana Mager said she understood the rationale for waiting to start the dashboard but felt this would lead to undue fear; we should put some information out.

Amy Boczer suggested that that could be a recommendation from this group. After meetings with Jennifer Anderson and other groups, Amy had thought there was going to be some narrative about the repopulation process on the dashboard. In that narrative, there could be some totals about the numbers of tests so far and, where we are at in that process. Amy also noted that, of the cases in the repopulation process (so far 66, including Quest), only a small fraction came onto campus (20). Of those, 13 were athletes who had been on campus all along. Another two were assistant coaches.

Shelley Phean added that if the information about repopulation testing is vague, faculty will assume the worst. It is better to put the numbers on the dashboard. They're good.

Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch noted that there is already some narrative on the dashboard. It just needs to be filled in with numbers. The narrative could highlight the cases that were prevented from coming to campus. Susan Birge agreed that that would be a good story to tell. In the fall, there wasn't always a good story to tell. Susan also added that this move-in was set up very well and the positivity rate is very low.

Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch said she thought there was a Lancet article that just came out about campus mitigation efforts being successful in the fall. She felt that if the University's efforts are effective, faculty should have that evidence. She noted that there will be concern about new variants, however.

Susan Birge asked if it was Quinnipiac University that has already locked down the residence halls. Amy Boczer confirmed that.

Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch shared that, anecdotally, she has heard of a few cases of students who have returned to campus but Residence Life doesn't seem to have a record of those students being back on campus. She asked whether this was affecting testing.

Susan Birge said that 200 residential students are "missing," but Residence Life thinks these students have not yet arrived. They are tracking down those students. Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch asked if we know that those students have all been tested.

Amy Boczer added that every semester, there is a "no show" meeting to deal with student who are expected to be on campus but do not arrive. The number this semester is not uncommon. And it does not mean that they never took a test. It also doesn't mean that they definitely have. There may be some that have slipped through the cracks.

Shelley Phelan said that she assumed that when students swipe in, that checks if they've completed their test(s). Susan Birge said that if a student came to move in and was denied, they would be sent to Josie Fitzpatrick to trouble shoot and if their at-home test was not valid or not recorded, they would be sent to the Health Center and get tested. In addition to card swipe, they also used acuity scheduling for move-in. Students had to sign up for a time and that gets checked when they arrive, so there are at least two different methods for clearing them.

Kim Doughty asked whether the group was in agreement about a recommendation to add a narrative summary of repopulation testing to the dashboard. All agreed.

Amy Bozcer followed up on the Advisory Team's previous request for data pertaining to each of the 3 repopulation tests. In short, the data team said it would be an excessive burden to pull that together because there are too many sources of data coming in. Amy also added that, looking at the fall data, there were only 4 faculty members out of the 600-650 cases. And within those, there were no known exposures to a student. We knew the infection sources and they were external to Fairfield. Additionally, looking at other universities, the numbers of employee cases are low relative to students. For faculty who want information, this information is relevant.

Shelley Phelan noted that a lot of faculty understand that there is very low in-person transmission, but this also may be partly because so many of them are teaching remotely. If faculty see the current rates, which are low, they will probably feel more comfortable going in.

Employee surveillance testing: Kim Doughty shared that, at the Academic Council meeting on Monday February 1st, some faculty expressed concern about the inconvenience of the weekly surveillance testing and in particular the testing on Sunday. She asked why those days were selected.

Julia Duffy explained that Sunday was chosen because Broad Institute had capacity to add extra tests on that day. Sunday also provides results during the workweek, as do Mondays and Tuesdays. This is important because offices are fully staffed during the week, so it is easier to contact those who test positive and to conduct contact tracing. In the fall, when we were getting positive test results on the weekend after some of the add-on testing (e.g., Griffin Health), that was very challenging.

Susan Birge added that the testing committee also thought the days would be good for employees who might be able to swing by on Sundays when they are out doing other things or come in on Monday or Tuesday mornings before classes.

Shelley Phelan asked what we would tell faculty who live an hour and a half away and only come in on Wednesday and Thursday. Are they expected to get an outside test every week? Julia Duffy said it may be that way, unless we're going to be able to offer Quest tests through HR, but she didn't know if that would going to be an option. It's an expensive test.

Jennifer Schindler- Ruwisch asked what will happen if a faculty member does not come one week for a test. Julia Duffy said that for repopulation testing, they are being turned away at the entrance, but it is not clear how that will work with surveillance testing. Susan Birge added that this has not been determined.

Diana Mager expressed concern about turning away people who get paid by the week and have missed a weekly test for a reason that may or may not be their fault. Julia Duffy said that HR has said there will be more information forthcoming, so the specifics have not been defined.

Shelley Phelan felt that Diana brought up a good point about staff and their pay and agreed that that is definitely an HR issue. She predicted that the faculty who are not on campus on Mondays and Tuesdays don't live near campus are going to have a serious problem with being required to be tested every week.

Diana Mager added that there may be faculty who are teaching in a hybrid model where they are on campus some weeks and not others, so required weekly testing may present a problem for them as well.

Julia Duffy noted that there are not a lot of faculty and staff on campus tending to all of the students who are on campus so we should not do anything will keep more staff from coming.

Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch asked Amy Boczer what happened in the fall when an employee was randomly selected and they didn't show. Amy responded that staff would have been contacted by Faith Hunt in HR.

Diana Mager shared that she opted to teach virtually last semester but did not request an accommodation. A couple times she was selected for testing, but there was no way to respond. She tried emailing the CovidHR account to let them know she wasn't on campus but she never received a response nor was she contacted about missing the test.

Kim Doughty asked whether the weekly testing requirement for employees was based on guidance from the state. She hadn't seen anything that referenced employees, but wondered whether others had. Other members did not think the state guidance included staff. Kim said that, in light of all of these challenges and the apparent lack of a directive from the state, if it were up to her, she would strongly recommend weekly testing for employees but not enforce the policy. Enforcing it will cause a lot of people to get upset and will be a lot of effort for minimal benefit. Others agreed.

Shelley Phelan added that, for faculty who live close, it might make sense to encourage those faculty to take the Sunday spots in order to keep more of the Monday and Tuesday spots open for faculty who live farther away.

Employee VAMS registration: Kim Doughty mentioned that a question came up at Academic Council about whether employees can register themselves in VAMS when they become eligible for the vaccine or would need to rely on the University to do that. Susan Birge said that employees can register themselves. Faith Hunt is getting ready to submit the next segment of phase 1b. As soon as they're accepting the next group, she is ready to submit it. Employees will then receive an email with a link to register.

Julia Duffy added that she thinks the system will eventually move away from reliance on employers and people will be registering themselves. For example, those in the age 16-64 with medical conditions category would likely need to register themselves, as would frontline workers who are self-employed.

Shelley Phelan asked whether we have any more clarity on what HR is using to determine which employees are “student-facing,” as this is believed to be the criterion for eligibility under the essential workforce category.

Susan Birge asked Kim whether she would consider inviting Faith Hunt to a meeting to help clarify these questions. Kim said she would be happy to do so. Shelley Phelan added that faculty who have an accommodation but are still coming to campus will want to be included. Shelley Phelan suggested trying to get some information on this point prior to the General Faculty meeting on Friday in case it comes up. Kim Doughty said she would email Faith Hunt to find out what the current plan is.

Summary of Recommendations

The Public Health Advisory Team advises Senior Leadership to:

1. Include a narrative summary of the outcomes of repopulation testing on the public dashboard. For example, a summary could include: the number of tests received, the number of cases prevented from coming to campus, the number of cases on campus at the end of the “study-in-place” period, and any relevant context about those cases (e.g., that most are athletes who have been on campus for many weeks). The Advisory Team feels that providing this information will help faculty and staff feel safer coming to campus.
2. Continue to recommend weekly testing of employees through February but not strictly enforce this policy. The Advisory Team recognizes that there are many reasons that weekly testing on selected days could be overly burdensome for some faculty and staff. There is also no evidence that employees are drivers of COVID transmission. Therefore, the cost of enforcing this policy is high relative to the benefits.

FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY
PUBLIC HEALTH ADVISORY TEAM
February 10, 2020
Notes by Kim Doughty

Members:

Kevin Lawlor, Executive Vice President

Susan Birge, Associate VP for Health & Wellness

Julia Duffy, Director of the Student Health Center

Joanna Wynne, MD, Medical Director for the Student Health Center (Chair)

Diana Mager, DNP, RN-BC, Associate Professor of Nursing

Shelley Phelan, Chair and Professor of Biology Department

Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch, Assistant Professor of Public Health
Kim Doughty, Visiting Assistant Professor of Public Health
Amy Boczer, Director for Institutional Research

In attendance: Kevin Lawlor, Julia Duffy, Diana Mager, Shelley Phelan, Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch, Kim Doughty, Amy Boczer, Erica Wuchiski (guest)

Testing set up: Concerns were raised at the General Faculty meeting on February 5th about the way testing had been set up on campus. Specifically, some faculty felt that there were sometimes too many people in the field house and that the practice of having individuals blow their noses inside the field house prior to completing their test could put others at risk.

Julia Duffy responded to these concerns, noting that nose blowing prior to test administration is a requirement from the Broad Institute. During the fall, individuals would blow their noses outside but now that the weather has turned cold, this is being done inside. Julia said that she double-checked the CDC site and confirmed that the University's approach is acceptable. CT DPH also approved of this procedure. Julia added that the testing team did move the bays farther apart and they had not received any new complaints this week.

Erica Wuchiski confirmed that the bays are farther apart, but the nose-blowing is still occurring indoors. She said that they keep some doors open to increase ventilation. Erica understood the concern, but worried that moving this activity outdoors would require one or more staff to oversee it. This is for several reasons. Because the Broad Institute has informed us that some of the samples have been too thick to process, the testing team is now telling people to blow their noses vigorously. Students wouldn't read signs instructing them to do this. Additionally, if it's outside and not monitored, there is a chance that students could gather by the garbage cans and that could be even riskier than having them adequately spaced out indoors. In order to have staff supervision, there would need to be a tent, a space heater, and a desk.

Julia Duffy added that anyone who is uncomfortable with the current set up could bring their own supplies and blow their nose outside. They just can't have people go out and come back in.

Diana Mager noted that she thought she heard from a faculty member that they had to walk past people who were blowing their noses and asked if there is a way to reconfigure the process so that this does not happen.

Erica Wuchiski did not believe that people would routinely be walking by others blowing their noses. Shelley Phelan added that an individual being directed to the last bay in the line would have to walk by others in the previous bays. Shelley also added that faculty complaints have related to the volume of people in the field house at one time, so there was not a lot of time between one person blowing their nose in a bay and the next person going in.

Erica Wuchiski responded that this is tricky because if they were to slow the pace down, they could inadvertently undermine social distancing as people gather while waiting to move forward. Students don't always show up at their scheduled time, so it not possible to ensure that the number of appointments is exactly aligned with the pace of the testing. It's not a perfect system,

but from a clinical point of view, Erica felt that it is nevertheless a good system and meets all CDC guidelines. She is open to suggestions, however.

Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch acknowledged that any hold up would compromise the system. The concern is that any time someone removes their mask there is a risk of exposure. She suggested giving individuals an option to blow their noses in their cars or outside and then sanitize their hands.

Kim Doughty asked why people couldn't blow their noses in the same space they do the swab testing in, so that at least they would only be removing their masks in one space for one period of time. Erica Wuchiski explained that individuals need to sanitize their hands before handling tests. Julia Duffy added that the test materials also need to be kept clean, so having people blow their noses in that space would make it difficult to maintain the sanitation in that area.

Diana Mager said it sounded like the testing team had thought of every possible option, but acknowledged that it is scary to enter an indoor space where people are blowing their noses. She suggested that, given that private testing is widely available and free with insurance, if people feel uncomfortable they could seek external testing.

Erica Wuchiski added that employees could also come in with a mask and a face shield for extra protection. Shelley Phelan agreed with that suggestion, understanding that there's only so much the testing team can do. Between the external tests and the face shields, those who are concerned can be accommodated.

Shelley Phelan also asked why the LiveSafe app was no longer being checked before testing. Erica Wuchiski said that they are not looking for that anymore because they want to minimize how much people have to touch their phones. Also, those who are coming to campus from outside have already shown their green check mark. For residential students, they seem to know at this point that if they are symptomatic they should not come to the test center.

Julia Duffy noted that the field house has a modern air handling system which should reduce risk somewhat. Jen Schindler-Ruwisch added that the process is very efficient and expedient.

Kim Doughty suggested that the recommendation, at this point, be to move nose blowing outside whenever weather permits and to recommend alternatives (i.e., external testing or the addition of a face shield) to those who are concerned in the meantime. All agreed.

Changes in Broad Testing: Kevin Lawlor shared that the Broad Institute has changed their testing platform. They are now using two probes- one for the spike protein and one for nucleic acid. In order for a sample to be positive, both probes need to be positive. Samples for which one of the two is positive, they are deemed "inconclusive." The question is what to do with those.

Julia Duffy added that the new testing platform increases capacity but is more sensitive and so Broad adjusted their threshold for what they consider positive. Julia also said that the Health Center brings in individuals with inconclusive results and repeats the test. Because of the change in the definition of a positive test, the Health Center received 6 results corrected from "positive"

to “inconclusive.” These students have been or will be retested. One was diagnosed based on clinical symptoms, 2 tested negative on retest, and the remaining 3 are pending results. These students, because of their initial positive results, are isolating off campus and have sought external tests.

Jennifer Schindler-Ruwish asked what would happen if a faculty member received an inconclusive test. Julia Duffy clarified that there are 2 categories: test not processed and inconclusive. When the test hasn’t been processed, that means there was something wrong with the sample (e.g., not enough to test). In those cases, individuals would need to retest but not necessarily quarantine. With inconclusive results (sample was adequate but results were not clearly positive or negative), individuals would be excluded from campus until they receive a negative test.

Repopulation testing updates: Kim Doughty asked whether there were any new cases or trends the group should be aware of. Amy Boczer shared that over 11,000 repopulation tests have been completed, with a total of 73 positives. Kim Doughty asked how many of those were diagnosed on campus as opposed to at home. Amy said that 21 were on-campus diagnoses.

Jennifer Schindler-Ruwish asked whether any direct contacts had converted to cases. Amy Boczer wasn’t sure but said she would find out and follow up. Julia Duffy added that she didn’t think so. Amy said that she hadn’t heard that any contacts had converted, and usually this would come up at the data team meeting. The most recent quarantine and isolation housing report was also low. Kevin added that there were 21 “guests” in quarantine or isolation (15 quarantine, 6 isolation).

Employee surveillance testing procedure: Kim Doughty said she understood that the decision was to maintain the weekly testing requirement for employees. Given that, she asked how adherence will be monitored and enforced. Jennifer Schindler-Ruwish asked whether there will be a roster of people missing a test and how that will impact their Stag card access.

Kevin Lawlor said that if employees skip a weekly test, their card will not be active for the next week. Employees who have an external test should aim to get that test around the same time an on-campus test would have been done.

Jennifer Schindler-Ruwish asked if there was a certain day that the roster of on-campus employees will be compared against test results or if it will be updated regularly. Kevin Lawlor said that it will not be a real-time update. That interval hasn’t been determined yet, but if it were Friday and results were not received by then, the employee’s card would be invalidated for the following week.

Jennifer Schindler-Ruwish noted that this may become an issue because faculty may assume that they can wait to get tested if they’re teaching later in the week. Kim Doughty presented a scenario in which a faculty member is not teaching on campus next week and so does not get tested and asked whether they would then be excluded the following week. Kevin Lawlor clarified that there will not be the option to skip weeks, regardless of faculty teaching schedules.

Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch said that people may be under the impression that if they are not coming to campus for a particular week they don't need to get tested, so that would be important to communicate.

Kevin Lawlor asked how the group felt about faculty skipping tests if they were not coming to campus, from a public health standpoint. Kim Doughty said that she thought it would be reasonable for employees to skip the weekly test if they were not coming to campus within that week, but she also understood that managing those exceptions creates logistical challenges. Kevin Lawlor felt that exceptions could poke holes in the University's carefully designed plan to keep the campus safe. KL:

Kim Doughty suggested that, if that is the case, then maybe the communication needs to be that faculty need to be tested—on campus or elsewhere—between Sunday and Tuesday each week.

Diana Mager noted that employees are going to want to know the ramifications of non-compliance. For faculty, they can teach remotely, but will pay be withheld for those who do not have the option of working remotely? She said that leadership needs to be prepared for those questions.

Kevin Lawlor said the spirit of the rule is to safeguard the campus. We've worked so hard to protect it with these tests. He also understood the need to address these questions.

Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch asked for confirmation that the link to sign up for testing had not been sent out yet. Julia Duffy said it was posted in Today @ Fairfield. Unique link for each week. Jen and Kim both said they did not see that.

Kim Doughty said she thought that the information about testing appointments should be communicated in a separate email because a lot of faculty will likely miss it if is only in Today @ Fairfield. Diana Mager also suggested that it would help if those emails came separately each week in addition to the announcements in Today @ Fairfield.

Kevin Lawlor suggested that there could be a separate section for anything related to COVID so that those announcements are highlighted. He said he would talk to Jennifer Anderson about that.

Kim Doughty added that communication about the timing of external testing also needs to go out ASAP so that employees can start scheduling those appointments.

Surveillance testing after February: Kim Doughty asked whether DPH had issued any new guidance on testing after February. Kevin Lawlor confirmed that no new guidance had come out, but they realize that it needs to come out soon. It could be 100% of the population weekly again or it could be a slightly smaller percentage.

Masks: Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch mentioned that she saw that the CDC did issue a new recommendation for either a surgical mask or surgical/cloth mask combination. Kevin Lawlor added that the statement was that the double mask would be more effective. They're not

necessarily advocating it but are saying it's better. Kevin noted that Dr. Fauci has also said that the best mask is the one you'll wear.

Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch said that if we reach a point of increased infection rates on campus we could use a double-mask policy as an additional mitigation measure

Kim Doughty suggested that the University recommend or communicate that 2 masks are better without requiring it. Kevin Lawlor agreed that the more informed people are, the better. He suggested that the University could share the article from the CDC and let people make their own judgements. Kim Doughty asked where would that go. Kevin said the best place would be on the Stags Come Home webpage. He would have to discuss that with Jennifer Anderson.

Jennifer Schindler-Ruwish suggested that the Public Health interns could think about ways to communicate with their peers about these issues. Kevin Lawlor suggested talking to the Mirror about running a column every week.

As the meeting wrapped up, Amy Boczer provided an update on what other institutions are doing with their spring dashboards. A few weeks ago, the question of whether to restart the dashboard or carry over from the previous semester was raised. Institutional Research looked at 46 different schools (those in CT plus other peers and competitors). As of Monday, February 8th, 30 are restarting at zero, 12 are continuing from the fall. It is unclear what the remaining institutions are doing because they have not updated their dashboards.

Summary of Recommendations:

The Public Health Advisory Team advises Senior Leadership to:

1. Communicate with employees as soon as possible the details about surveillance testing (i.e., the scheduling link, the timing requirement for external tests, and any repercussions for noncompliance). This communication should be in a stand-alone email and not incorporated into other announcements.
2. Share new guidelines about improving effectiveness of masks and other pertinent COVID-related information broadly with the University community to allow individuals to make informed decisions for themselves.

FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY PUBLIC HEALTH ADVISORY TEAM

February 17, 2020

Notes by Kim Doughty

Members:

Kevin Lawlor, Executive Vice President

Susan Birge, Associate VP for Health & Wellness

Julia Duffy, Director of the Student Health Center

Joanna Wynne, MD, Medical Director for the Student Health Center (Chair)

Diane Mager, DNP, RN-BC, Associate Professor of Nursing

Shelley Phelan, Chair and Professor of Biology Department
Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch, Assistant Professor of Public Health
Kim Doughty, Visiting Assistant Professor of Public Health
Amy Boczer, Director for Institutional Research

In attendance: Kevin Lawlor, Susan Birge, Julia Duffy, Diana Mager, Shelley Phelan, Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch, Kim Doughty, Amy Boczer, Erica Wuchiski

Concerns about testing operations: Kim Doughty shared that some of the faculty on the committee had heard some complaints from other faculty and students about the testing procedures in the Field House. These were shared with Erica Wuchiski and Julia Duffy earlier in the week. Among the reports were:

- Some staff were not giving directions proactively regarding nose-blowing, hand hygiene, and swabbing.
- Some staff were not observing swabbing (do they have to be observed now? I thought I remembered hearing something about this requirement going away over the winter break).
- Some individuals were not found in the system even though they had made appointments.
- Some staff were not wearing gloves or practicing hand hygiene when handling samples.
- Some staff were generally inattentive and distracted by their phones.
- The swab collection container was overfull, making it difficult for individuals to deposit their sample without touching others.
- There have at times been very long lines and some faculty have been delayed to the extent that they had to leave the line in order to get to class.

Erica Wuchiski addressed each of these concerns in turn. Regarding the long lines, she said that they tend to occur more in the early morning. Some individuals come 15-20 minutes before their scheduled time. Erica has asked to reduce number of appointments in the early morning. She also noted that if there is a long line outside and people are maintaining 6 feet of distance, then there is no risk in that.

Shelley Phelan shared that two faculty told her that they experienced a 20 minute delay and had to leave the line to get to class. So the concern is not about the safety of the lines, but the impact on faculty schedules.

Erica Wuchiski said that she had never seen more than a 5 minute delay, so she was surprised to hear that. Shelley said that one of the faculty members had already emailed Faith Hunt and she may have more details. Erica mentioned that faculty can always email her as well if they have any problems. To address the morning lines, they will reduce the number of appointments in that time.

Shelley Phelan added that another challenge is that because the testing is limited to Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday and only certain hours, the early morning times are the only viable option for faculty who have classes later in the day. Erica Wuchiski noted that the number of testing opportunities is still much more than most universities are doing. She suggested that faculty who have scheduling conflicts can get tested elsewhere and submit their results.

Susan Birge shared that 830 employees completed repopulation testing and Julia Duffy added that, based on card swipes, approximately 500 employees are coming to campus each day.

Diana Mager commented that, while she understands the concerns about the new variants and the desire to be cautious by requiring weekly testing of employees, she still does not think this policy is based on science for 3 reasons: 1) the CDC is not recommending weekly tests for college faculty and staff, 2) our own data show that our faculty are not being infected or transmitting the virus on campus, and 3) the tests are out of date by the time they are used. For example, an employee may get a test on a Sunday, the result is noted by Friday, and the employee is granted access to campus for the following week. So, in some cases an employee may be allowed on campus on the basis of a negative test 10 days prior. Several members of the group expressed agreement, but acknowledged that the policy is unlikely to change at this point.

Erica Wuchiski returned to the list of testing concerns and said that she did not have a response to the item regarding staff not giving instructions. Susan Birge added that there are big signs instructing people to blow their noses and sanitize their hands and there is usually a greeter providing verbal instruction as well. She also noted that there are plans to make the testing experience more positive and enjoyable, possibly by adding music and giving out “I got tested today” stickers or something similar. Erica said she will reiterate with both the nursing and registration staff the need to consistently provide instructions, but whenever she has observed, it has been done.

Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch noted that some of the nursing students may not feel as comfortable giving instructions to their peers. Erica Wuchiski agreed that that could be true.

Regarding the issue of individuals not being found in the system, Erica had no explanation but noted that they would accommodate those individuals regardless. Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch asked whether the text reminders stopped because she got one the first week but not the second week. There was some discussion about the reminders being sent by email but not text. Susan Birge asked if the reminders were helpful and Jennifer said yes, and they may help reinforce the need for individuals to arrive at their scheduled times. Susan Birge and Julia Duffy will follow up on the reminder system.

Regarding the issue of staff not wearing gloves or practicing hand hygiene when handling samples, Erica also had not seen that herself. Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch shared that when she was tested this week, someone took her sample without gloves on, and that was concerning. Erica clarified that staff should be collecting samples (rather than individuals placing their own samples in a collection box) and should be wearing gloves. She said she would address the lack of consistency.

Regarding the issue of staff being on their phones, Erica said that her students are not allowed to use their phones. This comment might be referring to the label makers. They are temp workers so when it is slow, they do get on their phones.

Inconclusive test rate: Kim Doughty noted that some faculty have been concerned about the possibility of receiving an inconclusive test result that would bar them from coming to campus,

so they are getting tested on campus but also seeking a second external test each week. Kim asked how common inconclusive test results are because if they are not happening with regularity, then we can inform faculty that it is not necessary to get a second test.

Kevin Lawlor shared that, as of yesterday, the number of inconclusive tests was zero. Julia Duffy clarified that there are actually 3 categories of invalid or inconclusive results. Kevin Lawlor added that the first 2 categories are test defects and those are interpreted as no test. The inconclusive results are different because there is a higher possibility that those people are positive.

Kim Doughty asked whether, for the first 2 categories, employees would be barred from campus without a subsequent negative test. Julia Duffy said that individuals with results in these categories would be notified that they have a “TNP” (test not processed) and there will be an effort to try to get them in for a second test, but if that’s not possible because the result is received later in the week, then they can just be tested the next week. Because these individuals have made a good faith effort, they would not be barred from campus. Kevin Lawlor agreed with this explanation.

Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch asked if it was possible that the things we’ve heard about tests not being observed or completed according to the standard procedure could contribute to the numbers of TNPs. Julia Duffy said that this was possible.

Julia Duffy shared that another issue the testing team has encountered is that a lot of students who had COVID in the fall but are past the 90-day window are testing positive but then getting outside tests that come back negative. Those individuals want to be exempt from isolation if they produce a negative test, but the policy is that if an individual has a positive result at any point, they still have to complete isolation. Susan Birge added that it would create havoc if we were to start accepting multiple tests and using the best of 2 or 3 tests to determine whether someone is negative or positive. All agreed that the policy of requiring isolation for a positive test regardless of subsequent negative tests is appropriate.

Implications of new variants: Kevin Lawlor requested the group’s input on the implications of the new, more transmissible variants that are circulating and may become more prevalent. Kevin shared that he found out yesterday that if we see a pattern of positives that is indicative of faster spread, the state Department of Public Health will take samples from us to test in one of the state labs to determine what variant it is. He added that there is one confirmed case of the South African variant in Fairfield, but not at Fairfield U. This is an adult who has not traveled, so it is present in the community. There are also about 30 UK variant cases identified statewide. Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch noted that one of those was in Fairfield public school system. Jen added that one of her fears is that the things that we’ve been doing all along that have been working will not work anymore. If that happens, we may need to make different decisions. Kim Doughty said she had the same fear. She also felt that we need to keep an eye on the cases and conversion rates among direct contacts. That information will tell us what’s happening on campus. If the more transmissible variants are present, that should be reflected in the case rates.

Diana Mager said that, optimistically, these variants may have been around longer than we think but were not identified because we were not testing for them, so the downward trends we are now seeing could be in spite of the variants. Others agreed that this was a good sign.

Shelley Phelan asked whether state labs were the only ones distinguishing between variants. Kevin Lawlor responded that in addition to state labs, 3 private labs are also doing this testing. The Broad Institute provides samples to some of these labs but is not conducting those tests themselves.

Definition of frontline essential workers: Kim Doughty noted that Kevin Lawlor also wanted the group to be thinking about how frontline essential workers will be defined. She asked Kevin to clarify whether that means that the University will have some say in how those workers are defined as it pertains to university staff. Kevin said that the state will rely on universities to provide some definition and to prioritize staff through the VAMS system, yes.

Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch reminded the group that one of the things we previously discussed was that if swipe data are going to be used to determine vaccine eligibility, then employees should be informed of that ahead of time so they are aware. Kevin Lawlor said that he thinks that is exactly what Quinnipiac University is doing. They have stratified employees based on the frequency of swipes. There will be other specifically called-out strata like foodservice and custodial workers. Then there will be a generic grouping for everyone else.

Shelley Phelan asked if HR is doing any education with these groups. She shared that she talked to a few custodial employees the other day and none of them wanted to get the vaccine. It occurred to her that there should be some education. Kevin Lawlor said that the University is relying on the corporations that employ those individuals to do that.

Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch shared that her students just created and delivered a presentation on vaccine hesitancy to local community members. There are many resources available to help address vaccine hesitancy and she can share those. Kevin Lawlor said that would be helpful.

Kevin Lawlor said that another issue that has come up is whether we can track the people who have been vaccinated on campus. Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch said she thought this was being collected for nursing students. Julia Duffy confirmed that Nursing students are uploading that information. Susan Birge added that we could collect aggregate data easily enough for students but the reporting would need to be voluntary.

Kevin Lawlor suggested that in the fall, assuming the vaccine is widely available, we could mandate it. Julia Duffy asked if DPH had given any indication that the state would mandate vaccination for residential students. Kevin said DPH has not said anything about this yet. Diana Mager mentioned that the vaccine could not be mandated if it is still under emergency use authorization.

Julia Duffy shared that there have been some inquiries about exemption from quarantine for vaccinated students. The CDC recently put out guidance on this. If an individual is exposed within 2-12 weeks of receiving their second vaccine dose, they can be exempt from quarantine,

but this exemption does not apply to healthcare providers, which would include Nursing students in clinicals.

Kevin Lawlor said that he will be attending an “office hours” event with DPH later this week and will ask this question.

Implications of vaccination for in-person classes: Kevin Lawlor shared that the expectation is that students won’t be vaccinated this semester, but as we get closer to 100% of faculty being vaccinated, then the number of in-person classes will increase. Julia Duffy added that one question that needs to be addressed is whether employees with accommodations will need to return to campus once they are fully vaccinated. Shelley Phelan noted that faculty should not be required to change their plans for teaching this semester once they become fully vaccinated because they’ve planned their courses based on the expectation that they would not be vaccinated. She was not sure how to handle other staff, however. The group agreed that at least for this semester, faculty should not be asked or required to come to campus more frequently once vaccinated.

Classroom distancing: Kevin Lawlor asked whether 6 feet of distance is necessary. Fairfield Prep is considering using 3 feet distancing in order to increase in-person classes. Jennifer Schindler-Ruwisch said that public schools in Fairfield have reduced the distancing between desks to 3 feet but if one person tests positive, the whole class has to quarantine.

Shelley Phelan said that from a science perspective, the use of masks and amount of time exposed seem to be the more important factors in determining the likelihood of transmission. That’s what the literature is telling us. She would be a little reluctant to endorse 3 feet, but from a science standpoint, the masks and duration of time are more important.

Julia Duffy noted that contact tracing is still based on 6 feet, so more people would get caught up in contact tracing if the distancing was reduced to 3 feet. Kim Doughty thought that was an important point. It may not be worth increasing classroom capacity if it means that more students in a class will end up getting quarantined during the semester.

Shelley Phelan pointed out that in mid-March if trends look the same, the limit on indoor gatherings will increase. Kevin Lawlor clarified that the new rule will be 50% capacity with a cap of 100. This will be effective March 19th.

Summary of Recommendations

The Public Health Advisory Team advises Senior Leadership to:

1. Maintain faculty accommodations for remote teaching throughout the spring semester, even after faculty with accommodations become fully vaccinated.
2. Inform employees about the University’s approach to identifying vaccine-eligible workers as soon as details about eligibility criteria are known.

Motion for a Student-Determined Credit/No-Credit policy to be added to the Journal of Record

Motion:

That the UCC accept this Student-Determined Credit/No-Credit Option and pass it along to the Academic Council for consideration to be included in the Journal of Record.

Background:

In 2014 the Academic Council passed a Pass/Fail Option for Undergraduate Courses that allowed a professor—with appropriate approval by his or her department and school or college curriculum committee—to designate a course pass/fail.

In fall of 2020, the Academic Council, in light of the novel Corona virus impact on the curriculum, and in view of the emergency pass/fail option they adopted for spring of 2020 and academic year 2020-2021, requested UCC to formulate a Pass/Fail option to be sent to the Academic Council.

Current JOR:

Pass/Fail Option

Some courses (e.g., many internships) do not lend themselves to the multiple distinctions made by traditional letter grades. In these cases, a Pass/Fail grade may be used, provided the following criteria are met:

- All students in the course receive a grade of either Pass or Fail.
- The requirements for a Pass grade have been specified in the course syllabus.
- The decision to designate a course Pass/Fail has been approved by the department within which the course is taught and by the curriculum committee of that school.

Furthermore,

- A Pass/Fail course counts as a regular course toward graduation, determining full-time status, etc.
- The grade in a Pass/Fail course is not included in calculating a student's grade point average but appears in all cases on the student's transcript.

Proposed language (to be added to the JOR immediately following the current Pass/Fail Option):

Student-Determined Credit/No-Credit Option:

Students may, in consultation of their academic advisor or academic dean, elect two (2) courses to be taken Credit/No-Credit.

- These may be taken among electives and applied to one course per minor discipline, but neither in the Core Curriculum — including the Magis Core and the schools' core — nor in their major discipline, nor in Honors Courses, nor in the Study Abroad courses.
- This option only applies to students who have already earned at least 60 academic credits.
- Students must inform the Registrar by the end of add/drop period that they wish to take the specific course Credit/No-Credit, and the decision may be reversed any time up to the last day of classes.
- The minimum grade to gain credit in the course under the Student Determined Credit/No-Credit option is a C.
- A Student-Determined Credit/No-Credit course counts as a regular course toward graduation, determining full-time status, etc.

- The grade in a Student-Determined Credit/No-Credit course is not included in calculating a student's grade point average, but the course (and credits if earned) appears on the student's transcript.
- This option stands apart from the special Pass/Fail option issued by the Academic Council under exceptional circumstances and does not affect any courses taken at those times.

Rationale for the Credit/No-Credit proposal:

The proposal falls into the range of options of our peer institutions, and satisfies the request of the Provost and the Academic Council for a Pass/Fail or Credit/No-Credit option for students to exercise as they wish.

Given the current JOR language (page 29) that declares under Definition of Academic Grades: “D – Minimal achievement, but passing,” and in view of the desire to establish rigor in the exercise of this option, the subcommittee felt it better to employ Credit/No-Credit language instead. This allows the grade of C to be established as the minimum.

The exclusion of the Core Curriculum including the Magis Core and their academic major is also in line with peer institutions, and sends the message to students that the several Cores and their majors are equally important for their education.

The inclusion of one course per minor discipline acknowledges that declared minors are often the result of taking a course either in the Core or as an elective, with their desire that their further exploration not erode their GPAs. If a student, therefore, has taken an elective course Credit/No-Credit, this would be no impediment to their continued pursuit of that minor.

The rationale for excluding any courses that occurred during the exceptional circumstances is that they are unforeseeable and students should not be penalized for exercising that option at that time.

The grade of C as the minimum will ensure the integrity of the academic progress of students and their authenticity of the credit they receive.

Students not receiving credit for a course under this option should not receive any liability for that consequence, only that the course show up on their record as no-credit but not be included in their GPAs.

Faculty will not be informed whether students are taking their courses Credit/No-Credit, expecting cases where the student wishes to reverse the decision by the last day of classes.

Objections voiced by subcommittee members:

The proposal is framed in light of intellectual adventure, but does not take into account students who — for reasons outside of their power — find themselves needing to turn a course in their major or the core into a credit/no-credit course.

The proposal does not affect the courses included in either the Magis Core or the core courses for the professional schools.

The proposal allows students to take courses credit/no-credit for their minor. However, in the case of students wanting to turn a minor into a major, then having taken a course credit/no-credit they would be restricted from doing so.

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Minutes (Excerpt)

Date: Tuesday, February 2, 2021

Faculty Members Present: Sergio Adrada Rafael, Djedjiga Belfadel, Zhanar Berikkyzy, Chris Casement, Ron Davidson, Carol Ann Davis, Tanika Eaves, Christa Esposito, Cathy Giapponi, Jessica Karanian, Helena Keefe, Steven Kozlowski, Maggie Labinski, Marti LoMonaco, John Miecznikowski (Chair), Nazuk Sharma, Toby Ugwu (FUSA), Brian Walker

Administrators Present: Dean Richard Greenwald, Dean Zhan Li, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Excellence Mark Ligas

Guests: Lynn Kohn, Matt Schirano

Regrets: Provost Christine Siegel

AGENDA ITEM #3 – Proposal for Credit/No Credit

JM thanked all subcommittee members for working on this proposal. The proposal brought forth today passed the subcommittee with a vote of 5-3-1.

R Davidson presented a proposal on behalf of the Pass/Fail Subcommittee. The proposal supports academic and intellectual adventure for students. It follows options that have been developed by our peer institutions and satisfies the request of the Academic Council for a pass/fail or credit/no credit policy. It was observed that the Journal of Record language on page 29 states that an academic grade of D is minimal achievement for passing. The subcommittee felt it better to move to a credit/no credit proposal in lieu of a pass/fail policy, and require a grade of C to be established as the minimum.

- The proposal does not apply to any core courses – either the Magis core or any cores of the various schools.
- Students have two courses that they may opt as credit/no credit, and up to one course designated for a minor.
- The goal is to encourage students intellectual adventure, and allow them the option of engaging in a course at no cost to them academically. Students would not have a failure or non-credit factored into their GPA.
- The course will be listed on the student transcript, even if they receive no credit.
- After students take a course credit/no credit, they can have that course count for a minor.

J Miecznikowski thanked R Davidson for the presentation.

Questions

- M Labinski inquired about the policy concerning core courses – Magis Core or core courses of various schools. R Davidson stated that courses that fulfill the cores cannot be selected. Once a student fulfills the core, then these courses turn into electives.
- B Walker offered comments about his abstention on the proposed policy in the subcommittee vote. (1) The subcommittee researched other universities that have a policy in place, and most universities changed its pass/fail policy in the spring 2020. This proposed policy would not be helpful during a pandemic. A policy for electives and minors would not be helpful for students under these conditions. (2) some Committee members thought that students could elect to take one core course as credit/no credit.

- H Keefe inquired about tuition ramifications for students choosing a no credit class. M Ligas replied that the tuition covers up to 20 credits, which is equal to six classes and two credits toward a seventh class. If a student does not earn credit for a course, there is no tuition reimbursement for that course.
- T Ugwu stated that: (1) Many younger students are taking elective classes, but this proposal only affects juniors, seniors and students who earned 60 credits or more. Most academic exploration happens in sophomore year which is the last chance that students can declare a major or minor. He suggested reducing the credit cap from 60 to include sophomores. (2) It would be helpful if the deadline for designating a course credit/no credit was extended past the add/drop period because the add/drop period is hectic for most students who are trying to get off waitlists, completing their course schedules, and settling into a new semester. The add/drop period for a credit/no credit decision would cause a considerable amount of students to miss that deadline. He suggested withdrawal period as a deadline. This gives students time to ensure they are making the best decisions.
- C Giapponi had concerns about keeping open pathways to majors. If students choose credit/no credit for a course that is required for the minor, then that would block their pathway to change that minor to major because the credit/no credit course is not allowable within the major. This topic had been discussed with the Business School Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.
- There was a discussion about how a course appears on the transcript if a student chooses credit/no credit. R Davidson stated that the course and credit (if earned) will appear on the transcript. Lynn Kohn, University Registrar, stated that using “NC” for no credit and “CR” for credit is standard among most institutions. Regarding implementation, if students choose credit/no credit, she suggested a blind credit/no credit policy, where the faculty member enters a grade. Then the grade is captured if they wish to revert to the grade because a minor course changes to major course. R Davidson stated that this might satisfy concerns about blocking pathways since grades would be retained. When students opt for credit/no credit, the system converts a grade to credit/no credit and places it on the transcript. The change is not manually done by the Registrar.
- M Ligas was not in favor of students switching back to a grade after choosing credit/no credit. This is not about giving the students the opportunity to choose the better option after realizing they are doing well in the class. The student should make a decision and accept it as a final decision.
- R Greenwald commented on his experience at other institutions that had a similar policy. It could be problematic to have grades switching back and forth. Many institutions allow students to choose, and it is a final decision. When students choose a course for a minor, but then it changes to a major, some schools offer a grandfathering which accepts the course for credit.
- M Labinski expressed concerns about credit/no credit systems and their compatibility with Community-engaged learning courses. She reiterated her suggestion from a past UCC meeting about allowing faculty to flag courses as open or not open for P/F or credit/no credit, so they can continue with pedagogical techniques that are most appropriate for their content.

Flagging course was done by many institutions that the subcommittee researched. There is concern about intentions of students who are aware that a C grade is their goal for receiving credit.

- B Walker commented that there are students whose best work is C, and it should not affect faculty teaching style. Students who obtain a C grade are doing satisfactory work and not belittling the work in a class.

Motion that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee accept the Student Determined Credit/No Credit Option and pass it along to the Academic Council for consideration to be included in the Journal of Record: R Davidson. Second: CA Davis

Discussion on the Motion

- CA Davis inquired about the date that students can opt for credit/no credit. R Davidson replied that students can decide until the end of the add/drop period. Students have until the last day of classes if they opt to switch back to a grade. J Miecznikowski stated that other universities they researched had students decide during the add/drop period.
- M Ligas opposed the motion, and suggested adding a third option where students could choose one major or a Magis Core course for credit/no credit. Students at times are faced with a personal or medical issue. There are levers in place to assist students, such as opting for an incomplete or course withdrawal. The opportunity to provide a credit/no credit option for a Magis Core course or a major course would be another viable lever. Withdrawing from a course is not a student's first choice, but they are aware that their performance and GPA would be affected by their personal situation.
- J Miecznikowski pointed out that the charge by the Academic Council to the UCC was to review policies of peer institutions. The subcommittee acquired information from 20 schools, plus other schools that Academic Council researched. None of these schools counted a class for their major as pass/fail, or credit/ no credit.

Call the Question: CA Davis

Vote In Favor: 17, Oppose: 0, Abstain: 0

Motion (again) that the UCC accept the Student Determined Credit/No Credit Option and pass it along to the Academic Council for consideration to be included in the Journal of Record: R Davidson. Second: CA Davis

Vote In Favor: 9, Oppose: 6 (including M Ligas' vote), Abstain: 2

Appendix A: Comparative Study of Peer Institutions
PASS/ FAIL POLICIES

Similarities:

- Only full-time students eligible (first-semester freshmen not eligible)
- The P/F can't be used to fulfill major, minor, core requirements, or honors program
- There is a limit of credits students can take as P/F (typically 3 or four courses). No more than one course per term as P/F
- Transcript shows P or F, can't be reversed to letter grade

Differences:

- Reversible or not
- Procedure and deadline: In some schools, students need to declare it during the first week of the semester, others are allowed throughout the semester. Advisor's and Dean's approval needed in some cases.
- GPA: Some colleges do not count the passing grade toward the GPA but do count the failing grade
- Faculty may decide that their course cannot be taken as P/F
- Eligible or not eligible for Dean's list

Questions for us:

- Should we limit the number of signature elements that can be taken as P/F?

Boston College

First-semester freshmen can't take any course as pass/fail—with the exception of Freshman Topic Seminars, which are one-credit seminars offered in the fall semester.

Second-semester freshmen who have been approved by their Academic Dean for an overload of a sixth course of three credits or more can take that course on a pass/fail basis, in which case the course can't be used to fulfill a major, minor, Core requirement, or corequisites. They can designate a course pass/fail and register for a sixth course only during the first seven class days of the semester.

Sophomores, juniors, and seniors may elect to take a course as pass/fail during the first seven class days of the semester. Only electives can be taken as pass/fail, and students can't take more than one course (three or more credits) as pass/fail each semester. Students can take up to six pass/fail courses of three or more credits toward a degree.

<https://www.bc.edu/content/bc-web/schools/mcas/undergraduate/advising/academic-policies.html>

Saint Peter's University

Any student, except those in their first semester with less than six earned credits, is allowed to register for one course per term on a Pass/Fail basis. There is a limit of three Pass/Fail courses in any Bachelor's or Associate's degree program. Completion of a course under this option

results in either a P or F grade. Courses not available for this option are those in the major department, cognate courses required by the major, or courses given through the Honors Program. Students may not take courses needed to satisfy matriculation requirements on a Pass/Fail basis. The Pass/Fail option is not available for basic courses in writing, composition, reading, or for any developmental courses. Permission to take any course under the Pass/Fail option must be approved by the student's advisor and the appropriate dean. A traditional day student who has completed at least one semester of courses at Saint Peter's University or an SPCS student who has earned at least six credits may register for one course each summer (including Intersession and the Janmester term) on a Pass/Fail basis.

Credit will be granted for a passing grade, but since there is no numerical equivalent, the grade is not included in the GPA. A failing grade will be recorded as F and will be computed in the student's cumulative average.

Appropriate forms for the option must be filed with Enrollment Services by the date noted in the Academic Calendar. Once students have filed for the Pass/Fail option and it has been recorded, they may not cancel the option.

<https://www.saintpeters.edu/academics/college-of-arts-and-sciences/academic-dean/academic-policies-regulations/>

Colby College

1. Courses taken S/U cannot fulfill distribution requirements.
2. Departments may specify that major or minor courses must be taken on a conventionally graded basis; an S/U election for a course in a major or minor so designated is invalid. It is the student's responsibility to be aware of applicable policies.
3. This form is due in the Registrar's Office by the date specified in "Critical Dates" on the Registrar's web page.
4. The instructor will submit a letter grade to the Registrar, who will convert it to "S" (for grades A through C-) or "U" (unsatisfactory).
5. Satisfactory or unsatisfactory, the grade will not figure in averages.
6. Only "S" or "U" will appear on the student's permanent record and transcript. An "S" cannot later be changed to a letter grade, nor will information about the "quality" of the "S" be released by the Registrar's Office even upon request of the student.
7. In a course elected on an S/U basis, only marks of "S" will accrue credits toward graduation. A limit of sixteen S/U credits may be applied toward the 128 credits required for graduation.
8. This S/U election can be revoked only by filing the "Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory Revocation" form before the date specified in the current "Critical Dates and Deadlines". The only exception occurs in the case of a course taken S/U which may be required for a major or minor declared at a subsequent date. The letter grade can be restored upon request of the student and major department or program; the "S" or "U" will be reinstated should the major or minor later be dropped.

9. Attention is called to the Catalogue statement on The Dean's List: "... must have earned 15 or more credits ...12 or more of which are [letter] graded credits."

<https://www.colby.edu/registrar/pdf/suelect.pdf>

St. Lawrence University

During the four years in college, a student is permitted to elect up to four semester course units of work to be graded Pass/Fail. The purpose of the option is to encourage students to explore new areas of study in which they are interested but have little or no background, not to justify reduced effort in a course. The Pass/Fail option may be chosen for semester course units taken to satisfy distribution requirements or any elective semester units outside the major or minor. The Pass/Fail option is subject to the following limitations:

1. Neither the First Year Program nor the First Year Seminar may be taken on a Pass/Fail basis.
2. Semester course units in the student's major or minor fields cannot be taken on a Pass/Fail basis after the major or minor is declared, regardless of whether the specific course is required to complete the major or minor and regardless of whether the course is multi-listed.
3. No more than one optional Pass/Fail course can be taken in any semester.
4. The Pass/Fail option requires that the written consent of the instructor be submitted to the registrar by the end of the ninth week of classes in the fall and spring semesters. In summer session or courses that meet only half of the fall or spring semester, students may avail themselves of the option by the midpoint of the course as determined by the registrar.

A student must attain a minimum of a 1.0 grade to receive a Pass for the course.

Students should be aware that grades of 0.0 (F) are calculated in the grade point average. Although the P grade is not calculated in the grade point average, P grades may place students at a competitive disadvantage when they apply for admission to some graduate or professional schools.

Students choosing to take one of their four, one-unit courses Pass/Fail in a given semester will not be eligible for the Dean's List in that semester.

If no Pass/Fail option is allowed in a course, the instructor will indicate that policy in the course syllabus

<https://www.stlawu.edu/sites/default/files/resource/SLU%20Curriculum%20and%20Course%20Catalog%202020-21.pdf>

Amherst College

Amherst College seniors may choose, in their last semester and if they have not exhausted their NGO grading options, to take a course pass/fail. In addition, five college students may use the pass/fail option if they have approval from their home institution in addition

to the permissions required below. The choice of a pass/fail alternative must be submitted by the last day of add/drop, and must have the approval of the student's advisor(s). No changes can be made to the grading option after the last day of add/drop. No grade-point equivalent will be assigned to a "pass," but courses taken on this basis will receive either a "P" or an "F" from the instructor, although in the regular evaluation of work done during the semester the instructor may choose to assign the usual grades for work submitted by students exercising this option.

<https://www.amherst.edu/system/files/media/Pass-Fail%2520NEW.pdf>

Providence College

http://catalog.providence.edu/content.php?catoid=25&navoid=858#Pass_Fail_Option

from their catalog:

"All eligible students desiring to take a course on a pass/fail basis must notify the Office of the Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies no later than the deadline, as noted in the College's official Academic Calendar. Once a student elects the pass/fail grading option it is final and cannot be retroactively changed back to a standard letter grade. (see [Academic Calendar](#)).

There will be no retroactive change of a standard to a pass/fail course.

1. Only one course per semester (with a maximum of four courses in total) may be taken on a pass/fail basis (option for freshmen begins with the second semester).
2. A student's cumulative grade point average for the previous semester must be at least 2.0.
3. Any course taken on a pass/fail basis must be selected from free electives.
4. Credits earned on a pass/fail basis will not be averaged in a student's grade point average.
5. Credits failed in a pass/fail course will be averaged as an "F" with quality grade points 0.00.

Courses excluded from pass/fail designation:

1. All courses designated as fulfilling Core Curriculum requirements.

All courses taken within a major or minor, either required or elective, that constitute the total credit hours required by the department (unless the course is only offered on a pass/fail basis).

A major or minor course taken as a free elective beyond the required credit hours for the program may be designated as pass/fail."

Trinity College

<https://www.trincoll.edu/Academics/registrar/Pages/AcademicPolicyFAQs.aspx#pass>

from their website:

"Pass/Low Pass/Fail Registration and Grading Policies

Q: How do I designate a course Pass/Low Pass/Fail?

A: Use TCOOnline to make this change to a course. The deadline to make this change is the last day of the add/drop period.

Q: How do I change a Pass/Low Pass/Fail grade back to a letter grade?

A: Once the add/drop period has ended you must come to the Registrar's Office to complete a form. The deadline to make this change is the last day of classes (NOT the last day of exams).

Q: How are regular grades converted into Pass/Low Pass/Fail grades?

A: If you earned a C- or higher, you will receive a Pass (P). If you earned any form of a D, you will receive a Low Pass (LP). If you failed the course, you will receive a Fail (F).

Q: How do Pass/Low Pass/Fail grades impact my Grade Point Average (GPA)?

A: Pass and Low Pass have no impact on your GPA, although you will earn the credit for the course. Fail will act as a regular F in calculating your GPA, and you will not earn any credit for the course.

Q: What courses may I take Pass/Low Pass/Fail?

A: This option may be used only for elective credits. These courses may not be used to fulfill proficiency, general education, distribution, major, or minor requirements.

Q: How many courses may I take Pass/Low Pass/Fail?

A: You may select the Pass/Low Pass/Fail option for only one course per semester, and for a maximum of four courses during your time at Trinity. If you select to take a course Pass/Low Pass/Fail and change it back to a letter grade at the end of a semester, this still counts as one of your four courses

Q: Do courses only offered as Pass/Fail count towards this limit?

A: No. Courses such as Physical Education or Exploratory Internships do not count towards the one credit limit for the semester, or for the four total courses you are allowed.

Q: Are there any other restrictions on Pass/Low Pass/Fail courses?

A: If you are on academic probation you may not elect to take a course Pass/Low Pass/Fail."

College of the Holy Cross

<https://catalog.holycross.edu/requirements-policies/academic-policies/#gradestext>

from their website:

At the College of Holy Cross, students take four courses a semester. During the week before add/drop and during the add/drop period, a student can register for a fifth class.

“Pass/No Pass Grading

The grades of P and NP are the Pass/No Pass grades. The option of Pass/No Pass grading is available only for those students taking five courses in a semester.

Following are the qualifications for the Pass/No Pass Option:

1. Students who wish to take a course on a Pass/No Pass basis shall have until the fifth Friday of the semester to decide which of the five courses chosen during the enrollment period is to be taken on the Pass/No Pass basis. A Pass/No Pass form must be completed and filed with the Registrar during the period designated for the declaration of the Pass/No Pass option.
2. Pass/No Pass courses do not count toward the 32 courses required for graduation.
3. Pass/No Pass courses cannot be used to remove deficiencies.
4. Courses taken on a Pass/No Pass basis may be used to satisfy common requirements.
5. Pass/No Pass courses may be taken within the student's major, minor, or concentration but cannot be used to fulfill the requirements of these programs.
6. Pass/No Pass grades will not be averaged into a student's GPA but will be placed on the student's record.
7. At any point during the semester a student may choose to convert a Pass/No Pass course to a letter graded course.

After final grades have been posted, a student has the option to uncover the letter grade associated with a Pass grade. Requests to uncover a Pass must be made in writing to the Class Dean. Once the letter grade has been uncovered, the course becomes a letter-graded course and the grade cannot be converted back to a Pass. All requests to uncover a Pass must be made no later than one week prior to the date of the student's graduation."

Fordham University

https://www.fordham.edu/info/24145/undergraduate_faculty_handbook/6603/grades/2

from the handbook:

"P or F: Pass or fail, for courses taken on a Pass/Fail basis

Sophomores, juniors, and seniors are allowed to register for one elective course per year on a Pass/Fail basis. Credit will be granted for a passing grade, and no credit awarded for a failing grade. Since there is no numerical equivalent, as noted above for grades representing academic performance, the grade is not computed in the student's GPA index.

No courses used to fulfill a core, major, or minor program requirement may be taken on a P/F basis. Once chosen, the P/F option cannot be rejected in anticipation of a high letter grade; conversely, the likelihood of a low letter grade is not grounds for a belated request for a P/F. In order to take a course on a P/F basis, the approval of the appropriate class dean or associate dean is required."

University of Connecticut

<https://registrar.uconn.edu/grades/#>

“Pass/Fail Option

The University Senate, the schools, the colleges and some programs have restricted the credits placed on Pass/Fail in various ways. Thus, students planning to place a course on Pass/Fail should consider the consequences carefully. The advantage to the student is that the grade for a course placed on Pass/Fail does not affect their grade point average. However, they should discuss with their advisor the immediate, the long-term, the direct, and the indirect effects.

A student who has earned at least 24 credits and is not on scholastic probation may elect a maximum of 12 credits to be distributed over not more than three courses, to be recorded as “P” for Pass or “F” for Fail on his or her permanent record. Students who are selecting a course for the Pass/Fail option must do so within the first two weeks of the semester. Students who are removing a course from the Pass/Fail option must do so within the first nine weeks of the semester. For courses taught outside of the fall and spring semesters, these deadlines will be adjusted in a pro-rated fashion by the Registrar.

During the semester, the student completes the course and is graded in the usual way by the instructor; and the instructor submits a letter grade. This letter grade is translated into a “P” (“D-” or above) or remains an “F”. In neither event will a course taken under the Pass/Fail option be included in the computation of the semester or cumulative grade point average, but a grade below “C” makes the student ineligible for the Dean’s List. The individual schools and colleges have the privilege of adopting the Pass/Fail option with or without supplementary restrictions. Students are referred to the detailed statements of the various schools in the *Undergraduate Catalog* for such restrictions.

Restrictions on Pass/Fail Courses

Courses placed on Pass/Fail may only be used as electives; they may not be used to satisfy the General Education Requirement, the major or related requirements, the skill requirements, the minor requirements, or any school or college course requirement. Pass/Fail credits may not be acceptable when a student changes majors or schools within the University. Pass/Fail credits may not be transferable to another institution.

Students working on a degree at another institution need written approval from their dean, or other official, at the other institution to place a course on Pass/Fail.

The Registrar does not place a student on the Dean’s List if the instructor’s grade for a Pass/Fail course is less than “C”. Note that at least 12 credits must contribute to the semester grade point average placing a student on the Dean’s List. As the Pass/Fail marks have no grade points, the instructor’s grade does not contribute to the grade point averages. Note also that at least 54 credits must contribute to the grade point average for students to graduate cum laude or higher.

Restriction by School or College

Listed below are the Pass/Fail supplementary restrictions imposed by each school and college.

- In the School of Business, students may not elect the Pass/Fail option for any of the departments of the School.
- In the School of Education, students may not elect the Pass/Fail option for courses offered in the School of Education which are required for certification as a teacher.
- In the School of Engineering, no course taken on Pass/Fail may be counted for credit toward graduation.
- In the School of Pharmacy, no specifically required courses (all courses for which no alternate choice is given in the curricular listings) can be taken on Pass/Fail.
- In the Ratcliffe Hicks School of Agriculture students may only place one course on the Pass/Fail option.

Loyola U Chicago

A student taking an elective course "pass/no pass" must receive a grade of C- or higher in order to earn a passing grade (P) for the course. Credit hours for which the student earns a grade of "P" will count toward graduation, but there is no grade computed in the grade point average. A student who receives a grade of D+ or lower in a course taken on the Pass-No Pass Option (see below) will receive a non-passing grade of "NP." Credit hours for which the student earns a grade of "NP" will not count toward graduation, and the grade will not be computed in the grade point average.

Vassar College

Non-Recorded Option

Courses designated by a department or program as available under the Non-Recorded Option are noted in the Schedule of Classes each semester. Most departments limit the option to nonmajors only. In order to elect the NRO in a designated course, a student must file a NRO form, signed by his or her adviser, with the Office of the Registrar indicating the lowest letter grade the student wishes to have recorded on the permanent record. The deadline for electing a course under the NRO is the last day of the sixth full week of classes. After this deadline, a student may neither change the choice of the NRO nor change the minimum grade elected.

A regular letter grade will be assigned at the end of the course by the instructor, who will, before turning in grades to the registrar, have knowledge of whether the student has elected the NRO, although the instructor will not have knowledge of the minimum grade set by the student. If the grade assigned by the instructor is lower than the student's elected minimum grade, but is still passing (D or better), a grade of PA is entered on the permanent record. (The grade of PA is permanent; it may not be revoked and the letter grade assigned by the instructor may not be disclosed.) If the letter grade assigned by the instructor is an F, an F is recorded and serves as a letter grade on the student's permanent record. The election of a course under the NRO counts in the total NRO Vassar work allowed each student, even if a letter grade is received.

Non-Recorded Option Limit - Students may elect a maximum of 4 units of work under the Non-Recorded Option. For transfer students, this limit is reduced by 1 unit for each year of advanced standing awarded to the student.

Ungraded Work

Ungraded work is open to all students who have the appropriate prerequisites subject to limitations imposed by departments on work done in the field of concentration. This work is graded SA (Satisfactory) and UN (Unsatisfactory).

“Satisfactory” work is defined as work at C level or above. “Unsatisfactory” work will not be credited toward the degree.

Community-engaged learning (290), Independent Work (298, 399), and Reading Courses (297) are all considered Ungraded Work. Other courses, including some half-unit courses and many theses/senior projects may be designated as Ungraded as well at the discretion of the department. All Ungraded work is noted in the Schedule of Classes with an SU grade type.

Special Note: Grades of “DS” - Independent Work and Ungraded Theses/Senior Projects may allow for grades of “DS” (Distinction) in addition to “SA” and “UN”, where appropriate and where the department policy indicates.

Ungraded Limit - Students may elect a maximum of 5 units of Ungraded Work. For transfer students, this limit is reduced by 1 unit for each year of advanced standing awarded to the student. This ungraded limit does not apply to any units taken in excess of the 32-unit minimum required for graduation.

Gonzaga University

No more than five (5) Pass/Fail graded courses can count toward a baccalaureate degree, and no more than two (2) can be taken in any one department. This grading option can not be used to satisfy core, major, minor, or concentration requirements. This grading option only applies to courses taken as elective credit.

Designated elective courses may be taken on a pass or fail basis at the option of the student, not of the instructor. The Pass/Fail option by a student should not be confused with the Satisfactory/Non Satisfactory option offered and graded for courses predetermined by academic departments.

1. A course with a "P" grade earned at the option of the student does not fulfill any course requirement for a core, major, minor, or concentration requirement.
2. The credits earned for a "P" grade count toward the 128 minimum credits necessary for a degree but do not count in a GPA.
3. A "P" (pass) grade will not affect the grade-point average; a fail will have the same effect as any "F" (fail) grade.
4. A student's level of performance for a "P" grade must correspond to the letter grade of "C" or better.
5. Undergraduate students wishing to exercise the Pass/Fail option must fill out the Pass/Fail Grade Option form in the Registrar's Office prior to the last published date for "adding or dropping" courses and may not revoke their decision after this date.
6. No more than five (5) Pass/Fail courses may count toward a degree, and no more than two (2) may be taken in any one department.

7. Students are allowed to take two (2) courses on Pass/Fail during the four semesters as first year and second year undergraduates, provided that no more than one such course is taken in any given semester. A total of three (3) Pass/Fail courses may be taken during the undergraduate third year and fourth year with no more than one in any given semester.
8. Any course failed ("F" grade) may not be repeated on a Pass/Fail basis.
9. Last day to change to or from the Pass/Fail grading option is the last day of Registration Period III.

Santa Clara (P/NP for COVID specifically, like us)

Dear SCU Community:

We are all facing unusual challenges as a result of COVID-19. We greatly appreciate the collective call to action from our faculty, staff, and students, who have all been impacted by our rapid pivot to remote instruction. We especially appreciate our students' resilience and flexibility during this time. To support our students' success during this period of disruption, the University is implementing a temporary change to the **undergraduate pass/no pass grading policy during the Spring 2020 quarter**.

For spring 2020, the following changes will be implemented:

- All undergraduates, regardless of class standing, may select the pass/no pass option for any undergraduate course.
- The deadline for selecting the pass/no pass option has been extended from the end of week 4 to the end of week 10 (**Friday, June 5**).
- The pass/no pass grading option is permitted for all core, major, minor, elective, and prerequisite courses.
- Courses taken pass/no pass in Spring 2020 will not count toward the limit of 6 pass/no pass courses taken in total at Santa Clara.

Per the Undergraduate Bulletin, a passing (P) grade is equivalent to a letter grade of "C" or better. Students who are considering a pass/no pass option should note that a pass/no pass grade is not factored into a student's grade point average. Additionally, students who receive a letter grade of "no pass" (NP) **will not earn academic credit for the course**, whereas credit is earned for a letter grade between C- and D-. Finally, it is important to note that some external organizations (external funders, graduate and professional schools) have specific letter grade requirements.

P/NP grading may also have implications for international students, NCAA athletes, students with ROTC or GI Bill scholarships, and some privately funded scholarship students; therefore, we encourage students to consult with relevant offices (e.g. ISS, Athletics, ROTC, and Veterans Administration) before opting to switch from letter grades to P/NP.

Undergraduates who are considering the pass/no pass option and have questions should consult with the course instructor, the Drahnmann Academic Advising Center, or the Office of the Registrar.

Georgetown University

<https://bulletin.georgetown.edu/regulations/studying/#PassFailPolicy>

4. Pass/Fail Option

After the first year, students may opt to take one elective course each semester on a pass/fail basis for a total of six courses during sophomore, junior, and senior years.

The procedure for selecting the pass/fail grade option is as follows:

- Students choose an elective course to be graded on a pass/fail basis during the add/drop period by initiating a pass/fail course request online in MyAccess. The request is sent to the student's dean for approval, and the instructor receives notification after the pass/fail request has been approved and processed.
- The pass/fail option is restricted to free electives and must be exercised only for courses within the normal course load for a given semester. A department, for valid reasons, may designate certain of its courses as unavailable to the pass/fail option and will notify the Dean's Office. Language classes at the language-learning level and studio art courses may not be taken pass/fail.
- Pass/fail courses will be marked S (Satisfactory), equivalent to letter grades of C or better, or U (Unsatisfactory), equivalent to letter grades below C. Neither the S nor the U will affect the student's QPI, but only courses marked as "S" receive credit.
- Once a student has elected to take a course on a pass/fail basis, it is not possible, under any circumstances, to record a letter grade for that course.
- The last day to request the pass/fail option is the last day to add a course for that semester. See the [Academic Calendar](#) for dates.

Creighton University:

<http://catalog.creighton.edu/undergraduate/academic-policies-procedures/pass-no-pass/>

Beginning with their Sophomore year, students may register for courses on a Pass/No Pass (P/NP) grading basis. A limit of twelve Pass/No Pass hours will be permitted for an eligible student. Courses to be taken on a "P/NP" basis must be selected from those outside the student's major and its requisite courses, and from outside educational courses leading to teacher certification. Up to four credit hours in the Arts and Sciences minor may be taken on a "P/NP" basis. No Core courses may be taken as "P/NP." Course prerequisites must be met. Hours passed will be counted toward graduation but will not be included in the grade-point average. Likewise, a "NP" does not affect the GPA. The grade of "C" will be the lowest pass grade. The "P/NP" status of a student is not made known to the instructor, who grades the student in the traditional manner. The final grade is converted to "P" or "NP" when the

student's end-of-term grade report is processed. For Heider College of Business students, "P/NP" will only be accepted for non-restricted electives.

Approval to take a course on a Pass/No Pass basis must be obtained from the Dean after registration. The deadline for signing up for Pass/No Pass is the same as for changing from credit to audit, i.e., four weeks following the first day of classes. No change in status from Pass/No Pass to regular grading or vice versa will be allowed after the first four weeks of the semester.

Yale University:

<http://catalog.yale.edu/handbook-instructors-undergraduates-yale-college/grades/credit-d-fail-option/>

The Credit/D/Fail Option

In order to encourage academic experimentation and to promote diversity in students' programs, the Yale College Faculty has provided that students may elect a certain number of courses on a Credit/D/Fail basis. In a given term a student may elect as many as (but no more than) two course credits on the Credit/D/Fail basis; and must elect at least two courses, representing at least two course credits, for letter grades or the mark of Pass, in any combination.

At the start of each term, students enroll in all courses without selecting any for the Credit/D/Fail option. They may subsequently select that option in any Yale College course—other than those Instructors submit letter grades to the registrar for all students in their courses. For a Yale College student who has elected the Credit/D/Fail option, the registrar converts grades of A, A–, B+, B, B–, C+, C, and C– to CR and enters that mark on the student's record. Grades of D+, D, D–, and F are recorded as reported. Students are not required to disclose to the instructor of a course whether they have enrolled in the course for a letter grade or have chosen the Credit/D/Fail option.

A student may not apply any course credit earned on the Credit/D/Fail basis toward satisfaction of the distributional requirements for the bachelor's degree.

All courses offered in Yale College for graduation credit are available for election under the Credit/D/Fail option. Program descriptions under [Subjects of Instruction](#) in the YCPS specify whether or not courses taken on the Credit/D/Fail basis count toward the requirements of particular majors.

For further information about the [Credit/D/Fail option](#), consult the [Grades](#) section of the Academic Regulations in the YCPS.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

<https://registrar.mit.edu/classes-grades-evaluations/grades/grading-policies>

Grading by year

- First-year students — all subjects taken in your first semester are graded on a Pass or No Record (P/NR) scale. In your second semester, subjects are graded ABC/NR. Learn more about [first-year grading](#).
- Undergraduate students — students entering MIT as first-year students in Fall 2020 and beyond — you may use the [Flexible P/NR Option](#) on up to 48 units after your first semester.
- **Sophomores** — students who entered Fall 2019 or earlier may designate a subject as [Exploratory](#). After completing the class, you can decide whether to keep the grade awarded or change it to listener status.
- **Juniors and seniors** — students who entered Fall 2019 or earlier may choose up to two subjects to designate as P/D/F.

Seattle University

<https://www.seattleu.edu/registrar/student-records/grades/>

The P grade is assigned when a student successfully completes an undergraduate course after electing the pass/fail grading option for a general elective course. Failure to achieve at the minimum D- level results in a grade of F, which will affect the grade point average.

The pass/fail grading option is not available for graduate students.

Undergraduate students are allowed to choose the pass/fail grading option for courses which will be used towards *general electives or minors only* (see note below). Core courses, college requirements, and major requirements cannot be taken pass/fail.

Only one course per quarter may be taken pass/fail and must be approved prior to the add/drop and change grading option date of the term of registration. This date can be found on the calendar on the Office of the Registrar web site.

If a student earns a D- or above in a course where the pass/fail grading options has been chosen, the grade on the transcript will appear as a "P" (pass). A failing grade will appear as "F". A pass (P) grade does not affect a student's cumulative GPA, while a fail (F) grade will be used in the computation of the cumulative GPA.

Please submit a [Registration Change- Petition to the Dean](#) for approval prior to the add/drop deadline and change grading option date for the term.

Saint Louis University

<https://catalog.slu.edu/academic-policies/academic-policies-procedures/pass-no-pass-option/>

To enroll in a course on a pass/no pass basis undergraduate students must:

- Submit completed [Petition for Pass/No Pass Grading Scale](#) and
- Receive approval by the instructor.

The Pass/No Pass option may only be petitioned for elective courses.

Therefore, a Pass grade will count toward the 120-credit minimum graduation requirement.

A Pass grade may not be used to satisfy a course prerequisite.

A Pass grade cannot be applied to any of the following:

- Required lower and upper division courses within each college or school,
- Required course for a major,
- Required course for a minor,
- Required course for a concentration or
- Required course for a certificate

Both grades of Pass/No Pass are not awarded quality points and therefore are not calculated in the cumulative grade point average.

A course registered with a standard grade may be changed to a Pass/No Pass grade only through the last day of the add/drop period.

A course registered with a Pass/No Pass grade may be changed to a standard grade only through the last day of the add/drop period.

Note: See Registration Procedures for additional information

Appendix B: Policy on Pass/Fail Option for Undergraduate courses & UCC Minutes (November 2014)

Policy on Pass/Fail Option for Undergraduate Courses Submitted by the UCC to the Academic Council

Rationale: Generally speaking courses should use the traditional (A, B, C, D, F) grading system. However, some courses (e.g. many internships) do not lend themselves to traditional grading by multiple letter grades, and a Pass/Fail grade may be preferable in these cases.

Details:

1. All students in the course will receive a grade of either Pass or Fail.
2. The requirements for a Pass grade must be specified in the course syllabus.
3. The decision to designate a course Pass/Fail must be approved by the department within which the course is taught and by the curriculum committee of that school.
4. A Pass/Fail course will count as a regular course toward graduation, determining full- time status, etc.
5. The grade in a Pass/Fail course will not be included in calculating a student's grade point average but will appear in all cases on the student's transcript.

Relevant portions of UCC minutes

UCC Meeting on 10/1/2013 (excerpt of minutes):

4. Pass/fail grade option – Currently there is no pass/fail grade option at Fairfield. Should this be reconsidered? When might it be most appropriately offered? Discussion.

UCC Meeting on 11/5/2013 (excerpt of minutes):

(4) Report from the Pass/Fail Policy Subcommittee:

Rosivach referred to the policy drafted by the subcommittee as submitted to the meeting. He mentioned that the 3.5 GPA in item BZ2 of the draft is up for the committee's discussion and consideration. The following discussion and Q&A followed the presentation:

- Pagano: asked if this policy for only undergraduate courses or will also apply to graduate courses
- Rosivach: said that it is mainly for undergraduate courses, and asked if graduate students are expected to take a P/F course
- Dean Crabtree: asked if this will be considered in the AACSB accreditation for the Business School, and Dean Gibson answered no
- Dean Crabtree: mentioned that a graduate student may take some course (i.e. Statistics course) just for general skills without seeking a grade
- Pagano: asked about the distinction between the two groups A and B in the draft policy. Rosivach explained the difference between the two groups of courses. In group A, the whole course is designated as P/F course. Group B courses are regular courses where some students may be permitted to take it as P/F instead of the regular grade according to the requirements and

conditions detailed in the draft

- Peduti: wondered about the reason behind picking GPA 3.5 for a student to be eligible for P/F election under group B. Rosivach replied that we decided to start with students on the Dean's list. However, the subcommittee needs guidance from committee members on that issue
- Perkus: we have to consider how this policy will affect other student choices and designations like applying for Fulbright Scholarship, joining associations like Beta Alpha Sigma, and others. Rosivach replied that we will need to make students aware of any of these consequences of their P/F election.
- Agresta: it is good that the suggested policy will expand the choices available to students. However, students electing P/F may not work as hard for these courses. In addition, the minimum 3.5 GPA means this is already an accomplished student who may not need that option to start with.
- Perkus: this option will be offered and applied to very narrow area of course work.
- Gerard: 3.5 GPA is too high and we may need to make it available to more students
- Pagano: it will be good to make this election available to graduate students too
- Jones: supports the higher 3.5 GPA but wonders how we will get enough enrollment in these courses with such high requirement. Rosivach replied that the option will be for selected students already enrolled in regular courses under group B in the draft, and the instructor will have the final say
- Staecker: asked about item BZ8 in the draft that makes the election "ordinarily" available only for junior and senior students. Is this a policy or just an expectation? Rosivach replied that we may leave this part for Deans to decide
- Miecznikowski: wondered how many students have GPA 3.5 or higher. We may need to obtain this information
- Perkus: commented on item BZ6 in the draft that allows students to switch back from P/F to regular grade during the semester. He thinks that students should be bound to their original choice. Rosivach replied that is why the draft includes a time period of 10 weeks. Perkus asked if the student will need the instructor's approval for the switch. He added that we may need to educate the faculty not to treat students any different
- Gerard: it sounds like the draft policy will be limited to elective courses
- Dean Crabtree: certain courses will be fit for this draft policy. We may need to consult with FUSA about this change
- Campbell: item BZ6 of the draft will give incentive for students to register as P/F first, and then switch to regular grade based on their performance. Rosivach agreed and added that –in addition to encouraging students to explore new areasZ it is still encouraging them to do well and be engaged in the course
- Campbell: asked if we can also apply that option to switching from regular grade to P/F in case a student is not doing well and would prefer the P/F option than the W option. Rosivach replied that we are trying to avoid having this option available
- Nantz: wondered what will happen when a student takes a P/F course as elective and, then, decides to declare the area as a major or minor after completing the course. Rosivach replied that, under the draft policy, the course will not count towards that newlyZdeclared major/minor, and students will need to take additional course to meet the major/minor requirements
- Perkus: wondered how group B of the draft policy will work for courses that depend heavily on teamwork when members of the same team are electing P/F while others are under the regular grade system. Rosivach replied that is why we are leaving the final approval to the instructor
- Pagano: asked why the P/F course will not count for a major or minor if minimum CZ is required to pass? Rosivach replied that it is a motivational issue for the student
- Peduti: referred back to item BZ2 of the draft policy and mentioned we may need to consider a lower GPA than 3.5. Etemad replied that the 3.5 is open for discussion
- Sauer: we may need to open it for students who would like to try new areas and don't meet the 3.5 GPA requirement
- Perkus: wondered how the draft policy will affect Financial Aid eligibility. Rosivach replied we should consider such implications
- Staecker: asked if we can count the P/F course towards major requirements if student changes major.

- Ebrahim: asked why we don't count the P/F course if a student later declares the area as a second major or a minor as long as the CZ meets the requirements of that major/minor. Rosivach said that we need to consider all these issues.
- Garvey: for the inter/disciplinary minors, we need to consider how the proposed P/F policy will work

Rosivach concluded the discussion of this agenda item by stating that the subcommittee will consider all the above points raised by members and will report back to the committee.

UCC Meeting on 4/1/2014 (excerpt of minutes):

2. Discussion of Pass/Fail Subcommittee Report

- a. Prof. Rosivach explained that the original proposal to offer a Pass/Fail option has been modified based on prior discussion of the UCC. Prof. Ebrahim asked for clarification as to how the P/F option would be limited to juniors and seniors. Prof. Rosivach indicated that as per communication with Financial Aid this is a concern and could be done by requiring any P/F student to have a minimum of 60 credits. Prof. Garvey asked about limiting the number of students taking P/F. Prof. Rosivach explained that this will be determined by the individual schools as issues may arise which make this desirable. Assoc. Dean Perkus asked for clarification on how grades would be assigned. Prof. Rosivach explained that the professor for the class would not know which students are taking P/F and would maintain and submit grades normally. The registrar would then record the P or F for those students electing this option. Prof. Peduti confirmed that the professor would record the grade, and the registrar would switch for those students.

- b. **MOTION: The UCC endorses RECOMMENDATION A (Pass/Fail Courses) and recommends its approval by the Academic Council for inclusion in the Journal of Record.** Motion to approve by Prof. Miecznikowski and seconded by Prof. Fernandez. Motion PASSED(16Z0Z1).

- c. **MOTION: The UCC endorses RECOMMENDATION B (Taking a Regular Course for a Pass/Fail Grade) and recommends its approval by the Academic Council for inclusion in the Journal of Record.** Motion to approve by Prof. Miecznikowski, seconded by Prof. Reckinger. Assoc. Dean Perkus clarified that under this proposal, if a student chooses P/F and earns a D the student will get no credit. He spoke against the motion stating that it was too confusing and he did not see how the institution would be better off with this policy. Prof. Fernandez expressed mixed feelings about the motion. She likes that students would be encouraged to broaden their experiences but sees too many complications. Prof. Rosivach reiterated that the subcommittee tried to incorporate all changes suggested by the UCC and he wants to make sure that this objective has been met but he added that these changes have resulted in the proposal moving away from the original intent. Prof. Ebrahim stated that the original intent was simply to encourage students to try new things. Prof. Garvey expressed gratitude to the subcommittee for doing a lot of good work but spoke against the motion saying there were too many steps that needed to be met. The motion was called to a vote. The motion FAILED (3Z14Z0). The subcommittee's work on the Pass/Fail option has been concluded.

The

Master of Public Administration Program
Revised Curriculum

Offered by the Masters of Public Administration (MPA) Program

Contents:

- 1) Description, Overview, and Summary of the Curriculum
- 2) Need for the Revised Curriculum
- 3) Rationale
- 4) Objectives
- 5) Impact
- 6) Program Detail
- 7) Administrative Structure and Governance
- 8) Resources
- 9) Projections for the Future

1. Description, Overview, and Summary of the revised curriculum

This proposal outlines a revised curriculum for the Master of Public Administration program. This comes because of 1) the growth of the program overall and 2) the program's 5-year review, which is discussed in Section 2.

The current MPA curriculum is in Appendix A; the revised MPA curriculum is outlined below under Program Detail – Section 6.

The summary of the changes are:

- 1) Reduction of degree credit hours from 42 to 36.
- 2) Restructured the Core MPA requirements to enhance our skills based program and academic foundations of a public administration program. The current Core consists of 33 credit hours (out of 42). The revised Core consists of 21 credit hours (out of 36).
- 3) The revised Core does the following:
 - a. Creation of new course (PAUD 5400 Statistics for Public Administrators).
 - b. Maintains PUAD 5405 (Intro to Public Administration), PUAD 5410 (Financial Management and Budgeting), PUAD 5415 Human Resource Management (Students choose from PUAD 5415, MGMT 6505, or MGMT 6525), PUAD 5420 (Research Methods), and PUAD 6999 Capstone (renamed Seminar in Public Administration).
 - c. Combined Leadership (MPA 420, CO 522 or MG 500) and Ethics (MG 503 or CO 440) courses into one course (PUAD 5425 Administrative Leadership and Ethics).
 - d. Eliminated the two (2) Communication courses requirement (6 credit hours).
 - e. Eliminated the internship requirement (6 credit hours).

2. Need for the Revised Curriculum

As mentioned, the revised curriculum was created because of 1) the growth of the program overall and 2) the program's 5-year review.

Under the leadership of Dr. LeClair, the MPA program became the second largest graduate program in the College of Arts and Sciences. To remain competitive in the market, and to address the concerns identified in the 5-year review, the MPA Steering Committee (Committee) sought to redefine the curriculum.

Public administration is the soul part of the public sector.¹ It is where programs and policies are analyzed, implemented, and evaluated. Indeed, without public administrators, public sectors' services and programs would be curtailed. The MPA Program prides itself on not only providing our graduate students the academic contexts important to public administration, but also as a skill's based program where our graduate students leave with the training and skills necessary to be effective public servants. The new curriculum better meets the skills needed in today's public sector jobs.

In 2008, the MPA program did a self-study. On April 10, 2019, Drs. Vike and Williamson conducted a site visit for the MPA program's 5-year review. The Committee received their review in May 2019. In their assessment, they stated the following that led the Committee to adopt the changes to the MPA curriculum:

- 1) "Updating an examination of the alignment between MPA courses and student learning outcomes will be particularly important if responsibility for the leadership and human resource management courses transitions over to the College of Arts & Sciences."
- 2) "We were confused about some aspects of the curricular requirements for the MPA program and the specialization tracks."
- 3) "Through our review and discussions, including those with students, we observed that some courses seemed appropriately related to public and non-profit settings, while others seemed less so."
- 4) "We believe it would be sensible to narrow the range of communications courses to choose from in order to ensure fit with needs of the program."
- 5) "We applaud Dr. Alberda's recent effort to share further information about the capstone with students. We recommend formalizing this information sharing process for the future and improving written documentation of the capstone for future literature about program requirements."
- 6) "It differentiates itself from competitor programs with a focus on skill-based courses that prepare students for working in nonprofits or state and local government."

Members of the Committee, last academic year (2019/2020), reviewed the entire MPA curriculum with point #1 in mind. As a skills based program, which is an advantage noted by the reviewers (see #6), the Committee discussed the outcomes students needed for today's public sector job market and the courses that were being offered. After thoughtful discussions about

¹ Public sector includes nonprofits, national, state, and local governments

each course, the Committee agreed upon the revised curriculum by simplifying it (#2), restructuring courses to fit appropriately (#3), narrowed the range of Communication courses students can take (#4), and solidified a capstone path (#5). The Committee believes it keeps the MPA program skills base, thus competitive and broadens the academic spirit of a MPA program (#3). The committee approved the new curriculum in the Committee meeting on October 9, 2020. The minutes from this meeting are in Appendix B. The specific changes to the new curriculum are copied again below for convenience. The reasons for each change made to the new curriculum is explained under each specific change.

- 1) Reduction of degree credit hours from 42 to 36.
 - a. The Committee noted that many students come into the MPA program with public sector work experience, therefore, their internship requirement is waived. The Committee believes it is best to eliminate this requirement, which naturally would drop the required number of credit hours to complete the degree from 42 to 36.
 - b. Reducing the number of credit hours for the degree also places our program among the norm, per se, for MPA programs. For instance, Sacred Heart University, New Haven University, American University, and University of Delaware, just to name a few, all have 36 credit hour programs.
 - c. By reducing the number of credit hours, it keep the program competitive as well.
 - d. The Committee is not eliminating academic courses or decreasing academic rigor as the 36 credit hour program reflects the elimination of the internship, not course work (maintains #6; meets #1 from 5-year review).
 - e. It also allows the MPA program to have a set schedule for offering courses and streamlines the program requirements (meets #2 from 5-year review).
- 2) Restructured the Core MPA requirements to enhance our skills based program and academic foundations of a public administration program. The current Core consists of 33 credit hours (out of 42). The revised Core consists of 21 credit hours (out of 36). The revised Core does the following:
 - a. Creation of new course (PAUD 5400 Statistics for Public Administrators).
 - This class focuses on the type of data analysis conducted in the public sector providing a much needed skill set in a data driven world (meets #1 & maintains #6 from 5-year review).
 - b. Maintains PUAD 5405 (Intro to Pubic Administration), PUAD 5410 (Financial Management and Budgeting), PUAD 5415 Human Resource Management (Students choose from PUAD 5415, MGMT 6505, or MGMT 6525), PUAD 5420 (Research Methods), and PUAD 6999 Capstone (renamed Seminar in Public Administration).
 - These courses provide the foundation for any MPA program, thus were kept (maintains #6; meets #1 from 5-year review).
 - c. Combined Leadership (MPA 420, CO 522 or MG 500) and Ethics (MG 503 or CO 440) courses into one course (PUAD 5425 Administrative Leadership and Ethics).
 - The Committee believes that combing these two courses into one course best reflects the alignment between outcomes desired from both courses and the current needs in the market (meets #1 from 5-year review).
 - This also helps streamline the requirements (meets #2 from 5-year review).

- Doing so allows MPA students to take an additional elective of their choosing. This allows students to take courses they feel would best help them achieve their career goals.
- d. Eliminated the two (2) Communication courses requirement (6 credit hours).
- Under the current curriculum students must take two (2) Communication courses. Depending on which course they took for their Ethnicity and Leadership requirements meant that a MPA student could potentially take four (4) Communication Courses as part of their MPA degree. While the Committee notes there are some Communication courses that students would find beneficial to a MPA degree, having students take PUAD courses instead better prepares them for careers in public administration. The new PUAD 5425 (Administrative and Leadership Ethics) course, for instance, replaces the need to students to take both Leadership and Ethics outside of the MPA program. This better aligns our MPA course offerings with our intended student outcomes for the program (meets #1 of the 5-year review).
 - Since there are some Communication courses that MPA students may find beneficial, the Committee did agree to allow students to take up to one (1) Communications course as an elective (meets #1 of the 5-year review). As noted in Appendix B and in Section 6 (Program Detail), the Committee also streamlined which Communication courses best fit each specialization (meets #4 of the 5-year review).
- e. Eliminated the internship requirement (6 credit hours).
- As mentioned above, many students come into the MPA program with public sector work experience, therefore, their internship requirement is waived. Indeed this semester alone, the MPA Director received over 10 requests from current students for their internship to be waived due to previous or current work experience. The Committee believes it is best to eliminate this requirement. Students may still do internships if they wish, however, no credit will be given for it.

3. Rationale

The MPA program at Fairfield is now in its eighth year, with enrollment rising from 6 in fall of 2013 to roughly 35 at present. In order to attract an even larger cohort of students, the program needs to remain competitive and keep up with the current trends in the public sector. The revised curriculum is one way that the MPA program is doing this.

The new curriculum also will provide students with a course sequence guide (Appendix C). This allows students to plan their courses and goals during their time in the program effectively and efficiently. Moreover, the new curriculum creates a set schedule of course offerings. Students will know what courses are being offered when so they can plan accordingly. This helps them gain the skills they need to be successful administrators by being able to take the courses they need.

4. Objectives

Two important objectives underlie the revised curriculum for the MPA program. One, increased graduate student enrollment is one of the stated goals of the Fairfield 2020 Strategic Plan. Two, collaboration and community expansion and growth as part of the Fairfield 2020 Strategic Plan.

In the “Fairfield 2020: The Way Forward,” the University identified 6 essential priorities. Using those 6 priorities, the new MPA tracks align strategically with two of the goals: growth and diversification of revenue streams and developing and continuing a renewed sense of collaboration and community. Each of these will be discussed in detail below.

Growth and diversification of revenue streams: invest and grow graduate programs

As indicated in the University’s strategic plan, it is recommended that Fairfield invest and grow graduate programs. The MPA program at Fairfield is now in its eighth year, with enrollment rising from 6 in fall of 2013 to 35 at present. The MPA program offers undergraduate students the opportunity to complete the MPA degree as a fifth year program. Our traditional graduate students – mainly are part time students and fulltime practitioners – can complete the program in two years. Public administration is in essence the ‘behind the scenes’ work of government agencies and nonprofits that administer goods and services to the community. For instance, there are over 2.79 million public administrators working for the federal government alone.² Additionally there are over 89,000 state and local governmental entities in the United States all of which have multiple agencies and nonprofit partnerships.³ In particular to Connecticut, currently there are 75,782 state and local government employees alone.⁴

This new curriculum will help build enrollment for MPA program in the College of Arts and Sciences. The new curriculum ensures that students can complete the program in the two-year time frame that is advertised. It also will help the program recruit undergraduate students to it as they can complete the accelerated masters within the additional year after graduation. Revising the Curriculum to better prepare our students is a viable way to help increase enrollment.

Growth and diversification of revenue streams: innovative part-time educational opportunities that satisfy career requirements and market demand

In particular, the ability to meet the goal of a two year program is key. The Committee also passed the new public administration minor. The Committee feels that the new curriculum and minor will help to satisfy the career requirements (e.g. the new Stats course) and draw undergraduate students into the program for the accelerated MPA degree.

Collaboration and Community: establish new collaborative cultural norms

Redesigning the MPA curriculum requires that we work with other academic areas, enrollment, finance, and marketing. We have already taken the lead on developing these relationship with the creation of the MPA Certificate in Nonprofit Management and the creation of the Public Health track within the MPA program. It also keep our relationships with Dolan (the Human Resources class) and the Communication Department (Communications elective).

² US Census Bureau

³ Ibid

⁴ Ibid

5. Impact

It is anticipated that the revised MPA curriculum will attract new students. First is it on par with other MPA programs that are nearby as far as credit hours are concerned. Second with the course sequencing and course offering plans, students can plan accordingly. Third, students will also be able to complete the program within 2 years. Finally, because the Human Resource course, Program Management course, and Communication courses are offered to students under the new curriculum, it naturally will feed additional students into both Graduate Communication, and the graduate programs at the Dolan School of Business. It is also anticipated that this will strengthen existing links between the program and governmental agencies, both at the state and local level.

6. Program Detail

The proposed revised curriculum for the Master of Public Administration (MPA) program will provide an opportunity for MPA students to study (and master) both the basics of public administration as a discipline, and the specifics for their area of specialization (tracks). Students will complete 36 credits of course work – 21 in required courses, 9 credit hours in this specific track and 6 credit hours of electives (15 credit hours total).

Master in Public Administration Degree Requirements (36 credit hours)

Required Courses (21 credit hours – 7 classes)

- PUAD 5400 Statistics for Public Administrators
- PUAD 5405 Introduction to Public Administration
- PUAD 5410 Financial Management and Budgeting
- PUAD 5415 Human Resource Management
 - Students choose from PUAD 5415, MGMT 6505, or MGMT 6525
- PUAD 5420 Research Methods
- PUAD 5425 Administrative Leadership and Ethics
- PUAD 6999 Seminar in Public Administration (Capstone)

Students choose from *one* Specialization/Track and Electives to fill remaining 15 credit hours (5 classes)

1. State and Local Government Track

- Required (3 classes, 9 credit hours)
 - PUAD 5440 State & Local Government
 - PUAD 5445 Urban Policy
 - ISOM 6520 Project Management
- Electives (2 classes, 6 credit hours)
 - PUAD 5435 **Grant Writing**
 - PUAD 5470 Public Policy
 - PUAD 5455 Healthcare Management
 - **PUAD 5430 Economics of the Nonprofit Sector**
 - PUAD 5460 Introduction to Public Safety Administration
 - PUAD 5465 Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Recovery
 - Can take One (1) from the following as an Elective

- **COMM 5340 Conflict Communication**
 - **COMM 5321 Communication Processes in Organizations: Negotiation or COMM 5524 Negotiation and Conflict Management: Communication Approaches**
 - COMM 5324 Crisis Communication
 - **COMM 5502 Small Group and Team Communication**
2. Nonprofit Management Track
- **Required** (3 classes, 9 credit hours)
 - **PUAD 5430 Economics of the Nonprofit Sector**
 - **PUAD 5435 Grant Writing**
 - ISOM 6520 Project Management
 - Electives (2 classes, 6 credit hours)
 - PUAD 5470 Public Policy
 - PUAD 5440 State & Local Government
 - PUAD 5445 Urban Policy
 - PUAD 5455 Healthcare Management
 - PUAD 5460 Introduction to Public Safety Administration
 - PUAD 5465 Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Recovery
 - Can take One (1) from the following as an Elective
 - **COMM 5532 Nonprofit Media**
 - **COMM 5502 Small Group and Team Communication**
3. **Healthcare Track**
- Required (3 classes, 9 credit hours)
 - NURS 7602 Healthcare Econ & Marketing
 - PUAD 5455 Healthcare Management
 - ISOM 6520 Project Management
 - Electives (2 classes, 6 credit hours)
 - PUAD 5435 **Grant Writing**
 - PUAD 5470 Public Policy
 - PUAD 5440 State & Local Government
 - PUAD 5445 Urban Policy
 - **PUAD 5430 Economics of the Nonprofit Sector**
 - PUAD 5460 Introduction to Public Safety Administration
 - PUAD 5465 Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Recovery
 - Can take One (1) from the following as an Elective
 - **COMM 5343 Ethics and Medical Marketing Communication**
 - **COMM 5547 Healthcare Organizational Communication or COMM 5347 Communication in Healthcare Organizations**
 - **COMM 5348 Health Risk Communication or COMM 5488 Health Risk Communication**
4. Emergency Management Track
- Required (3 classes, 9 credit hours)
 - PUAD 5460 Introduction to Public Safety Administration
 - PUAD 5465 Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Recovery

- ISOM 6520 Project Management
- Electives (2 classes, 6 credit hours)
 - PUAD 5435 **Grant Writing**
 - PUAD 5470 Public Policy
 - PUAD 5440 State & Local Government
 - PUAD 5445 Urban Policy
 - PUAD 5455 Healthcare Management
 - **PUAD 5430 Economics of the Nonprofit Sector**
 - Can take One (1) from the following as an Elective
 - COMM 5324 Crisis Communication
 - **COMM 5340 Conflict Communication**
 - **COMM 5502 Small Group and Team Communication**

7. Administrative Structure and Governance

The MPA program is managed by a Director and a 6-member (all full-time faculty) Steering Committee. The Director handles the day-to-day operations of the program, while the Steering Committee provides oversight, strategic guidance and participates in the process of admitting students. The Director reports to the Dean of Arts and Sciences. The revised curriculum will be administered in the same manner as the existing one.

8. Resources

The proposed revised curriculum will utilize the resources already in place.

9. Projections

The Steering Committee believes this revised curriculum will provide students with the skills needed for public sector work and the theoretical and academic context to be effective public administrators. If anything, it will make the MPA program more attractive to prospective students, which would increase our enrollments. That would benefit the program, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the university.

Appendix A

Master in Public Administration Degree Requirements (42 credit hours)

- Required Courses (33 credit hours)
 - MPA 410 Introduction to Public Administration
 - MPA 405 Research Methods
 - MPA 400 Financial Management and Budgeting
 - MPA 415 Human Resource Management
 - Students choose from MG 0505 or MG 0525
 - Ethics Class
 - Students choose from MG 503 or CO 440
 - MPA 420 Leadership
 - Students choose from CO 0522 or MG 0500
 - MPA 500 Internship (6 credit hours)
 - This requirement may be waived for those who already have experience working for a nonprofit or a government agency.
 - MPA 510 Capstone Experience
 - Communication
 - Students choose 2 courses in Communications in addition to the required courses above
- Students choose from one Track (12 credit hours)

1. State and Local Government Track (9 credit hours)

- PUAD 5440 State & Local Government
- PUAD 5445 Urban Policy
- ISOM 6520 Project Management

Electives to Choose From (3 credit hours)

- PUAD 5435 **Grant Writing**
- **PUAD 5430 Economics of the Nonprofit Sector**
- NURS 7602 Healthcare Econ & Marketing
- PUAD 5455 Healthcare Management
- PUAD 5460 Introduction to Public Safety Administration
- PUAD 5465 Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Recovery

2. Nonprofit Management Track (9 credit hours)

- **PUAD 5430 Economics of the Nonprofit Sector**
- PUAD 5435 **Grant Writing**
- ISOM 6520 Project Management

Electives to Choose From (3 credit hours)

- PUAD 5440 State & Local Government
- PUAD 5445 Urban Policy
- NURS 7602 Healthcare Econ & Marketing

- PUAD 5455 Healthcare Management
- PUAD 5460 Introduction to Public Safety Administration
- PUAD 5465 Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Recovery

3. **Healthcare Track** (9 credit hours)

- NURS 7602 Healthcare Econ & Marketing
- PUAD 5455 Healthcare Management
- ISOM 6520 Project Management

Electives to Choose From (3 credit hours)

- PUAD 5435 **Grant Writing**
- **PUAD 5430 Economics of the Nonprofit Sector**
- PUAD 5440 State & Local Government
- PUAD 5445 Urban Policy
- PUAD 5460 Introduction to Public Safety Administration
- PUAD 5465 Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Recovery

4. **Emergency Management Track** (9 credit hours)

- PUAD 5460 Introduction to Public Safety Administration
- PUAD 5465 Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Recovery
- ISOM 6520 Project Management

Electives to Choose From (3 credit hours)

- PUAD 5435 **Grant Writing**
- **PUAD 5430 Economics of the Nonprofit Sector**
- PUAD 5440 State & Local Government
- PUAD 5445 Urban Policy
- NURS 7602 Healthcare Econ & Marketing
- PUAD 5455 Healthcare Management

Appendix B

MPA Steering Committee Meeting (Excerpt)
Friday, October 9, 2020

Members: Profs Gayle Alberda (Director), Mousumi Bhattacharya, David Downie, Mark LeClair, Tom Murray, Michael Pagano

Present: Professors Gayle Alberda (Director), Mousumi Bhattacharya, Mark LeClair, Tom Murray,

Regrets: Michael Pagano, David Downie

1. Revisiting the new MPA curriculum post 5-year program review

Alberda stated that last year, the Committee voted to amend the MPA curriculum to meet the recommendations outlined in the 5-year program review. The new curriculum reduces the number of credit hours for completion of the program from 42 to 36. The current program curriculum includes a six (6) credit hour internship that most of the MPA students are able to have waived because of their work experiences. Therefore, the majority of the MPA students only take 36 credit hours. Moreover, the reduction places the MPA program in a more competitive place as many MPA programs are only 36 credit hours. Committee members received the new proposed MPA curriculum in advance of the meeting.

Changes the Communication course requirements. The current curriculum requires students to take two communication courses. As the committee agreed last year, the two (2) COMM requirements will be moved to electives. Pagano made suggestions for our MPA students on which courses they would do well in. Alberda thanked him for his time and help with this. Alberda also reached out to the Communication Chair, Prof Horan. The list is the recommend courses based on the information from Horan and Pagano.

The new curriculum adds one new courses: PUAD 5400 Statistics for Public Administrators. PUAD 5400 is required courses that help the program meet the recommendations in the 5-year program review.

Alberda suggested renaming PUAD 6999 Capstone to PUAD 6999 Seminar in Public Administration.

Under the current curriculum, students must take both a leadership course and an ethics course. The committee recognized the importance of both topics, however, also note the two courses can be combined into one course. The new curriculum offers one, 3-credit hour course PUAD 5425 Administrative Leadership and Ethics that is required.

The Committee worked hard on developing ways to meet the recommendations. Alberda thanked all the committee members for their hard work and dedication to growing the program.

Alberda shared with the Committee, per the recommendations put forth, a revised MPA curriculum. Committee members received proposal in advance of the meeting.

Alberda also mentioned that the Dean's Office would like the PUAD courses filled – this means reducing the number of outside MPA courses students take as electives or required classes.

The Committee discussed options for the new MPA curriculum. They agreed that all options maintain the 21 credit hours that are required. For the electives, they agreed that they should reduce the number of outside electives a MPA student can take to one (1) and all other electives will be within the MPA program (PUAD courses). This will provide balance between filling our courses and providing students with the skills they need to be public administrators.

Motion to approve new curriculum made by LeClair.

Second by Bhattacharya.

Motion passed.

Appendix C

MPA Course Sequence

<u>Year</u>	<u>Course #</u>	<u>Course Title</u>
Year 1		
	PUAD 5400	Statistics for Public Administrators
	PUAD 5405	Introduction to Public Administration
	PUAD 5410	Financial Management and Budgeting
	PUAD 5415	Human Resource Management
	PUAD 5425	Administrative Leadership and Ethics
		Specialization Course or Elective
		Specialization Course or Elective
Year 2		
	PUAD 5420	Research Methods
	PUAD 6999	Seminar in Public Administration
		Specialization Course or Elective
		Specialization Course or Elective
		Specialization Course or Elective

2]

Course Number	Course Name	Fall Even	Winter Odd	Spring Odd	Summer Odd	Fall Odd	Winter Even	Spring Even	Summer Even
Required									
PUAD 5400	Stats for PA								
PUAD 5405	Into PA								
PUAD 5410	Fin. Mgmt & Budget								
PUAD 5415 (MGMT 6505/6525)	HR Mgmt								
PUAD 5420	Methods								
PUAD 5425	Admin. Leadership and Ethics								
PUAD 6999	Seminar in PA (Capstone)								
Specializations & Electives									
PUAD 5440	State & Local Gov't								
PUAD 5445	Urban Policy								
PUAD 5430	Econ Nonprofit								
PUAD 5435	Grant Writing								
PUAD 5455	Healthcare Mgmt								
NURS 7602	Healthcare Econ & Marketing								
PUAD 5460	Public Safety Admin								
PUAD 5465	Emerg. Mgmt								
ISOM 6520	Project Mgmt								
PUAD 5470	Public Policy								

Appendix D

Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee Meeting (Excerpt): 11/10/2020

Attendees: Sergio Adrada Rafael, Zhanar Berikkyzy, Carol Ann Davis, Ronald Davidson, Laura Gasca Jimenez (Chair), Jessica Karanian, Maggie Labinski, Scott Lacy (Associate Dean), Martha LoMonaco, John Miecznikowski, Brian Walker

Guests: Dina Franceschi (item 2), David Downie (item 3), Gayle Alberda (items 3 and 4)

4. Revised Curriculum for Master of Public Administration Program (Alberda)

Alberda outlined the reasons for the new curriculum:

- Information and suggestions from the five-year review led to revisions.
- This was originated by the MPA steering committee as an interdisciplinary course. It appeared over time that it did not work very well.
- Students were not able to get jobs. The types of classes offered needed a change. Students mentioned this to our site reviewers.
- The site reviewers noticed this and reviewed what was presently online, the diversity in teaching, and ways we were not aligning with a Jesuit curriculum for a graduate program.
- We started looking at neighboring programs. Sacred heart, our biggest competitor, offered this at almost half our price and in a one-year program versus our two-year program.

Based on conversations with current graduates, public administrators, nonprofit managers, etc. on what skill sets were needed, we came up with a newly designed curriculum.

- Many of the classes are the same. We kept a decent amount of our core basics.
 - We added a statistics course on top of our research methods course - Statistics for Public Administrators.
 - Our Research Methods course will be developed into their Capstone, renamed Seminar and Public Administration. They can then take those back to back.
 - As most of our students come in with an internship, we removed our internship requirement.
 - The credit hours are reduced from 42 – 36.
 - We decided to merge our Ethics and Leadership courses together into one course, and we are going to teach it out of the MPA program. Our students are not necessarily getting what they need for jobs in the actual public sector. This frees up electives for them.
 - We dropped the two communication requirements, but we allow them to take up to one communication class as an elective within the different areas of specialization.
 - HR is taught in the DSB, so there is a little bit of cross collaboration. The instructor offers it on a regular basis. She alters her classes for our students' needs. That was something we were finding that was not happening when we did these cross collaborations.
 - This is going to help us on the path to national accreditation.
- Berykkzy – Is the course PUAD 5400, Statistics for Public Administration, being created or does it already exist?

- Alberda – It would technically be a new course. Currently, our research methods course is a combination of statistics and methods. The students find it overwhelming and frustrating. When they get to their Capstone, they have difficulty because we did not segregate those out. Statistics for Public Administration are vastly different than what we would think of when we think of academic statistics. Public administrators are not running regressions, time series analysis, etc. They are doing program reviews, policy analysis and assessments. They are still statistical, but they are different. This gears them up for those processes so they have a skill set. One of the top jobs in the federal government right now is a research analyst and a program evaluator. It also teaches the basics - measures of central tendency, dispersion and some preliminary hypothesis testing. It is geared toward that application in these formats, which makes it a little different. Methods would be the traditional methodology class.
- Berykkizy – The mathematics department has a statistics classes, including applied statistics, do you think this course will be significantly different?
- Alberda-We felt it was best to keep in the program because it was something asked of us by the administration, to keep things within our house. Secondly, it is geared specifically toward our jobs. I do not know exactly what the Applied Mathematics course looks like, if you do program evaluation and policy analysis. To my knowledge that does not exist, but I am open to conversation.
- Karanian - It sounds like a better proposal. I was also struck by the statistics, especially when trying to trim down, but you added it in. I think it is something everyone could get a lot of training in. The psychology department has an IO psych program. The IO psychology undergraduates can test out of the four plus one if they have taken psychology statistics as an undergraduate and did well. Would you think of offering that as an option? It may give students who have had fundamental statistical training an option to use that those electives for something else that they are more interested in.
- Alberda - Yes, that would be up to the discretion of the director according to how we govern the program.
- Davidson asks if the new course PUAD 5425 Administrative Leadership and Ethics is already on the books?
- Alberda – We are taking two courses and combining them. It is still the same Leadership course, which has an ethics portion in it. We are renaming it, so the students know there is an ethics component.
- Davidson - Even though it is just a renaming of the course, it needs approval. You may want to send the new and old syllabus to the chair of the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee and she can use her discretion on approval.

Alberda will send the current and new syllabus to the committee. Gasca Jimenez, as chair, will approve and bring it to the committee if there are concerns.

Motion: Davidson moves to approve; Walker seconds: Vote: 9 in favor; one abstention

Appendix E

Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee Meeting (Excerpt): 12/8/2020

Attendees: Sergio Adrada Rafael, Zhanar Berikkyzy, Carol Ann Davis, Ronald Davidson, Richard Greenwald (Dean), Laura Gasca Jimenez (Chair), Jessica Karanian, Maggie Labinski, Scott Lacy (Associate Dean), Martha LoMonaco, John Miecznikowski, Brian Walker

Guests: Dina Franceschi and Adrian Rusu (item 3)

c. PUAD 5400 Statistics for Public Administrators (Alberda)

- Gasca Jimenez – This was part of the revised curriculum for the Master's in Public Administration. We asked for a resubmission of this course, because the committee raised questions about potential academic redundancy. Alberda has written a letter for us, addressing these concerns. She has submitted a new syllabus, which is annotated. She sent new minutes reflecting their conversations about the issues we raised.
- Davidson notes that in the past, email meetings of the department minutes were not acceptable, the department had to meet in person.
- Lacy suggests the committee should revisit as the culture has changed. Zoom is a viable. We are using it now and perhaps will continue to use it when we get back together in person. We may need clarification on email vs. online meetings.
- The committee discusses how the minutes were submitted in email format and if this is acceptable. Alberda was asked to hold an emergency meeting regarding the issues, but the ASCC did not specify if an in person meeting was required. As this is a resubmission, the committee will accept it this time. Moving forward, with cases such as this one, the committee should specify a non-email meeting.
- Berikkyzy – Questions why the initial course submission was "Statistics for Public Administration" and it was changed to "Data analysis for Public Administration". At the very beginning of the syllabus it says this is an introductory statistics course.
- Gasca Jimenez will ask for clarification.
- LoMonaco – Reads a portion of Alberda's letter to the committee that addresses Berikkyzy's question. "The PUAD 5400 course is designed with these specific goals in mind. For instance, the textbooks are specifically selected to address discipline specific applications; the textbooks provide a tailored approach to statistics for public administration students. They contain the key concepts of traditional statistics classes, but go further by illustrating how to conduct the key types of assessments, evaluations, and analysis that public administrators will do in the real world."
- Davidson – We could recommend they consider a reversion to the previous title. The rebranding of the course was to try and get some clean air between the statistic courses and math.
- Gasca Jimenez will make that recommendation.
- Miecznikowski - On the grading scale, they use a 987654 number scheme. I never saw that before. Perhaps you could ask them to omit that.
- Lacy notes that Alberda, as new director of the program, had a discussion with him in order to understand how the committee works. She has not been putting forth curriculum like this before the committee. Her intent here, was that the committee knew this was not a redundancy in the curriculum.

Motion: Walker motions to accept the course with the minor comments that have been noted by Gasca Jimenez; Davidson seconds.

Vote: All in favor; motion passes unanimously

d. PUAD 5425 Administrative Leadership and Ethics (Alberda)

Motion: Walker moves to approve; Adrada Rafael seconds

- Gasca Jimenez - This course is a marriage of two courses, which was not previously submitted as a new course. We requested Alberda submit this course as new course.
- Miecznikowski- Once again, on the grading scale, ask them to remove in 987654.
- Berikkyzy – Under Due Dates & Late Work - work turned in late will be graded as follows - Same day after class – one day late: one partial grade drop (i.e. A to A). Should it state A+ to A?
- Gasca Jimenez will relay this comment.
- Brian Walker – Notes that on the grading scale, the lowest grade listed is a C+.
- Lacy – This needs to comply with Fairfield University guiding standards and even if the lowest grade is usually a C+, there needs to be an F as possible grade.

The committee discusses the grading scale and how it is a bit different as the lowest grade is C+. Gasca Jimenez will ask Alberda to revisit this and send the syllabus back before approving the course. Gasca Jimenez will review as chair. If she has questions, she will contact the committee members.

- Labinski - Under the mental health assistance policy, it seems as though the undergraduate policy is listed, not the graduate student policy.
- Lacy informs the committee that this is in the midst of a change. The Committee should inform Alberda, as well as others proposing new graduate courses, to assure that the policy noted is up to date. They can contact the Dean's Office for clarity and for the current most accurate version.

Vote for approval of this course contingent upon the grading scale being updated - including the official Fairfield university grading policy. All in favor; motion passes unanimously.

Proposed Minor in Public Administration⁵

Gayle Alberda, Director of the Public Administration Program
David Downie, Chair of Politics (Lead Author)
Public Administration Steering Committee

November 12, 2020

1. Description, overview and summary of proposed new program, major, minor, or concentration.

- “Public Administration” is the on-the-ground implementation of government (especially at the local, city and state level) as well as an academic discipline that not only studies this implementation but also prepares students for working in public service or related non-profit, not-governmental organizations (NGOs). The proposed minor in Public Administration will offer students an opportunity to explore critical issues and skill sets relevant to public administration. The minor would consist of six courses:
 - **POLI 2103 Public Administration.**
 - POLI 2113 State and Local Government.
 - **A course in research design/methods relevant to working in the public sector.**
 - A course in grant and proposal writing.
 - Two courses from a specific topic area: city government; criminal justice; local economic development; environment policy; disaster and emergency management; non-profit management; or public health policy.
- As such, the minor will create a robust, multidisciplinary, curated set of courses that help prepare students for internships, jobs, and graduate programs in public administration. Conferring the minor will also provide students with official acknowledgment on their transcript that the student has undertaken this work, a recognition that potential employers and graduate schools can see.

2. Need. Explain why the new program is needed at Fairfield University, e.g. student-driven, faculty-driven, special interest.

- The need for a minor in Public Administration is fourfold. First, the proposed program responds to student interests and needs. Fairfield students often compete for internships and jobs with state and local government agencies. However, there is no official, curated set of classes to guide them in gaining the knowledge and skills important in these positions. The classes exist but they have not been formally combined into an official program. As a result, each year Fairfield students ask faculty about what classes to take to help them obtain, prepare for, and excel in such positions and how to make it easier for

⁵ Many aspects of this proposal intentionally copy a recent proposal to create a minor in Campaigns and Election (also authored by David Downie) because the purposes, needs, and rationale of the two programs are nearly identical.

potential employers to understand the knowledge and skills they have acquired. Creating this minor will do both. It will provide students with a clear roadmap of courses they should take in order to prepare for these positions. It will also enhance their marketability by conferring the University's stamp of approval on these courses as a coherent program. Potential employers understand that completing a minor confers authenticity. It is something students can list on their resume.

- Similarly, creating this minor will also help students gain admission and compete for financial aid in Public Administration graduate programs. Fairfield and most leading national and regional Universities have a Master of Public Administration (MPA) program that trains students for careers in city and state government and positions in NGOs and companies that interact with city and state governments. (An indicative list includes American, Arizona, Arizona State, Berkeley, Brown, Carnegie Mellon, Chicago, Columbia, CUNY, Duke, Harvard, John Hopkins, Michigan, Minnesota, North Carolina, Ohio State, NYU, Princeton, Rutgers, Texas, UCLA, UCONN, USC, Washington, and many others). The placement rate of these graduate schools is excellent. The existence of Fairfield's relatively new MPA program has increased student interest in applying to these programs, including the possibility of completing Fairfield's undergraduate curriculum and MPA degree in five years. Creating the minor would respond to these interests and assist students.
- Second, creating a minor in Public Administration responds to calls by the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) and Fairfield University as a whole regarding the need to prepare students for professional opportunities while also providing a leading-edge Core Curriculum and outstanding liberal arts education. Fairfield University has undertaken several initiatives designed to provide deeper and more impactful training to help undergraduates bridge the gap between their time at Fairfield and the start of their professional lives – and to attract more undergraduates to consider and attend Fairfield. To this end, CAS has introduced new courses and initiatives, including the College's Leadership and Development Program. A minor in Public Administration will support these developments by providing a rigorous set of courses organized to provide students with both a greater understanding of Public Administration and valuable knowledge and skills for obtaining, and excelling in, internships and employment.
- Third, creating a minor in Public Administration will allow Fairfield University to add a program still not offered by most of its closest competitors while matching other institutions. Amazingly, no Jesuit college offers an undergraduate major or minor in Public Administration – despite the clear link such programs can have to internships, career opportunities, and graduate programs. In addition, amongst the other schools that Fairfield competes with for applicants, and other schools in our region, only Alfred, CUNY, Delaware, Elon, Hunter, LIU, Marist, Maine, NYU, Penn State, Providence, Rutgers, Suffolk, UMASS-Dartmouth, and Villanova offer an undergraduate major or minor in Public Administration. Thus, adding a minor in Public Administration, which Fairfield students could productively pair with majors or minors in Accounting, American Studies, Business, Economics, Management, Philosophy, Politics, Public

Health, Sociology and other programs, would not only allow Fairfield to stay even with some competitor schools but also move ahead of all the Jesuit colleges and many other competitor schools. This includes, as indicative examples, Bentley, Boston College, Boston University, Bryant, Catholic University, CT College, Northeastern, Quinnipiac, Sacred Heart, Stonehill, Syracuse, UCONN, UMASS-Amherst, and Vermont. It would also group Fairfield with the many prominent Universities that already offer such a program. Indicative examples, from different parts of the country, include Arizona, Arizona State, Auburn, Chicago, DePaul, Duke, George Mason, Georgia Tech, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Miami, Michigan, Mills, Minnesota, North Carolina, Ohio State, Oklahoma, Oregon State, Pittsburgh, Princeton, Virginia, USC, and William & Mary.

- Fourth, the proposed minor in Public Administration responds to the exigencies of the current financial situation by allowing Fairfield University to add a new program that exploits some comparative advantages, could be popular with potential applicants interested in public service, and requires no new resources. Fairfield already offers all the courses required to create a robust Minor (see Appendix 1) as well as an expanding graduate MPA program with increasing regional visibility. The annual MPA Summit draws elected officials, campaign staff, press, and advocacy groups to campus each year and is also simulcast on the internet. Fairfield alumni – both recent and more distant graduates – work in city, town and state governments and non-profit institutions in CT and elsewhere in the region. Over the last five years, an increasing number have given guest lectures at Fairfield or participated in campus events. An official minor in Public Administration would help yield greater synergies from this constellation of existing resources, increase Fairfield’s visibility among government officials, and potentially draw additional applications to the college and the MPA graduate program – all by simply using existing resources more intentionally.

3. Rationale. *Discuss the reasons for the program, rationale, how it meets the mission of Fairfield, and its particular place in the curriculum.*

- The proposed program aligns well with the mission of the University. Service to Others is an integral theme within Jesuit education. Indeed, Pedro Arrupe, a beloved Superior General of the Jesuits, said the principle objective of Jesuit education is to form "men and women for others." Dedicated public service is a profession that conforms to and fulfills this calling. Similarly, more just, compassionate and effective government agencies can contribute to enhanced Social Justice – another integral element of Jesuit Education. By combining training in public administration with Fairfield’s core curriculum, in-depth exploration in a relevant major, and overall emphasis on *cura personalis*, the new minor can help Fairfield train more compassionate and skilled government leaders.
- The reasons and rationale for the proposed program’s place in the curriculum is multifaceted. Several reasons were outlined above in section two. In particular, the minor responds to calls to increase and better highlight the career-oriented aspects of an

excellent liberal arts education. Adding the minor would also allow Fairfield to keep up with some of its competitors schools and move ahead of many others. The program would also enhance the utilization of faculty and course resources by creating a new program of interest to potential students without the need for additional faculty or courses. Finally, the program will utilize, and thus not waste, our comparative advantage in already having the needed classes, interested faculty, important co-curricular activities, a link to a Fairfield graduate program, and productive relations with many government officials, including a number of Fairfield alumni.

- The proposed minor also aligns with the new Magis Core, an integral element of the University, specifically the Core's interdisciplinary element. The Public Administration minor is inherently interdisciplinary, incorporating classes, and bringing students together, from many different departments and schools. While obviously distinct from the Core, the Public Administration minor conforms to the intent of the interdisciplinary element of Magis Core to enhance opportunities for students to gain insights into important issues from multi- and interdisciplinary perspectives.
- With regard to its specific place within the undergraduate curriculum, the Minor in Public Administration will provide a new, important, and different type of option for students. There is no current program for Fairfield undergraduates that brings together this constellation of courses from several different departments. Some competitor and aspirational schools have done so but we have not – despite already having the courses on the books.
- In addition, the new minor would complement several existing majors, by providing a value-added minor for students interested in public service. For example, while public administration is often associated with politics departments, it is a separate and more interdisciplinary field (as exemplified by the courses in the proposed minor and those in Fairfield's existing MPA program). The Politics major and minor are oriented toward the four major fields of political science: American Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, and Political Theory. This is appropriate and is the standard foundation of an excellent major or minor. At the same time, this structure can be somewhat limiting for a student that also wants to take a large number of classes focused on a particular, narrow area of study within one of the four sub-fields of political science or who want to take an interdisciplinary minor that involves politics but other subjects as well. Students are free to take such courses, of course, but they receive no official recognition for doing so. Creating this minor will allow interested students to complete not only a major that demonstrates their mastery of the general field of political science but also a more specific, professionally-oriented, interdisciplinary program. Thus, the new minor would represent a significant value-added for politics majors with a specific interest in Public Administration – providing them something not previously available. Importantly, the same would also be true for students in other majors. Indicative examples include an economics major with a particular interest in urban economic development who might want to work in city or state government; an environmental studies major interested in working with a government or NGO on local water pollution, solid waste, or environmental justice issues; a sociology major interested in working in

city and local government on criminal justice reform; a public health major interested in working in local or state government on health policy issues; or a management or accounting major interested in bringing the knowledge and skills obtained in an undergraduate business program to a position in local government or a non-profit organization.

4. Objectives. *What does the program seek to accomplish?*

The Public Administration minor seeks to accomplish the following:

- Provide students with a basic foundation of knowledge regarding:
 - Core concepts in the theory and practice of public administration, bureaucratic politics, decision-making strategies, and public management;
 - The operation of local, city and state government;
 - How to design a policy research study on issues relevant to local, city and state government; and
 - How to develop a grant proposal to seek funds for implementing a program at the local, city or state level.
- Provide students the opportunity to:
 - Build a knowledge base and skill-set helpful for obtaining internships and employment in state and local government and related NGOs, or acceptance into leading graduate programs related to Public Administration.
 - Tailor professional skill building classes to their particular interest related to Public Administration;
 - Provide the opportunity for interested students to accelerate their acceptance into, and completion of, Fairfield's MPA program; and
 - Meet and ask questions of professionals working in local and state government.
- Provide a program not offered by many of our competitor schools.
- Provide an undergraduate counterpart to our increasingly visible graduate MPA program.

5. Impact. *What program(s) if any, will this replace? How will it impact current programs in your discipline or other disciplines? How will it impact the core curriculum? How will it overlap with other programs?*

- The Public Administration minor will not replace any current program. Given the contents and objectives of the program, the strategic opportunity, and utilization of current courses, there are no concerns regarding overlap or conflict with current majors or minors. Rather, it will provide an important, value-added option for students majoring in many different programs, including, among others: Accounting, American Studies, Business, Communication, Digital Journalism, Economics, Environmental Studies, Management, Philosophy, Politics, Public Health, Public Relations, and Sociology.

- The new minor will also attract more students to a number of the skill-based courses listed among the required and elective courses. Because of the relatively large number and diverse array of these electives, the number of additional students in any individual class due to the minor will be very small and thus add to their robustness without overflowing their capacity. The Chair of the CAS, DSB, and Egan School departments with courses listed among the electives has formally approved their inclusion in the proposed minor (via email, as has the Dean of the Dolan School of Business), even though doing so is not required for the proposal to move forward.

6. Program detail. *List approved courses required or recommended, discuss course sequence, and reasons for including courses. Include other programmatic detail not specifically course-related, such as internships, special university events, etc. Any new courses proposed must be fully detailed, including description, rationale, draft syllabus.*

- The 6 course, 18 credit minor, consists of four required courses (with some choice) and two electives. The required courses provide a foundation of factual knowledge and skill development that will assist students gain employment or do more advanced work in graduate programs in Public Administration. The electives provide the opportunity to gain additional knowledge and skill development in a specific issues-area of importance to local government and public administration.
- *Required courses.*
 - **POLI 2103 Public Administration**⁶
 - POLI 2113 State and Local Government⁷
 - **A course in public sector relevant research methods or data analysis:**
 - POLI 2501 Research Methods⁸; **SOCI 3600 Methods of Research Design**; or SOCI 3610 Statistics: Social & Political Data Analysis
 - A course in grant and proposal writing:
 - Grant Writing: ENGL 1839 Grant and Proposal Writing; **ANTH 3700 Grant Writing for the Social Sciences**; or PUAD 5435 Grant Writing⁹
- *Elective Courses.*

Two Courses from one of the following topic areas:

 - **City Government (two courses from two different departments)**¹⁰

⁶ This course is cross-listed with **PUAD 5405 Introduction to Public Administration, which is required course in the MPA program.**

⁷ This course is cross-listed with **PUAD 5440 State and Local Government, which is an elective course in the MPA program.**

⁸ This course is cross-listed with **PUAD 5420 Research Methods, which is required course in the MPA program.**

⁹ Students would need to obtain instructor permission in order to register. The MPA Program Director has agreed undergraduates could enroll on a case by case basis with instructor permission

¹⁰ This requirement, which does not exist in the other tracks, reflects the importance of tacking advantage of the diverse array of options across departments and the importance of not choosing electives in this area too narrowly.

- POLI 2102 Urban Politics; POLI 2109 American Public Policy; PUAD 5410 Financial Management and Budgeting;¹¹ **SOCI 1140 Urban/Suburban Sociology: NYC; SOCI 2110 Race, Cities, and Poverty; ECON 2185 Regional Economic Development; ECON 3224 Labor Economics and Labor Relations**
- **Criminal Justice**
 - **PHIL 2264 Philosophy of Law; SOCI 2200 Criminology; SOCI 2210 Sociology of Law; SOCI 2215 Death Penalty; SOCI 2220 Criminal Justice System Seminar**
- Disaster and Emergency Management
 - POLI 2473 Humanitarian and Disaster Response Field Training; and one of the following: PUBH 2201 Public Health, Disease, and Injury; **PUBH 2240 Introduction to Global Public Health; POLI 2472 Politics of Humanitarian Action; AETH 2272 Ethics of Humanitarian Action**
- **Economic Development**
 - **ECON 2185 Regional Economic Development; ECON 3252 Urban Economics; ECON 3276 Public Finance;**
- Environment Policy
 - ECON 2120 Introduction to Environmental Economics; BUSN 3220 Environmental Law and Policy; POLI 2112 United States Environmental Politics and Policy; POLI 2474 International Environmental Policies; **ECON 3225 Applied Environmental Economics**
- Nonprofit Management
 - MGMT 4370 Managing Non-Profit Organizations; PUAD 5430 Economics of the Nonprofit Sector;¹² ACCT 3380 Not-for-Profit Accounting; **MGMT 3240 Leading and Managing People; MGMT 4336 Social Entrepreneurship;**
- Public Health
 - PUBH 1101 Public Health and Social Justice; PUBH 2201 Public Health, Disease, and Injury; **PUBH 2240 Introduction to Global Public Health; PUBH 3303 Public Health Program Planning and Evaluation; COMM 3248 Health Communication; COMM 3348 Health Risk Communication; ECON 2140 Health Economics**
- ***Course sequence and reasons for including courses***

Each of the four required courses examines a different important area related to the theory and practice of public administration. *POLI 2115 Public Administration* explores core concepts in the theory and practice of public administration, organizational behavior, decision-making strategies, and public management and highlights key political, practical, and managerial factors that affect public administration. *POLI 2113 State and Local Politics* examines the operation of local and state governments and key political elements that impact the making and implementation of policy at the local level. The grant and proposal writing course builds critical skill sets related to researching and writing grant and other funding proposals – an important entry level activity in many settings. The research methods course builds critical skills related to research and data

¹¹ Students would need to obtain instructor permission in order to register.

¹² Students would need to obtain instructor permission in order to register.

analysis related specifically to the type of issues of central importance to public and NGO officials working at the state and local level.

- The electives allow students to gain knowledge and develop skills specific to an issue area that interests them – and perhaps intersects with one of their other majors or minors. The issue areas include many of current importance to state and local government and contain courses that draw on existing faculty talent and teaching interests in many different departments. Students would be responsible for completing any potential prerequisites for the few elective options that have them but the broad array of options ensures adequate choices across issue areas and departments. (See Appendix 1.)

7. Administrative Structure. *What faculty group has control over curriculum and course development? What individuals have administrative authority? What is the proposed "chain of command"?*

- The Public Administration Steering Committee (PASC), the body that oversees the existing Masters of Public Administration (MPA) program, would oversee the minor. All curricular issues (which would likely be confined to potential adjustments to the list of elective courses), would be discussed and approved by the PASC. Acting as the administrative representative of the Steering Committee, the Director of Public Administration, currently Dr. Gayle Alberda of the Politics Department, will have administrative authority. Thus, there would be no new administrative costs or structures required to start the minor.
- The current members of the PASC are: Dr. Gayle Alberda (Director), Assistant Professor of Politics; Mousumi Bhattacharya, Associate Professor of Strategic Management; David Downie, Chair and Associate Professor of Politics; Dr. Mark LeClair, Professor of Economics; Dr. Thomas Murray, Associate Professor of Economics; and Dr. Michael Pagano, Associate Professor of Communications.

8. Resources. *List personnel, space, resources; Library -- both in terms of resources AVAILABLE and resources NEEDED. Prepare a proposed draft yearly budget. Also, consider OPPORTUNITY COST. What other programs would the university, or your curricular area, have to sacrifice or delay in order to implement this program?*

- The proposed minor is entirely resource and budget neutral. We also foresee no opportunity costs. All of the required and elective courses already exist and are offered with enough regularity that students will be able to complete the minor (See Appendix 1). In addition, as noted above, the Chair of each academic department with courses included among the electives has stated that students in the minor can enroll in these courses when they are offered – on the same registration basis as any other undergraduate (including any having completed any relevant prerequisites).
- The Public Administration minor might create a positive budget impact if completing the program makes it more likely that a Fairfield undergraduate will continue her/his studies

at Fairfield by completing the graduate MPA program. It is also conceivable that it could attract an undergraduate student to attend Fairfield whose aim is to work in the public sector because she/he could now combine a minor in Public Administration minor with a relevant major (e.g. Accounting, Economics, Environmental Studies, Management, Politics, Public Health, Public Relations, Sociology, etc.).

9. Projections for the Future. What are your anticipated plans for this program down the line: two years? five years? When and how will you evaluate its effectiveness?

- We believe this minor will allow Fairfield students to complete a curated set of theoretical and skill-based courses that can help them obtain exciting internships while at Fairfield and employment or admission to graduate school after graduation. Because this program utilizes existing courses and administrative infrastructure, there is no need to reach a certain number of students to justify it economically. That said, we believe the number of students completing the program will grow slowly but steadily and include students who will then enter Fairfield's graduate MPA program. We also anticipate that the minor will help Fairfield University's MPA program and Politics, Economics and other departments continue to develop productive relationships with local and regional government offices and leading non-profits.
- The PASC will evaluate the program for the first time after its fifth year in operation or at a time directed by the CAS Dean. Following the initial review, the PASC will then regularly evaluate the program's effectiveness at the same time that it conducts the formal Program Review for the MPA program.

Appendix List:

- **Appendix 1: Proposed Minor in Public Administration – Course Offering Frequency over past 11 Semesters**
- **Appendix 2: Approval by the Public Administration Steering Committee – Relevant Section of Meeting Minutes.**
- **Appendix 3: Approval by the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee – Emil Confirmation**
- **Appendix 4: Approval by the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee – ASCC Minutes**
- **Appendix 5: Approval by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee – Emil Confirmation**
- **Appendix 6: Approval by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee – UCC Minutes**
- **Appendix 7: Email from Walter Rankin confirming no budget implications if minor in Campaigns and Elections is approved, and attaching an email to this effect.**
- **Appendix 8: Memo from Walter Rankin confirming no budget implications if minor in Campaigns and Elections is approved.**
- **Appendix 9: Approval by the Educational Planning Committee (EPC) – Email Confirmation**
- **Appendix 10: Approval by the Educational Planning Committee (EPC) – EPC Minutes - pending**

Appendix 1: Proposed Minor in Public Administration – Course Offering Frequency

Course	Course Title	Fall '15	Spr '16	Fall '16	Spr '17	Fall '17	Spr '18	Fall '18	Spr '19	Fall '19	Spr '20	Fall '20
	<i>Required Courses</i>											
POLI 2103	Public Administration			X			X		X		X	X
POLI 2113	State and Local Politics*								X			X
POLI 2501	Research Methods*									X		
SOCI 3600	Methods of Research Design		X		X	X		X		X		X
SOCI 3610	Statistics: Social and Pol Data Analysis	X		X					X		X	
ENGL 1839	Grant and Proposal Writing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X
ANTH 3700	Grant Writing for the Social Sciences		X		X		X		X		X	
PUAD 5435	Grant Writing		X		X		X		X	X		X
	<i>Topic Areas</i>											
	<i>City Government</i>											
ECON 2185	Regional Economic Development		X				X				X	
ECON 3224	Labor Economics and Labor Relations			X								
POLI 2102	Urban Politics											X
POLI 2109	American Public Policy		X								X	
PUAD 5410	Financial Mgmt and Budgeting							X			X	
SOCI 1140	Urban/Suburban Sociology: NYC							X		X	X	
SOCI 2110	Race, Cities, and Poverty			X	X				X	X		X
	<i>Criminal Justice</i>											
PHIL 2264	Philosophy of Law;							X	X			
SOCI 2200	Criminology	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
SOCI 2210	Sociology of Law				X	X	X		X		X	
SOCI 2215	Death Penalty	X						X		X		X
SOCI 2220	Criminal Justice System Seminar			X			X		X			
	<i>Disaster and Emergency Mgmt</i>											
POLI 2473	Humanitarian and Disaster Response	N/A										

PUBH 2240	Intro to Global Public Health						X	X				
POLI 2472	Politics of Humanitarian Action	X		X		X					X	X
AETH 2272	Ethics of Humanitarian Action	N/A										
	<i>Economic Dev</i>											
ECON 2185	Regional Economic Development		X				X				X	
ECON 3252	Urban Economics			X								
ECON 3276	Public Finance		X				X		X			X
	<i>Environment Policy</i>											
ECON 2120	Environmental Economics				X		X				X	
BSN 3220	Environmental Law and Policy								X			X
POLI 2112	US Environmental Politics and Policy			X	X						X	
POLI 2474	International Envntl Politics	X							X			
ECON 3225	Applied Envntl Economics								X			
	<i>Non-Profit Management</i>											
MGMT 4370	Managing Non-Profit Organizations		X	X	X		X		X		X	
PUAD 5430	Economics of the Nonprofit Sector				X		X	X	X	X	X	
ACCT 3380	Not-for-Profit Accounting			X		X		X		X		
MGMT 3240	Leading and Managing People	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X
MGMT 4336	Social Entrepreneurship		X				X				X	
	<i>Public Health Policy</i>											
PUBH 1101	Public Health and Social Justice								X	X	X	X
PUBH 2201	Public Health, Disease, and Injury							X	X	X	X	X
PUBH 2240	Introduction to Global Public Health	N/A										
PUBH 3303	Public Health Program Planning and Evaluation				X					X		X
COMM 3248	Health Communication	X										
COMM 3348	Health Risk Communication		X	X	X		X		X		X	
ECON 2140	Health Economics	X		X			Sum mer	X	Sum mer	X		

* Now offered every two years

Appendix 2: Approval by the Public Administration Steering Committee – Relevant Section of Meeting Minutes.

MPA Steering Committee Meeting (Excerpt)

Friday, October 9, 2020

Members: Profs Gayle Alberda (Director), Mousumi Bhattacharya, David Downie, Mark LeClair, Tom Murray, Michael Pagano

Present: Professors Gayle Alberda (Director), Mousumi Bhattacharya, Mark LeClair, Tom Murray,

Regrets: Michael Pagano, David Downie

.....

3. New Public Administration Minor

Alberda explained that Downie created a new minor, Public Administration. This minor would be housed within the MPA program. The 6 course, 18 credit minor, consists of four required courses (with some choice) and two electives. Classes from more 10 different departments, including politics, were included among the required or elective courses. The minor (and any attendant advising and administrative tasks) would be overseen entirely by the Steering Committee and MPA director. The chairs and Alberda have reviewed the proposal prior to its submission to the Committee. Alberda thanked him for his time in developing this proposal. Committee members received proposal in advance of the meeting.

Bhattacharya noted how comprehensive and timely the minor is.

LeClair mentioned it was a good minor that could help feed student into the MPA program and help recruit students for the accelerated MPA program option.

Murray noted the number of classes in the minor as options give it lots of diversity in courses for students to take.

LeClair motion to approve new minor.

Second by Murray.

Motion passed.

Appendix 3: Approval by the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee – Emil Confirmation

From: Gasca Jimenez, Laura <lgascajimenez1@fairfield.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, November 10, 2020 4:55 PM
To: Downie, David L. <ddownie@fairfield.edu>; Alberda, Gayle A. <galberda@fairfield.edu>
Subject: Minor in Public Administration

Dear David and Gayle,

Thank you again for joining us today. I am happy to let you know that the Minor in Public Administration has been approved unanimously by the ASCC.

Best,

Laura

--

Laura Gasca Jiménez, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Spanish and Translation Studies
Department of Modern Languages and Literatures
Fairfield University
lgascajimenez1@fairfield.edu



Appendix 4: Approval by the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee – ASCC Minutes

Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee Meeting (Excerpt): 11/10/2020

Attendees: Sergio Adrada Rafael, Zhanar Berikkyzy, Carol Ann Davis, Ronald Davidson, Laura Gasca Jimenez (Chair), Jessica Karanian, Maggie Labinski, Scott Lacy (Associate Dean), Martha LoMonaco, John Miecznikowski, Brian Walker

Guests: Dina Franceschi (item 2), David Downie (item 3), Gayle Alberda (items 3 and 4)

3. Minor in Public Administration (Downie and Alberda)

- Downie - Although this is not a proposal for the politics department (it is a proposal from the interdisciplinary Public Administration Program) the logic and the language behind it is quite similar. Public Administration is a popular new graduate program. Some of our competitor and non-competitor schools have public administration majors or minors. We do not. However, we have all the classes. Now that we have a graduate program, students are interested in doing a five-year program. We have student inquiries on how to get jobs, internships and succeed in this area, while questioning why there is not a minor. It occurred to Gayle and me that it would make sense to develop a minor to meet this demand. As the graduate program is ongoing and succeeding and we have the classes. The minor has a set of core classes in politics. The core classes are linked directly to public administration and a variety of classes in different departments providing depth in particular disciplines or an issue area that is a current importance to people who work in public administration. I received an enthusiastic endorsement to include the classes as electives from the chairs and the Dean of the Dolan School of Business. While they are not offered all of the time, enough are offered. We can assure students that they can complete the minor, with the elective area of their choice. That is the background - student demand, opportunity and competitive advantage and comparative advantage (because we already have a graduate program). We have connections to a variety of local government agencies and officials, some of which are graduates of our university undergraduate programs, and some that are now recent MPA graduates.
- Alberda – One of the things that has been frustrating, as a graduate program director, is that our students do not know about the accelerated degree or that we have an MPA degree. I have had students who have taken my MPA classes, as undergraduates and then transferred to another university for their MPA degree because they do not know of this. We looked at how to get this advertised and at what classes would make sense.
- Downie -The other genesis of this is the new ID part of the core, which I am the coordinator of. We thought, "Can we enhance the suite of interdisciplinary minors we have by updating and adding more, include those interdisciplinary minors as skill based courses, while still having intellectual scholarly depth?" The combination of public administration state and local government courses (which provide scholarly background and insight into skills) combined with a grant writing proposal course and a course in research methods (specifically designed for the student to gain that knowledge and access and skill set) at the level relevant to an undergraduate in this minor, would be advantageous to the university and our ID element of the Magis Core.
- Walker – Is PUAD 5435 a graduate grant writing class an undergraduate can take with the permission of the graduate director?
- Alberda - Undergraduates can take two graduate courses during their junior/senior year with permission of the graduate director. For a four plus one fashion, they would have to take, minimum, two or possibly three. The two they could take would count for undergraduate pricing rates. Additionally, beyond that, at the graduate pricing rate. It does not count toward their actual degree. They still have to get their 120 for their undergraduate and currently 42 separately for the graduate

program. Without that ability, there is no way a student could get out with a four plus one, including in the business school.

- Downie - Gayle is referring to students who are planning to do the four plus one. A student not planning that could still take the graduate class with the permission of the instructor. For example, there are several classes in politics that are cross-listed at the graduate and undergraduate level; we provided that just in case the undergraduate grant writing classes were not offered. The MPA program has to offer that course regularly. Therefore, the combination of the three grant writing classes ensures the student access when they need it. To some extent, they can choose the grant writing class that focuses more on their perspective, whether it be the social sciences, whether it be the professional aspect of the MPA program or perhaps a more general one (which is offered by the professional writing part of the English department).
- Walker - Is the four plus one program formally designed?
- Alberda – It is not referred to in the proposal, but yes it *is* in the brochures and advertising, etc.
- Downie - We did not want the minor to be seen as something that was only available to the four plus one, as the minor exists on its own. The four plus one is part of this. It makes it more robust; it is part of the demand.
- Walker – If students are specializing in one of these seven areas, is there a way it can be denoted on their minor that they are a "public administration:criminal justice"?
- Downie –It is not something we really thought about, in part because I would not want to imply that taking two classes in a particular field provides more expertise than the overall public administration degree.
- Alberda – As the graduate director, I would oversee the minor. This is something that I do very consistently with our graduate and interested students. I teach them how to couple the classes in a way that makes sense for a narrative to get a job. There are over 4 million, state and local government positions, 2 million federal government positions and we have 200 nonprofits in Connecticut alone per capita. They need to know how to talk about these courses. They are organized to help them make sense of where they can plug in for their jobs post Fairfield.
- Walker – That is why I think it would be nice if they have a focus of the two in that one. Otherwise, I might suggest, why not let them take one from two different areas. There is kind of a tradeoff between having the electives focus either on criminal justice *or* on environmental policy. They are not really labeled at all as opposed to letting someone dabble a little bit more in criminal justice and environmental policy.
- Downie – That is an interesting idea, and we will take that under advisement. I certainly would like to provide students more opportunity to represent what they have learned or market themselves. We thought it was more important for them to get some depth in an issue area.
- Berykkizy - Research Methods - POLI 2501, is required and only offered once every two years. Do you think having a course required and offered once every two years could be potentially a problem for students?
- Downie - There are three opportunities to take research methods, none of them have a mathematical prerequisite.
- Alberda - Because our MPA program has grown in the last few years, we set our schedules so that course is offered once every year now. It will be offered either every fall semester or every spring semester moving forward, if the curriculum is approved.

Davidson suggests that Walker's concerns should be addressed during the five-year review period. Every minor has a five-year review; that would be the time to take stock.

Gasca Jimenez will reiterate Walker and Davidson's suggestions via email.

Motion: Davidson moves to approve; Miecznikowski seconds

Vote: All in favor; motion passed unanimously

Appendix 5: Approval by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee – Emil Confirmation

From: Miecznikowski, John R. <jmiecznikowski@fairfield.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, December 1, 2020 5:02 PM
To: Alberda, Gayle A. <galberda@fairfield.edu>; Downie, David L. <ddownie@fairfield.edu>
Subject: Public Administration Minor

Dear Gayle and David,

Thank you for presenting the Public Administration Minor to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee this afternoon. I am pleased to report that the Minor was approved unanimously.

Please note that the ASCC mentioned having a five year review in their meeting (November 10th). This statement was included in the ASCC meeting minutes.

I will send you the UCC meeting minutes once they are completed.

Best,

John Miecznikowski

Appendix 6: Approval by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee – UCC Minutes

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Minutes

Date: Tuesday, December 1, 2020

Faculty Members Present: Sergio Adrada Rafael, Djedjiga Belfadel, Zhanar Berikkyzy, Ron Davidson, Carol Ann Davis, Christa Esposito, Laura Gasca Jimenez, Cathy Giapponi, Jessica Karanian, Steven Kozlowski, Maggie Labinski, Marti LoMonaco, Lin Lu, John Miecznikowski (Chair), Nazuk Sharma, Toby Ugwu (FUSA), Brian Walker

Administrators Present: Vice Provost for Undergraduate Excellence Mark Ligas

Guests: Gayle Alberda, David Downie, Jen Ewald, Shannon Harding, Matt Schirano

Regrets: Susan Bartos, Provost Christine Siegel

AGENDA ITEM #3 – Public Administration Minor Proposal

A proposal for a Public Administration minor was presented by Dr. David Downe, Associate Professor of Politics, and Dr. Gayle Alberda, Assistant Professor of Politics.

Public Administration is the study of the implementation of government, especially at the local, city and state level. While public administration is often associated with politics departments, the proposed minor is a separate and more interdisciplinary field. The minor will offer students an opportunity to explore critical issues and skill sets relevant to public administration. The six-course, 18-credit minor consists of four required courses and two electives, with a multidisciplinary set of courses that prepares students for internships and career opportunities in public service or related non-profit, and not-governmental organizations (NGOs). Conferring the minor will provide students with official acknowledgment on their transcript that the student has undertaken this work, a recognition that potential employers and graduate schools can see.

Need and rationale for the new minor:

- Help students gain admission and compete for financial aid in Public Administration graduate programs, including Fairfield's Master of Public Administration (MPA) program. The existence of the MPA program has increased student interest and the possibility of completing Fairfield's undergraduate curriculum and MPA degree in five years.
- Draw additional applications to the college and the MPA graduate program.
- The proposed minor is not offered by many of Fairfield's competitors. No Jesuit college offers an undergraduate major or minor in Public Administration.
- Fairfield has a comparative advantage. The annual MPA Summit draws elected officials, campaign staff, press, and advocacy groups to campus each year, which is simulcast on the internet. Fairfield alumni -- both recent and distant graduates -- work in city, town and state governments and non-profit institutions in CT and elsewhere in the region. They and other elected officials give guest lectures at Fairfield and participate in campus events.
- Aligns with the mission of the University. Service to Others is an integral theme within Jesuit education. Dedicated public service is a profession that conforms to this calling. Compassionate and

effective government agencies can contribute to enhanced Social Justice – another integral element of Jesuit Education.

- Requires no new resources.

Questions

- M Ligas asked if the proposed minor prepares students for the graduate program. G Alberda stated that the minor will prepare students. Students interested in the 4+1 program can take two graduate classes, as undergraduates, towards the program (not double counting towards their undergraduate degree). The MPA program is designed to give undergrads that option to complete both degrees in five years.
- C Giapponi asked if students could get credit for internships with one of the open courses. D Downie and G Alberda stated that it is not an option yet, but something they will consider in the future.

JM thanked D Downie and G Alberda, at which point the guests left the room.

Motion to approve the proposal for a Public Administration Minor: B Walker. Second: R Davidson.

J Miecznikowski stated that there would be a five-year review, as recommended by the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee.

Vote

In Favor: 15

Oppose: 0

Abstain: 0

Appendix 7: Email from Walter Rankin confirming no budget implications if minor in Campaigns and Elections is approved, and attaching an email to this effect.

From: Rankin, Walter <wrankin@fairfield.edu>
Sent: Friday, January 15, 2021 10:03 AM
To: Phillips, Kathryn <kphillips1@fairfield.edu>
Cc: Downie, David L. <ddownie@fairfield.edu>; Alberda, Gayle A. <galberda@fairfield.edu>
Subject: Re: EPC 1/21 at 3:30 pm

Happy Friday, Katie,

Thank you very much for sharing the proposal for the exciting new Minor in Public Administration (and thank you, especially, to David and Gayle for creating it!). I've attached a brief letter of support from the Provost's Office to confirm that there are no new resources required for this program.

Looking forward to our first meeting!

Have a great weekend,

Walter

Appendix 8: Memo from Walter Rankin confirming no budget implications if minor in Campaigns and Elections is approved.



Fairfield
UNIVERSITY

Office of the Vice Provost for Graduate, Professional & Continuing Studies

TO: Dr. Kathryn Phillips, Chair, Educational Planning Committee
FROM: Dr. Walter Rankin, Vice Provost, Fairfield University
RE: Memo of Support for Minor in Public Administration

January 15, 2021

To the Educational Planning Committee:

Provost Siegel and I have reviewed the Resources & Budget section (#8) of the proposal for a new **Minor in Public Administration**. We commend the faculty of the Department of Politics for creating a minor that complements the recently approved Minor in Campaigns & Elections while also providing students with a distinct option that connects other undergraduate majors at Fairfield while creating a clear pathway to the Master of Public Administration.

This proposal builds upon existing courses offered regularly by Fairfield faculty as part of load from across a wide variety of departments, including, but not limited to Anthropology, Communications, English, Management, Public Health, and Sociology. As described in the proposal, we believe this minor will be resource-neutral while strengthening Fairfield's portfolio of academic offerings.

We know that the prior year presented a host of challenges and fully appreciate the time, creativity, and investment that the faculty have continued to provide in order to create important new program opportunities such as this.

Appendix 9: Approval by the Educational Planning Committee (EPC) – Email Confirmation

From: Phillips, Kathryn <kphillips1@fairfield.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 8:28 PM
To: Downie, David L. <ddownie@fairfield.edu>
Cc: Alberda, Gayle A. <galberda@fairfield.edu>
Subject: Re: For EPC - A Proposal for a Minor in Public Administration

David and Gayle,

We wanted to let you know the EPC approved your proposal for the minor in public administration. Congratulations! The draft minutes from the meeting are attached.

All the best,

--

Kathryn E. Phillips, PhD, CHSE, APRN

Associate Professor

Marion Peckham Egan School of Nursing and Health Studies

Fairfield University
1073 North Benson Road
Fairfield, Connecticut 06824
T. 203-254-4000 ext. 0000
#fairfieldu
www.fairfield.edu/nursing

Email: kphillips1@fairfield.edu

Appendix 10: Approval by the Educational Planning Committee (EPC) – EPC Minutes – pending

Educational Planning Committee Meeting Minutes – Excerpt January 21, 2021

Members Present: Mousumi Bose Godbole, Andres Carrano, Richard Greenwald, Kimberly Gunter, Lucrecia Garcia Iommi, Erica Hartwell, Diana Mager, Kathryn Phillips (Chair), Rose Rodrigues, Jillian Smith-Carpenter.

Guests: David Downie, Walter Rankin.

Regrets: Christine Siegel.

AGENDA ITEM #2: Proposal for a new Minor in Public Administration

David Downie presented a proposal for a new Minor in Public Administration:

- This minor will create a robust, interdisciplinary, curated set of courses that help prepare students for internships, jobs, and graduate programs in public administration. It will offer students an opportunity to explore critical issues and skill sets relevant to public administration.
- This is an interdisciplinary minor that will be administered by the Public Administration Committee that runs the Master's program.
- Its origins are student driven and opportunity driven in the sense that we have a graduate program.
 - We have all the classes necessary for the minor.
 - We have had students inquire about this minor.
 - We have a five-year option for undergraduates who want to proceed.
 - We have students who, for a variety of reasons, may want to pursue a MPA graduate program somewhere else and want to have a minor first.
- When David Downie became Chair of Politics, he worked with the Public Administration Committee to create the minor.
- The classes focus on politics since that is where some of the Master's classes reside but the minor is interdisciplinary.
- Gayle Alberda has received interest from some undergraduates for potentially adding the minor if it occurs.

Questions/Comments:

- Kathryn Phillips advised that the EPC Committee received a memo from Walter Rankin in the Office of the Provost that the program was resource neutral.
- Richard Greenwald is in full support. There is interest, no budgetary impact and desire on the part of the faculty. David Downie concurred that the classes already exist. Politics, sociology and grant writing classes are offered regularly as well as electives so that students can finish the minor in whatever given time they wish to do so.
- Jillian Smith-Carpenter is in favor of the program.

- Mousumi Bose Godbole: How many students do you think will be interested in this minor? David Downie: We think it will be relatively small to begin with and grow gradually. We are hoping that, in 2 to 3 years, we will have 5 to 6 minors that will begin to roll into the Master’s program as the Master’s becomes more well known. We believe that this will be a selling point and be more visible to the undergraduates. These are the types of jobs that exist in America. They are public service jobs that staff the government at the local and state level. We think more students interested in government work will engage with the minor. We would like to see 5 minors in 2 years and 10 to 15 minors in 5 years.
- Mousumi Bose Godbole: It is a great idea to think of this as a “ladder” to get into the graduate program. In the Dolan School of Business, we have started talking in the students’ sophomore year about the 5th year. Students are becoming more interested in their sophomore year and this would be a great tool to go in that direction. David Downie: There are 3 members from DSB (2 from Economics and 1 from Management) on the Steering Committee for the MPA program so we will be able to speak to undergraduates in a variety of ways. This is good advice for us to start talking to students fairly early in their career.
- Rose Rodrigues: This minor is a good introduction to students who might not quite know what public administration is (the nature of the work and background). With minors, it helps students to discover that once they take courses, they can decide if it is right for them or they can go in another direction. David Downie: Students will take classes and be exposed to several different programs. Courses will be disbursed throughout the undergraduate set of classes, which will expand their experimentation.
- Diana Mager concurs with everything said by her colleagues and found this be a straight forward, easy to read and a great program.

David Downie left the meeting and the Committee discussed the proposal.

- Kimberly Gunter is in full support of the program. We have had a number of proposals this year where students are getting a new credential for things that are already in the curriculum. Students will have a credential for work that they might have been already been doing.
- Lucrecia Garcia Iommi: This might provide more interest in courses in the Politics Department and other departments as well. This is an attractive proposal.

Motion to approve the proposal for the Minor in Public Administration: Erica Hartwell

Second: Lucrecia Garcia Iommi

VOTE:

In favor: 10 (unanimous)
 Opposed: 0
 Abstain: 0

UCC SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT ON STUDY ABROAD POLICY

Original Motion:

To form a subcommittee of the UCC to work with Study Abroad and investigate several issues regarding Study Abroad offerings. The subcommittee will (1) develop a policy or process for approval of courses; and (2) meet with department chairs and program directors to evaluate departmental commitment of the Study Abroad program.

Subcommittee members:

UCC representatives: Brian Walker, Cathy Giapponi, Christa Esposito

Global Fairfield representatives: Jen Ewald (AVP) & Shannon Harding (Faculty liaison)

The sub-committee met virtually three times and made revisions via email. We reviewed the current policy and drafted guiding principles to inform our work of modifying the existing policy and to share with departments and schools.

1. Guiding principles:

1. All qualified Fairfield students will have an opportunity and be encouraged to apply to study abroad.
2. Courses in all majors, minors, and in the *Magis* Core will be available for students studying abroad.
3. Departments & programs will work with Global Fairfield to find locations where major and minor classes can be taken. These programs should be actively promoted by departments and programs.
4. Established protocols for approval of study abroad courses will be adhered to by all departments and programs.
5. Courses that do not have exact fit/matches to classes at Fairfield University should be approved as elective credit in the relevant discipline.
6. Approval of courses will be based on content, learning objectives and outcomes, as foreign institutions tend to operate on different schedules, including contact hours, methods of assessment, and specific course requirements.
7. Fairfield University will respect the decisions of partner universities that the faculty they choose for their courses are well trained and appropriate for the course.
8. Departments will have a regular cycle of review of courses offered abroad.
9. The established process for removal of study abroad courses outside the regular review cycle should be followed.

2. The current policy:

Assignment of Course Credit in FU Study Abroad Programs:

All Study Abroad programs that award Fairfield University grades for courses must assign credit for those courses according to the following policy.

a. The Office of International Programs (working with the program director, if a Fairfield academic program is closely linked to the study abroad site) will sift through the catalog and compile an initial list of courses that correspond to offerings in our current departments and schools.

b. The Office of International Programs will send the corresponding courses to the relevant dean, department chair or program director. The dean/chair/director, in consultation with the department/advisory board, will decide whether a study abroad course

- 1) should qualify for Fairfield credit;
- 2) meets departmental/program requirements for the major or minor; and
- 3) meets core requirements in the department's area following the procedure

outlined above.

c. Fairfield students also would have the opportunity to seek Fairfield credit for study abroad courses that do not correspond to Fairfield departments and schools. Students would seek approval from the Director of the Office of International Programs to use such courses as electives.

d. The process set forth in a., b., and c. shall be initiated by the Office of International Programs and repeated every three years. AC: 03/11/2002 AC: 03/03/2003 AC: 03/02/2015 AC: 05/03/2019

In reviewing the existing language, we discussed a number of issues including the following

- Replacing outdated language with "Global Fairfield"
- Having approval and reviews happen at the departments / program level, where faculty review the content of courses, and whether they are equivalents of what we currently have / how they should count.
- Creating an appeals process for courses denied departmental and / or *Magis* core designation.
- A formalized delisting process for how courses are removed from the database.
- Creating a regular review of existing courses every 5 years, with the understanding that courses should be approved for that time period unless substantial changes occur.
- That short-term faculty led courses should be approved by school curriculum committees.

MOTION 1: To remove the current language from the Journal of Record and replace it with the following language:

Assignment of course credit in Global Fairfield programs:

1. New courses.

a. The Office of Global Fairfield (OGF) will determine which courses seem to be good candidates for Fairfield University credit. For each such course, the OGF will send the syllabus to the most relevant Department/Program Chair/Director who will work with the Department/Advisory or Steering Committee to determine whether the course fulfills major or minor requirements and / or is equivalent to an existing course at Fairfield University:

b. After review of the content and course learning objectives, the department will recommend whether a course should qualify for departmental designation as (i) the equivalent to an existing course or (ii) as a departmental elective or (iii) would be a better fit for a different Department or Program and should be sent on.

c. If the course is determined to be the equivalent of an existing course, then it will have the same Orientation or Exploration status in the *Magis* core as does the existing course.

d. If a College of Arts and Sciences department/program grants the course credit within the department/program, without finding it to be the equivalent of an existing course, then they should use the process outlined for the designation of courses to fulfill Orientation and Exploration Tiers of the *Magis* Core to determine whether the course can earn *Magis* Core credit.

e. Courses denied departmental or *Magis* Core designation may be sent-by the department to the UCC with a recommendation for General Elective designation.

f. In the event that a department/program does not judge the course to meet the standards for departmental and / or Core designation, or refer the course to a different department/program as a better fit, they will provide a rationale and minutes from the department/program to OGF.

g. Appeals:

- i. If a course is denied departmental designation, the OGF may appeal to the school curriculum committee.
- ii. If a course is granted credit in a CAS department/program and denied *Magis* Core designation, the OGF may appeal to the UCC.

2. Previously approved courses.

a. Study abroad courses that have received departmental or *Magis* core designation should continue to meet those requirements for at least 5 years, unless the granting institution notifies the OGF of substantive changes in the course.

b. To ensure that all subject areas remain updated, at least once every 5 years courses in the database will be audited by departments on a rotating basis in consultation with OGF.

c. If the OGF is informed of a substantial change in a course outside of the auditing process, it will notify a department and the course will be reviewed. After review of the course, a department may recommend retaining or removing a designation (delisting).

d. A department / program may also review a previously approved course in consultation with OGF if there has been a substantial change to the Fairfield curriculum (e.g. changes to the equivalent course at Fairfield University, or changes to major or minor requirements).

e. Removal of a designation of an approved study abroad course requires a written justification and departmental minutes submitted to the OGF and the UCC Chair for review. Removal of courses will typically occur the following academic year.

3. Faculty led courses offered abroad.

a. Short-term courses led by Fairfield University faculty must follow approval procedures set forth by schools with an additional focus on whether (i) the proposed course has equivalent credit (contact) hours to semester long courses and (ii) the relevance of offering the course in the proposed location.

b. Courses approved by school curriculum committees will be reviewed by the OGF to assess compliance with the University international travel policy.

MOTION 2: To endorse the guiding principles for study abroad and to add language to the Journal of Record regarding Fairfield University's commitment to study abroad education as enumerated above.

MOTION 3: That the faculty liaison shepherd the policy through governance and begin to implement the review of courses in partnership with OGF, departments and schools.

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Minutes (Excerpt)

Date: Tuesday, November 3, 2020

Faculty Members Present: Sergio Adrada Rafael, Djedjiga Belfadel, Zhanar Berikkyzy, Ron Davidson, Christa Esposito, Cathy Giapponi, Jessica Karanian, Steven Kozlowski, Maggie Labinski, Marti LoMonaco, Lin Lu, John Miecznikowski (Chair), Nazuk Sharma, Tobe Ugwu (FUSA), Brian Walker

Administrators Present: Vice Provost for Undergraduate Excellence Mark Ligas, Dean Andres Carrano, Dean Richard Greenwald

Guests: Jen Ewald, Shannon Harding

Regrets: Susan Bartos, Carol Ann Davis, Laura Gasca Jimenez, Provost Christine Siegel

AGENDA ITEM #3 – Study Abroad Policy

The UCC Subcommittee on Study Abroad was formed and charged to (1) develop a policy or process for approval of courses; and (2) meet with department chairs and program directors to evaluate departmental commitment of the Study Abroad program. Presenting on behalf of the subcommittee were Brian Walker, Shannon Harding, faculty liaison; and Jen Ewald, Associate Vice Provost for Global Strategy. A report on Study Abroad Policy was shared with the UCC. B Walker talked about the guiding principles:

1. All Fairfield students will have an opportunity and be encouraged to study abroad.
2. Courses in all majors, minors, and in the *Magis* Core will be available for students studying abroad.
3. Departments & programs will work with Global Fairfield to find locations where major and minor classes can be taken. These programs should be actively promoted by departments and programs.
4. Established protocols for approval of study abroad courses will be adhered to by all departments and programs.
5. Courses that do not have exact fit/matches to classes at Fairfield University should be approved as elective credit in the relevant discipline.
6. Approval of courses will be based on learning objectives and outcomes, as foreign institutions tend to operate on different schedules, including contact hours, testing, specific course requirements and content.
7. Fairfield University will respect the decisions of partner universities that the faculty they choose for their courses are well trained and appropriate for the course.
8. Departments will have a regular cycle of review of courses offered abroad.
9. The established process for removal of study abroad courses outside the regular review cycle should be followed.

S Harding stated the following motions from the subcommittee (see UCC Subcommittee Report on Study Abroad Policy for full details):

1. To remove the current language from the Journal of Record and replace it with language related to the assignment of course credit in Global Fairfield programs:
 - New courses
 - Previously approved courses.
 - Faculty led courses offered abroad.

2. To endorse the guiding principles for study abroad and to add language to the Journal of Record regarding Fairfield University's commitment to study abroad education as enumerated above.
3. That the faculty liaison shepherd the policy through governance and begin to implement the review of courses in partnership with OGF, departments and schools.

Questions

- T Ugwu referred to the Guiding Principles and study abroad credits that students receive, and asked if they are transferred as credits or as grades. J Ewald stated that center programs receive Fairfield credit and grade. It shows on a student's transcript as full credit, not transfer credit. Special customized programs are designated as transfer credits for grade C and higher.
- M Labinski asked if there was a policy for Magis Core courses that fulfill signature elements, and would they be at Fairfield. S Harding stated that faculty-led courses are eligible. Faculty members abroad can apply for that designation.
- R Davison expressed concerns about:
 - (1) Guiding Principles #1 stating that all Fairfield students in good standing can take a study abroad course. This could read as obviating GPA questions. J Ewald responded that there are students in special circumstances who experience trauma, which affects their GPA. If they progress in a positive path, they would be approved of a study abroad experience. The language leaves room for students in that type of scenario.
 - (2) #6 states that approval will be based on learning objectives and outcomes. There is inconsistency with Motion 1, #1b which states that after review of the content and learning objectives, the department will recommend whether a course should qualify for departmental designation. R Davidson suggested using the same language in #1b into the Guiding Principles. B Walker agreed to add "content" to both statements so the language is the same.
 - (3) Motion 1, #1c states that a course would have the "same status in the Magis core". It implies that when there is a course equivalent to an existing course, then the signature elements carry over. S Harding will amend the language to include "i.e. orientation or exploration designation".
- T Ugwu asked how the new proposal affects study abroad programs that are not University centers, but programs that students find and could get approved for study abroad. J Ewald responded that currently there is not an option for students to find their own program. The current programs are contractual agreements set up as approved vendors.
- C Giapponi inquired about #6 and leaving the option open to approve courses as Signature Element. S Harding responded that this option is open and currently listed in the Journal of Record in the Magis Core section.

Motion to table this item, and ask Committee members to provide additional feedback to S Harding and B Walker by November 9. The subcommittee will provide a summary presentation at the next UCC meeting on December 1: B Walker. Second: R Davidson.

Vote In Favor: 15 Oppose: 0 Abstain: 0

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Minutes (Excerpt)

Date: Tuesday, December 1, 2020

Faculty Members Present: Sergio Adrada Rafael, Djedjiga Belfadel, Zhanar Berikkyzy, Ron Davidson, Carol Ann Davis, Christa Esposito, Laura Gasca Jimenez, Cathy Giapponi, Jessica Karanian, Steven Kozlowski, Maggie Labinski, Marti LoMonaco, Lin Lu, John Miecznikowski (Chair), Nazuk Sharma, Toby Ugwu (FUSA), Brian Walker

Administrators Present: Vice Provost for Undergraduate Excellence Mark Ligas

Guests: Gayle Alberda, David Downie, Jen Ewald, Shannon Harding, Matt Schirano

Regrets: Susan Bartos, Provost Christine Siegel

AGENDA ITEM #4 - Study Abroad Policy

Shannon Harding, Faculty Liaison for Global Fairfield, spoke on behalf of the Study Abroad subcommittee. A report on Study Abroad Policy was shared with the UCC. At the November 3, 2020 UCC meeting, the UCC proposed edits to the report, and motioned to table this agenda item so the subcommittee can provide additional feedback to S Harding and B Walker. The most recent report reflects the following changes:

- Guiding Principles, revised wording for #1: “All qualified Fairfield students will have an opportunity and be encouraged to apply to study abroad.
- Guiding Principles, revised wording for #6: Approval of courses will be based on content, learning objectives and outcomes, as foreign institutions tend to operate on different schedules, including contact hours, methods of assessment, and specific course requirements.
- Motion 1, revised wording for #1c: If the course is determined to be the equivalent of an existing course, then it will have the same Orientation or Exploration status in the *Magis* core as does the existing course.

Questions

T Ugwu inquired about the addition of the word “qualified” to the first point under Guiding Principles. S Harding and J Ewald stated that Students have to meet both the Fairfield requirements for study abroad, such as GPA and Code of Conduct, as well as the host university requirements for admission.

Motion to (1) remove the current language, and replace it with the proposed language, (2) endorse the Guiding Principles for study abroad and to add language to the Journal of Record regarding Fairfield University’s commitment to study abroad education as enumerated, (3) the faculty liaison shepherds the policy through governance and begin to implement the review of courses in partnership with OGF, departments and schools. Motion by B Walker. Second: R Davidson

Vote In Favor: 16 Oppose: 0 Abstain: 0

Professor Jerelyn Johnson, Chair of the Academic Council
Professor Adam Rugg, Executive Secretary of the Academic Council

Dear Professors Johnson and Rugg,

I am writing on behalf of the International Studies and International Business (INST / INBU) program to ask that the Academic Council affirm two motions by vote. The motions, our case, and background to the case are below. Our governance documents are attached.

Motion 1:

Regarding the elimination of the position of Associate Director of International Studies on July 1, 2020: the Academic Council strongly objects to the administration's unilateral action and disregard for the governance procedures of the International Studies and International Business Program in the elimination of this position.

Motion 2:

The Academic Council asks the Office of the Provost to respect the shared governance documents and proceed with any changes desired for the program, including staffing changes or changes in the governance procedures themselves, in accordance with the bylaws of the program. The documents include mechanisms for changing the program. These cannot be abrogated.

The Case

Our INST / INBU governance documents state in section 1.2.2:

"Matters of concern specific to the IL Program proposed by the President, the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (SVPAA), the General Faculty, the Academic Council, either Dean, or CAS or DSB Faculty shall be acted upon only after the ILPCC [International Studies Program Coordinating Committee] has had reasonable opportunity to discuss them and to make recommendations."

Moreover, section 1.10.2 states:

"The ILPEC [International Studies Program Executive Committee] will work closely with the SVPAA [now Provost] and in consultation with the Deans of CAS and DSB on staff hires, such as for the position of Associate Director, and per 1.9.2 and 1.9.3 establish a search committee to determine candidate selection and interview process."

The case seems clear. The existence of the Associate Director position is plainly a "matter of concern specific to the IL Program," and yet the ILPCC, and its executive committee the ILPEC, was afforded no "reasonable opportunity to discuss." The director was notified of the termination *after* it was done. The Provost did not offer to discuss this termination with the Director or either of our governing bodies. It was the Dean of Arts and Sciences who did the actual firing, and who, afterwards, contacted the Director for a list of tasks that needed to be reassigned. To date, more than six months after the termination, most of the functions of the associate director have not been reassigned, nor have our governance documents been amended to reflect the new organizational structure.

This is a clear violation of our shared governance documents, and a violation of NECHE Standard 3, as well as other sections:

(https://www.neche.org/resources/standards-for-accreditation/#standard_three),

Brief Background:

The International Studies and International Business Program is a unique, cross-school program that graduates approximately thirty to forty students per year. Daily operations are handled by a faculty director, and a full-time Associate Director –the position at issue here—who are advised by an Executive Committee comprised of dedicated faculty who teach our foundational courses, and a Coordinating Committee, comprised of faculty from across the College and DSB who deliver elective courses. The Director has always reported to the Office of the Provost (or the Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs before we had a provost), as well as to the Deans of the College of Arts and Science (CAS) and the Dolan School of Business (DSB).

This program is unique in that our “studies” and our “business” students take a shared set of “foundational courses” that are delivered by formally dedicated faculty who have departmental responsibilities in either the CAS (in the departments of Sociology and Anthropology or Politics) or the DSB (in the department of Economics). Our rigorous capstone experience, for instance, is a one of the most important courses students from both schools attend together. Elective courses come from across the University, and so it is the pedagogical integration of our “foundational courses” that helps the overall learning experience cohere for the students as a viable major. Because they come from very different academic disciplines, it requires a great deal of work to ensure these courses articulate with one another, and build on one another, and consequently the professors dedicated to the program must sacrifice much of their independence in order to design and deliver courses that build a program greater than the sum of its parts.

In practical terms, the keystone of the program has always been the Associate Director, a Master’s level position (though it has sometimes been staffed by a PhD) to organize our many disparate threads into something students experience as whole cloth. This position has been understood as essential by every dean, academic vice president, and provost involved since the inception of the program, and the position is written into our by-laws as such. The position was also recognized as essential in our most recent self-study (2016), and by the outsider reviewers who came to campus to review our program, who noted, “The position of Associate Director is a stroke of genius.” I am happy to provide documentation of this, and of the other comments on the Associate Director position.

While the daily operation of the program is managed by the Associate Director, there is also a faculty “director” who serves something like a chair. Like a chair, the Director handles issues related to the curriculum, scheduling of classes, and staffing, among other things. The Associate Director does everything else. This includes acting as the instructor of record for our Internships (thus the requirement for an MA), attending foundational courses and giving feedback on their articulation, giving recruitment presentations in our introductory courses, advising a significant proportion of the majors (especially those with vexed issues related to double majors and study abroad in unconventional locations), attending major fairs and other recruitment events (especially when faculty are busy with their departmental responsibilities), managing speakers and colloquia, managing internships abroad, and smoothing course articulations abroad (especially in atypical study abroad locations) so that there are fewer post-hoc approvals for the

Director. The director shares in some of these responsibilities, but directors are faculty members with departmental responsibilities. Every time we change directors, or one goes on sabbatical, it is the Associate Director who has the institutional memory, and practical grasp, how the daily needs of the program.

The Associate Director also manages alumni relations for our program, and maintains a robust alumni database to draw on for student internships and campus speakers. She oversees our student journal, [The Undergraduate Journal of Global Citizenship](#), which includes a professional review process and produces several issues a year using volunteer student labor. (I am told that the site for the journal gets more downloads than any other element of the Fairfield website.) The Associate Director also inaugurated the Peace Corps Prep program, she coined the term “Global Fairfield” shortly before she was fired, and she oversees the Model UN Program (both the part where several hundred local high school students come to our campus, and the part where we send our students to compete at another university). Closely related to bringing speakers and alumni to campus, the Associate Director also oversees the International Studies and International Business Club.

BY-LAWS DOCUMENT FOR THE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES PROGRAM AT FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY

1. International Studies, a degree conferring interdisciplinary program, major and minor
 1. Membership
 2. Educational Policies
 3. IL Program Voting
 4. IL Program Meetings
 5. Eligibility for Directorship
 6. Election and Appointment of Director
 7. Responsibilities of Director
 8. Procedures for Removal of the Director
 9. Procedures for Hiring
 10. IL Staff
 11. Program Budget
2. Reporting
3. Amendment Procedure

1.0 International Studies Program (IL)

The International Studies Program at Fairfield University is a unique interdisciplinary program that spans the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) and the Dolan School of Business (DSB) in terms of its curriculum and is served by faculty jointly appointed to the IL Program and another department of hire in CAS or DSB. It is one of the largest degree-granting majors on the Fairfield University campus. It operates much like a department of instruction as a body of fulltime and part-time faculty responsible for that portion of the curriculum assigned to it by the General Faculty, the CAS Faculty, the DSB Faculty, the President, and the Board of Trustees.

1.1 Membership

1.1.1 IL Program Executive Committee

The faculty of the International Studies Program consists of all full-time members jointly appointed to serve the IL Program and another department within the CAS or the DSB, holding the rank of Assistant, Associate or Full Professor. These contractual appointments bind the appointees to teach a portion of their course load in the International Studies curriculum. Faculty bound by such joint contractual appointments form the IL Program Executive Committee (ILPEC). The IL Program Executive Committee is specifically responsible for the delivery and evaluation of the foundational curriculum, directing the program, and hiring and evaluating faculty as stipulated in this document. The ILPEC members will nominate, by majority vote, one ILPCC member to attend ILPEC meetings, ex officio. The IL Associate Director will attend ILPEC meeting also, ex officio.

1.1.2 IL Program Coordinating Committee

The IL Program Coordinating Committee (ILPCC) shall consist of representative faculty

from both the College of Arts and Sciences and the Dolan School of Business who share professional commitments and expertise in the IL Program. This committee helps to integrate the IL curriculum with area studies programs and contributing departments in the CAS and the DSB. Responsibilities of the ILPCC include reviewing the overall IL curriculum in terms of program specific norms and standards, especially the elective offerings, reviewing extra-curricular programming and offering advice to the ILPEC and IL Program Director.

The membership of the ILPCC will include (all must be full-time faculty):

All members of ILPEC, defined above.

A selected appointee from the Asian Studies Program

A selected appointee from the Latin American and Caribbean Studies Program

A selected appointee from the Russian and East European Studies Program

Three selected appointees from the Dolan School who have been designated as International Business advisors (in their departments)

Two at large members, recommended by ILPEC

Associate Director of International Studies, ex officio

Any full-time or part-time faculty teaching an IL course may also be invited to attend the ILPCC meetings.

1.2 Educational Policies

1.2.1 IL Program

The IL Program shall determine its own educational policy, including the conduct of courses and methods of instruction, within the framework of principles laid down by the General Faculty, the CAS Faculty, the DSB Faculty and by the Deans.

Matters of concern specific to the IL Program proposed by the President, the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (SVPAA), the General Faculty, the Academic Council, either Dean, or CAS or DSB Faculty shall be acted upon only after the ILPCC has had reasonable opportunity to discuss them and to make recommendations.

1.2.2 Individual Professors

Individual faculty members shall have freedom of course instruction within the scope of the courses assigned them so far as is compatible with the interest of the Program as a whole and the framework of general principles as noted in section 1.2.1 above, and in accordance with the Fairfield University Policy on academic freedom.

1.3 IL Program Voting

1.3.1 Faculty members serving on the ILPCC who have voting rights in the General Faculty meetings shall have IL Program voting rights. [Refer to the Fairfield University Faculty Handbook.]

1.3.2 Those members of ILPEC on leave of absence shall have voting rights only for the election of program director.

1.3.3 A voting member of the ILPCC who is prevented by professional duties from attending a program meeting may designate a proxy for a specific meeting. No IL Program member may hold more than one proxy in a program meeting.

1.3.4 Any voting member of the ILPCC may make suggestions, introduce motions, or participate in discussions. Any member may consult the President, the SVPAA, or the Deans on matters affecting the program.

1.3.5 Any ILPEC member may request that matters concerning foundational curricula, program direction, hiring, or amending this document be transferred to a special meeting of ILPEC for a final vote.

1.4 IL Program Meetings

1.4.1 At least two meetings of the ILPEC shall be held in each semester, not including the meeting of the ILPCC. The director also shall call a meeting at the request of any two members of the ILPEC. A quorum shall consist of a majority of voting members (exclusive of those on leave).

1.4.2 The ILPCC will meet twice per year to discuss overarching needs of the program as a minimum, or more often as needed per the ILPEC.

1.5 Eligibility for Director

All ILPEC members are eligible for the office of director, including any new tenure-track appointment made with contractual obligations to the IL Program (excluding those that serve ex officio). If the IL Program should have fewer than three eligible members, then the ILPEC will determine further eligibility in consultation with the SVPAA and the appropriate Dean.

1.6 Election and Appointment of the Director

1.6.1 The director must be elected by a majority vote of the ILPCC or a new hiring process (as detailed in 1.9). The ILPEC may choose an election officer to supervise the elections by secret ballot. Once the ILPCC has agreed on a director, the election officer will convey that recommendation to the IL Program faculty and the SVPAA, who will make the appointment in consultation with both Deans. The SVPAA may decline to appoint the elected faculty member, in which case the SVPAA shall meet with the ILPCC to discuss the recommendation denial and state the reasons for doing so in writing to the program members within 10 class days. In such a case, the ILPCC will hold a new election.

1.6.2 If the ILPCC cannot agree upon a director, the ILPEC will vote and decide based on majority vote, after consulting the Program members, and the SVPAA. The SVPAA may decline to appoint the chosen faculty member, in which case the SVPAA shall state the

reasons for doing so in writing to the program faculty within 10 class days and to the Academic Council.

1.6.3 If the ILPEC vote does not result in an elected director, the SVPAA may appoint a full-time faculty member from the ILPCC who is willing to serve as interim director for one year.

1.6.4 If no eligible Program member will agree to serve as interim director, or if the procedure detailed in 1.6.3 fails to lead to the appointment of a program director, the ILPEC will vote to determine eligibility from tenured members of the College or Dolan School Faculty who is willing to serve as interim director for one year.

1.6.5 If a director is temporarily unable to serve, the ILPEC must elect an acting director, following the rules in this section for the election of directors. The acting director will serve until the original director can resume office.

1.6.6 The term of office for IL director shall be three years, normally beginning on July 1, renewable once by the aforementioned election procedure, for a maximum of 6 consecutive years.

1.7 Responsibilities of IL Director

The IL Director's duties and responsibilities are in accordance with and encompass the duties detailed in both the College of Arts and Sciences and Dolan School of Business governance documents on responsibilities of department chairpersons and responsibilities of program directors, including mentoring and evaluating faculty toward tenure and promotion for cases of jointly appointed faculty.

The director may, at his/her discretion, delegate some of these duties to other members of the program as needed. The director shall have a reduced teaching load and/or receive proper compensation for their services.

1.8 Procedures for Removal of the Director

A serious breach of duties or responsibilities shall be grounds for removal of the director. The process of removal of a director may be initiated by any ILPEC member, by either Dean, or by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and shall follow these steps:

1.8.1 the complainant(s) must discuss the charge in a personal conference with the director;

1.8.2 if the matter is not resolved, the complainant(s) may place the charge on the agenda of the next scheduled program meeting;

1.8.3 if the matter is still not resolved then the complainant(s) may present the charge to the SVPAA who shall try to resolve the problem. If the complainant(s) choose(s) to follow

this step the option to do so must be exercised within ten (10) class days following the program meeting. (If the complainant is either Dean or SVPAA, he or she may take the matter directly to the Academic Council after the first two steps above.);

1.9 Hiring

1.9.1 Searches for faculty jointly appointed to the IL program and another department will proceed with close consultation with the SVPAA and with the Deans of CAS and DSB, depending in which School the faculty line lies. The ILPEC faculty will work with the program director to determine which curriculum area(s) are recommended for a new hire; the director will then communicate the recommendation to the SVPAA and the appropriate Dean.

1.9.2 If a search is approved, the director will consult with program faculty and then appoint members to the search committee in consultation with the SVPAA and appropriate Dean. The program publicly acknowledges the goal of including search committee members closest to the subject area being sought, plus members who can provide diversity to the committee and make it represent the program as a whole. The search committee will be chaired by the IL director, will include at least two additional ILPEC members and at least one additional ILPCC member.

1.9.3 The search committee will draft a job placement ad for consideration by the SVPAA and CAS or DSB Dean, again depending on the area or department of hire. The search committee will select candidates to be interviewed. Each candidate will be asked to offer a colloquium on his/her research, which will be open to all faculty who wish to attend. The candidate may be asked to teach a class in his/her area of expertise. The search committee will keep the ILPCC apprised as to its progress and its recommendations on which candidates to bring to campus. After consultation with other faculty who have met with the candidates, the search committee will recommend a decision to the SVPAA and CAS or DSB Dean. The Dean will then make the final decision on which candidate to recommend for appointment. The appropriate Dean will then send a letter of recommendation to the SVPAA, describing the conditions of appointment.

1.9.4 The IL director will seek approval to hire and evaluate adjunct and visiting faculty to cover areas of the curriculum that lack full-time coverage. Such positions often will be approved with a specific instructor or curriculum area in mind (e.g. to replace a professor on leave). The IL director will report to the ILPCC once per year on the performance of adjunct and visiting faculty, and the ILPCC will vote to recommend contract renewals.

1.10 IL Staff

1.10.1 The IL Associate Director reports directly to the IL Director and will fulfill his or her duties according to the job description for that position. The IL Director will carry out an annual performance review according to Fairfield University's Human Resources guidelines and in consultation with ILPEC members.

1.10.2 The ILPEC will work closely with the SVPAA and in consultation with the Deans

of CAS and DSB on staff hires, such as for the position of Associate Director, and per 1.9.2 and 1.9.3 establish a search committee to determine candidate selection and interview process.

1.11 IL Program Budget

An appropriation from the Academic Affairs Division shall be made annually to the IL Program for operational and travel/entertainment expenses to cover materials, supplies, professional development and other costs of the Program to be administered by the director. No expenditures beyond the authorized budget may be made except in cases of emergency and then only with the express approval of the SVPAA.

2. Reporting

The Director of International Studies reports directly to the SVPAA, and will regularly confer with the Deans of both schools, as necessary, on matters pertaining to the program. The director will regularly attend chair and director meetings in both the CAS as well as the DSB.

3. Amendment Procedures

All amendments to this document will be reviewed by the SVPAA, must be accepted by majority vote of the ILPCC and will be finalized with formal notification of both CAS and DSB faculty.

TO: Members of the Academic Council
FROM: The Executive Committee of the Academic Council
RE: Formation of Subcommittee to look at forming a Graduate Curriculum Committee
DATE: February 22, 2021

Due to the increased attention to graduate instruction at Fairfield University, it has become clear that we need to consider the formation of a Graduate Curriculum Committee to provide university-wide curricular review, much like our Undergraduate Curriculum Committee does at the undergraduate level. Therefore, we suggest the following motion:

The ACEC will create a subcommittee to draft a proposal for a Graduate Curriculum Committee that would provide university-wide curricular review. The subcommittee will discuss the need, and propose a Handbook amendment describing Membership, General Purpose, and Specific Duties. They will also propose revisions to the current routing procedures needed for graduate curricular review and approvals. The subcommittee will report back to the Council with a proposal at the May 3, 2021 meeting.