AGENDA

1. Announcements.
2. Approval of minutes for 10/28/05 General Faculty meeting (attached)
3. Handbook amendment on years in rank for promotion (attachment)
4. Report from the Faculty Salary Committee
5. Remarks by President von Arx, S.J., on the Strategic Plan
6. Adjournment

ATTACHMENTS.
For item 2: Draft minutes of the 10/28/2005 GF Meeting (pages 2-9)
For item 3: Proposed new text for the Handbook (p.10); excerpt of 11/7/2005 Academic Council minutes (p.11). (See also page 21 of the current Faculty Handbook.)

******

The meeting will be followed immediately by a gala reception hosted by the Faculty Welfare Committee

******
At 3:37 PM, the meeting was called to order by the Chair of the Faculty, Professor Betsy Gardner.

1. **Announcements.**

Professor Ed O’Connell was called upon to give a remembrance of Professor Fred Lisman, which was followed by a moment of silence.

Faculty members who have been here less than 15 years may not know of Prof. Fred Lisman, he was a member of our Chemistry department for 20 years. He was educated at Fairfield University and received a Ph.D. in Physical Chemistry from Purdue. He worked for a time for the Atomic Energy Commission until he started teaching at Fairfield and took up residence in Milford. He taught Freshman Chemistry and Physical Chemistry for years, but his true calling was politics. Professors Boggio and Sarneski – and anyone else who ate lunch on a regular basis with Fred – knew just about everything about Milford politics. Prof. Lisman left Fairfield in the early 1990s and was elected Mayor of Milford. In fact, he was elected to four terms as Mayor of Milford. Prof./Mayor Lisman is remembered in many roles: as a chemist, a professor, a politician, a Republican Mayor of Milford, and as a good man.

Professor Lucy Katz was called upon to give a remembrance of Stephen O’Brien. Prof. Katz read the following statement, which was followed by a moment of silence.

Stephen J. O’Brien was a professor of business law, in fact the first professor of business, here at Fairfield. He died June 2, 2005 at the age of 90. Steve taught at Fairfield for 35 years, from 1949 to 1984. He was a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Wesleyan University and the Yale Law School.

I asked some of my colleagues who served here with Steve what they remembered about him, and they all described the time in 1970 when, during a student sit-in against the Vietnam war he urged the University President to call out the National Guard. I believe with the hindsight of 25 years we can today put that incident into perspective and celebrate his many good qualities.

Steve was a patriot, in an era when that was a popular, respectable descriptor. He served in the U.S. Navy during World War II where he worked in Naval Intelligence and then on a destroyer escort in the Pacific. That makes him one of what some call the Greatest Generation, in part because they fought in the last “good” American war. At Fairfield he was one of our founding generation, a group we are gradually losing, and with each loss goes an important piece of our institutional memory.

I am almost, but not quite, Steve’s successor in business law. We taught together for one year. Before that, though, I had stepped in to teach some of Steve’s classes when he suffered a heart attack. From that time on we were friends, and I shall always remember him as gracious, kind, intelligent and a good colleague and friend. When I first arrived as a full time faculty member I must have been a bit of a thorn in his side, as the new, then younger, upstart.
outspoken lawyer full of ideas for changing our curriculum. He was a good sport, though, and in fact was consistently supportive of my efforts and ideas. Throughout his life, Steve “gave back” to his community, using his legal skills as a volunteer lawyer for the elderly in the town of Fairfield, working for the March of Dimes, and serving in the naval reserve for 22 years. At Fairfield he helped establish a chapter of Phi Beta Kappa, the precursor of our current chapter, and I know in his retirement he was so pleased to see how active the chapter has become. Through these years I have thought often about Steve, and I wish that we could have worked together for much longer than that one year. He would have been a good partner.

Secretary of the General Faculty, Professor Irene Mulvey, announced that there were extra copies of the packet for this meeting - including all attachments, copies of the Strategic Plan, and extra copies of the 2005-2006 Directory of the General Faculty at the front of the room.

2. Approval of Minutes from September 16, 2005.

Prof. Gardner asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the previous meeting. The following motion was made by Professor Vin Rosivach and seconded by Professor Beth Boquet.

**MOTION. To approve the minutes of 9/16/2005 as circulated**

The **MOTION PASSED unanimously.**

3. Proposal for Pre-Tenure Review.

Professor Kathleen Wheeler, current chair of the Rank and Tenure Committee, made a brief presentation on the Proposal for Third Year Review, which had been circulated with the materials for the meeting. Prof. Wheeler acknowledged that this proposal has a fairly long and complicated history, at first being called Pre-Tenure Review and now called Third Year Review. The latest action on the proposal was in May 2005 when the Academic Council, acknowledging the complicated history, voted (10-1-3) to send the proposal to the General Faculty with a recommendation for approval. Prof. Wheeler acknowledged the hard work, in particular, of Professors Jo Yarrington and John Thiel. She gave a brief description of the process to be followed if the GF approved the proposal for Third Year Review, and the floor was opened up for questions.

Professor Mark Scalese, S.J., asked how work related to Jesuit mission and Identity would be evaluated in a Third Year Review. Professor Kathy Nantz, member of the Rank and Tenure Committee, answered that this is a larger question involving evaluation in general for rank and tenure. The evaluation in the Third Year Review would be the same as that for tenure or promotion.

Professor Cecelia Bucki asked how the Third Year Review would fit in with current departmental reviews. Professor George Lang, who had worked on the proposal at previous stages, answered that the Third Year Review is separate from departmental reviews.

Professor Dennis Hodgson asked what would happen if the members of the Third Year Review Committee did not agree on the evaluation. The current proposal seems to be all about contract renewal. Is this to be taken seriously? Prof. Wheeler said that the intent is to give the candidate meaningful feedback when there is still time to make changes to the tenure portfolio.
Professor Bob Epstein referred to the statement that results from the review. Is this statement directed to the candidate or to the administration? Prof. Wheeler answered that the statement serves many purposes. It is advice to the individual, the department, and the dean. It need not be particularly binding. Prof. Kathy Nantz followed up saying that it is still the Dean’s prerogative whether or not to renew a contract. That decision is not being turned over to the Third Year Review Committee.

Dean Norm Solomon agreed that this decision remains with the Dean. The Third Year Review is designed to assist the faculty member in understanding how they are progressing.

Professor Don Greenberg asked, since the outcome is a recommendation of either a renewed contract or a terminal contract, what is the rationale for an individual to cooperate?

Professor Vin Rosivach raised two specific issues: (1) What is the rationale for the proposal? What are the problems the proposal is designed to address? What improvements will it bring about? (2) Why is the Third Year Review Proposal going into the Journal of Record and not the Faculty Handbook?

For (1), Prof. Kathy Nantz said there is a need for mentoring. The Rank and Tenure Committee noticed that some individuals coming forward had not had appropriate mentoring and wanted to help. The proposal is an attempt to help individual faculty members by providing feedback on their progress. It’s an attempt to level the playing field so that all faculty members can get appropriate feedback on their progress. It can also help the administration and give faculty more of a voice in contract renewal decisions. Prof. Dennin, a member of the Rank and Tenure Committee, continued to say that one of the most important reasons for the proposal is that some departments do not do a good job of mentoring their junior faculty.

For (2), Prof. George Lang said that it seemed most appropriate to see how things worked out before putting this into the Faculty Handbook.

Professor Walt Hlawitschka asked why the report doesn’t go to the AVP or the President? Is there a process for appeals? Can the Third Year Review Committee reconsider their decision if new information becomes available? Prof. Nantz said that the letter goes to the Dean and so it will be discussed with the AVP and President.

Professor Robbin Crabtree asked will there be enough full professors to staff all the Third Year Review Committees? Prof. Wheeler said this should not be a problem.

The following motion was made by Prof. Nantz and seconded by Prof. Epstein.

**MAIN MOTION. To approve the Proposal for a Third Year Review.**

Professor Eric Mielants spoke against the motion. Three years is not enough time for this kind of evaluation and the proposal would put an undue burden on the junior faculty member.

Professor Jen Klug spoke in favor of the motion. Everyone else she knows in academics has had a third year review and even though she is in a strong and supportive department, she would welcome the meaningful feedback that the Third Year Review would provide.

Professor Dennis Hodgson spoke against the motion for a few reasons. First, it is not clear what happens if the Third Year Review Committee isn’t in agreement. Also, it’s one thing if the Third Year Review is just to provide feedback, but the pre-eminent output of this Review is a recommendation for either a terminal contract or a renewed contract. This seems inconsistent with the goal of simply providing meaningful feedback. In addition, we may have 15 or 20 different Third Year Review Committees and the assessments they produce may not be consistent across candidates. We already have adequate feedback from the department and the dean. If an assessment is inadequate, then the Dean should give the candidate feedback.
Prof. George Lang spoke in favor of the motion, giving the proposal a mild thumbs-up. The proposal should provide enough feedback so that an individual will know in advance that they are not making appropriate progress toward tenure. A candidate should have this kind of a meaningful assessment before getting a negative tenure decision. Some departments are good at mentoring and some are not. We have some small and friendly departments that are not capable of providing an accurate evaluation. An earlier draft had former members of the Rank and Tenure Committee on the Third Year Review Committee in order to provide more consistent evaluations. Prof. Greenberg is right to wonder why an individual would cooperate, but this is a two-edged sword, a good recommendation works to a faculty member’s advantage.

Professor Don Greenberg, seconded by Kraig Steffen, made a motion to amend the pending motion.

**MOTION TO AMEND:** To amend the pending motion by striking out from the proposal the words in II.6.

“In addition, a summary paragraph should specifically state the candidate’s progress using one of the following two statements:

a. The candidate has made progress and is recommended for a continuing contract.

The details of suggested improvements will be explained in the report.

b. The candidate has *not* made expected progress and is recommended for a terminal contract.”

Prof. Greenberg spoke in favor of the amendment. With these words in the proposal, the output of the review is a recommendation for a terminal contract or a renewed contract. It simply doesn’t help a faculty member.

Professor Ron Salafia spoke in favor of the amendment. Whatever we put in place should truly help faculty members and not be something that just supports an administrative decision to issue a terminal contract.

Prof. Bob Epstein asked if there was anyone that could provide an argument in favor of keeping these words in the proposal. When no one volunteered, Prof Epstein, seconded by Prof. Boquet, made a

**MOTION:** to call the question. The **MOTION** to call the question passed unanimously.

**The MOTION TO AMEND THE PENDING MOTION** was voted on and **PASSED** with all in favor except for 4 opposed and 3 abstaining.

Professor Gardner asked for members to speak either for or against the amended main motion.

Professor Kurt Schlichting spoke against the main motion. Prospective faculty members do ask about our Rank and Tenure process and this proposal adds a significant new step to our process. This may result in candidates not choosing to come to Fairfield.

Professor Rosivach spoke against the main motion. Rank and tenure is traumatic and this proposal would add and create new trauma. We hire faculty with the assumption that they will be tenured. For all the rhetoric about being formative and supportive for faculty, it’s just making hoops for junior faculty to jump through.

Professor Eric Mielants made the following motion to amend the pending motion, which was seconded by Prof. Hodgson.
MOTION TO AMEND: To amend the pending motion by making the Third Year Review voluntary.

Professor Hlawitschka felt this was too drastic a change and wondered if it was in order.

The parliamentarian, Professor George Lang, was called upon to decide if this motion to amend was in order and it was ruled in order.

Professor Mulvey spoke against the motion to amend. The proposal has been worked on for years by many individuals and committees and the amendment changes it so drastically that we’d be voting on something completely different than what the Rank and Tenure Committee proposed. We should vote against the motion to amend and get back to a discussion on the main motion.

Professor Crabtree, seconded by Prof. Scheraga, made a

MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION ON THE MOTION TO AMEND and the MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION PASSED OVERWHELMINGLY.

The Chair called for a vote on the motion to amend and the

MOTION TO AMEND failed.

Professor Mark Scalese, S.J., spoke against the main motion since we already have very good mentoring in our Center for Academic Excellence and in our departments.

Professor Joan Weiss spoke in favor of the main motion. It isn’t any more work for faculty; it’s what we do all the time in departmental reviews.

Prof. Epstein spoke in favor of the main motion. People claim this is an undue burden on faculty and an undue burden on the Third Year Review Committees, but neither objection is valid. We do hire people to tenure them and the proposal would provide meaningful feedback without undue burden.

Prof. Wendy Kohli spoke in favor of the main motion. Most places do have this kind of a Third Year Review and Fairfield is an anomaly in this regard. This would help our junior faculty.

Professor Boquet, seconded by Prof. Crabtree, made a

MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION ON THE MAIN MOTION and the MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION PASSED OVERWHELMINGLY.

The Chair called for a vote on the main motion. There were 30 votes in favor and 30 against. The Chair, who is entitled to vote only in the case of a tie, voted against the motion.

MAIN MOTION FAILED 30 in favor and 31 against.

4. Handbook Amendment re membership on FDEC.

Secretary of the General Faculty, Professor Irene Mulvey, presented this item as written up in the packet of materials for the meeting. The current Handbook language for membership on the FDEC is problematic because it states that the committee be composed of eight elected faculty members including a faculty member from the University College. Of necessity, the representative from the University College has been appointed rather than elected, which is not consistent with the language of the Faculty Handbook. The amendment does not change the size of the committee or the voting privileges of the University.
College representative. On April 11, the Academic Council unanimously passed this motion to change the Handbook and now it must be passed by a 2/3 vote of the General Faculty. Prof. Mulvey made the following motion, which was seconded.

**MOTION** to replace the paragraph in the Faculty Handbook on Membership of the Committee on Faculty Development and Evaluation with the following paragraph:

Seven members elected from the faculty for three-year overlapping terms, according to the following electoral divisions: four from the College of Arts and Sciences, one each from the School of Nursing, the School of Business and the Graduate School. The Dean of University College or the appointed representative of the same shall be an ex officio member with a right to vote. The Academic Vice President or the appointed representative of the same shall be an ex officio member with a right to vote.

The **MOTION** was voted on and **PASSED** with all voting in favor except for one opposed.

---

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

Professor Beth Boquet, Chair of the Faculty Salary Committee (FSC), made the report for the committee. The FSC wants to update the General Faculty with regard to the FSC surveys and where we stand with regard to this year’s agenda.

Prof. Boquet thanked the many faculty members who returned the surveys, as they are extremely informative and helpful in shaping the agenda. Faculty input is always helpful, of course, and faculty should feel free to contact any member of the FSC at any time. Prof. Boquet went over the surveys as follows:

Question 1 concerns the relationship between sustained merit and the cost-of-living. There was overwhelming support that sustained merit be set at or above the increase in the cost-of-living.

Question 2 concerns the relationship between sustained merit and additional merit. Here, faculty members reiterated their support for the fact that sustained merit must be at or above the increase in the cost-of-living. Beyond that, people were reluctant to be more specific. There is a willingness to allocate funds to additional merit but only if the sustained piece is properly funded. Faculty maintain that properly funding the sustained piece is vitally important.

Questions 3 and 4 concern inadequate benefit areas and the impact of the recent changes to benefit co-pays. Faculty report inadequate coverage in prescription drug costs closely followed by inadequate dental coverage. Many people are surprised at how many drugs are in the $30 co-pay category. Last year, the administration said that very few drugs would fall into this non-formulary category, but data from faculty members indicates that this is not so. Non-formulary drugs were supposed to be the exception, but they are in fact fairly common.

Turning to the collegial discussions for this year, Prof Boquet said that the administration team this year will be co-chaired by AVP Grossman and VP Lucas and that we are in the process of formulating our joint agenda. Agenda items include:

- Reaching agreement on a 2006-2007 Memo of Understanding (MOU)
- Monitoring the terms of the current MOU
- Salary increase for faculty who are close to the maximum of the range when promoted
- Salary increase for first-year faculty
e. Collaboration on a joint review of benefits
f. Our contract, MOU, and Benefits Plan Overview booklet; perhaps combining into 1 document

6. Discussion of the Strategic Plan.

Prof. Mulvey explained that the President had sent advance copies of the Strategic Plan to the Secretary of the General Faculty as well as to chairs of several of our Handbook committees. Now it is on an intranet site (http://info.fairfield.edu/strategic plan) and all members of the University community are invited to comment on it. As a result, Prof. Mulvey decided to put this on our agenda today so that while we are together this afternoon, we can have a conversation about the Strategic Plan from the perspective of the General Faculty and, if anything substantial comes up, she will respond to the intranet site on behalf of the General Faculty. Prof. Sandy Billings asked, with regard to the items on pages 12 and 13 that relate to the Graduate School, how many of these items will in fact be implemented? Prof. Lang said the only concern he had was that there are suggested changes to the core requirements that would need to go through the General Faculty. Prof. Rosivach said that the working assumption has always been that all items will go through the appropriate structures. Prof. Nantz raised the concern that faculty representatives, in order to be legitimate, must be elected by the faculty. Some appointments are OK, but legitimate faculty representation must be chosen by the faculty. Prof. Hodgson said there is a great deal of emphasis on changing how we teach – team-teaching, multidisciplinary teaching, etc. But what about junior faculty who have very stringent requirements for research? There should be some recognition that newer faculty are under tremendous time constraints - they need to stick to their disciplines, as opposed to focusing on multi-disciplinarity.

Prof. Gardner recognized Prof. Lang for an announcement. Prof. Lang told the faculty that this week the AAUP is supporting Campus Equity Week because contingent faculty deserve pay proportional to the work they do, access to benefits, and some form of job security. The number of contingent faculty (adjunct and non-tenure track) has grown from 43% in 1974 to 65% in 2005. Buttons supporting Campus Equity Week will be available during the reception following the meeting.
A MOTION TO ADJOURN was made, seconded and PASSED WITHOUT OBJECTION. The meeting adjourned at 5:04 PM and was followed by a very gala post-meeting reception sponsored by the Faculty Welfare Committee.

Respectfully submitted,
Irene Mulvey
Secretary of the General Faculty
General Faculty Meeting
February 10, 2005
Agenda Item 3. Handbook Amendment on years in rank for promotion

PROPOSED NEW WORDING FOR THE FACULTY HANDBOOK’S FACULTY POLICIES

Personnel Policies, Qualifications for Appointment to Rank, Associate Professor, item b (pg. 21)

Current wording:

b) four years experience in the rank of assistant professor

Proposed wording:

b) five years experience in the rank of assistant professor

Rationale: To avoid confusion and split decisions, the number of years required for promotion to Associate Professor should be consistent with those required for tenure, pg. 24, under item b.:

(3) That the candidate for tenure shall have served a probationary period of not less than five years in the academic profession, not less than two years of which shall have been served at Fairfield University.
Excerpt of Academic Council Minutes of November 7, 2005:

1) **Handbook Change from Rank and Tenure Committee** (reordered).

Dennin provided an overview of the Rank and Tenure Committee’s recommended changes to *Faculty Handbook* language. He explained that the language seems inconsistent and illogical. Discussion followed.

DeWitt agreed with the motivation for the proposed change but had concerns about how the new language would affect our traditional policy of allowing faculty to apply for tenure in their fifth or sixth years. DeWitt explained his position, that criterion 1 for tenure (page 24 of the *Faculty Handbook*) requires that a candidate satisfy the criteria for academic rank, hence changing the criteria for rank changes the criteria for tenure. Dennin repeated that members of the Rank and Tenure Committee want candidates to apply for promotion and tenure in the same year, something the current language complicates.

Lakeland voiced his support for the change, saying that DeWitt's concern seemed to be about whether or not an applicant can count the current year in which the application is submitted towards the minimum years necessary for eligibility. Lakeland said that the current year has always counted towards eligibility. DeWitt suggested that the change be delayed until the General Faculty decides whether or not to pursue a sixth-year “up or out” review. Rakowitz answered that the change is limited to the issue of promotion and does not influence tenure; she concluded that waiting was not necessary. Mulvey asked whether or not the AC should send the proposal back to the Rank and Tenure Committee for clarification.

Lang asked that the possibility of a sixth-year review not be considered in the process of determining if this change to the *Faculty Handbook* should be made. He expressed his belief that “we are not ready” to discuss major changes to the rank and tenure process. **Lang made a motion (see below).** Discussion of the motion followed.

Grossman stated that the current language is “awkward” and “inappropriate.” He expressed his displeasure at the possibility of a candidate applying for tenure and promotion under different standards of criteria (i.e., for promotion under normal criteria in the fourth year, and under extraordinary criteria for tenure in the same year). DeWitt insisted that the language, as it currently exists, is being misinterpreted. Lakeland said that he was in favor of the motion because “it can’t make things worse.” Steffen spoke against the motion, asking for the proposed change to be sent back to the Rank and Tenure Committee for clarification.

**Motion by Keenan: “Call to Question.” Seconded by Rakowitz. Vote: 12-1-0. Passed.**

**Motion by Lang: “The Council accepts the change to the *Faculty Handbook* as recommended by the Rank and Tenure Committee and forwards the changes to the General Faculty for its consideration.” Seconded by Rakowitz. Vote: 10-2-2. Passed.**