General Faculty Meeting
Friday November 15, 2013
Gonzaga Auditorium, 3:30-5 pm

Agenda

1. Announcements
2. Approval of the minutes of October 18, 2013 (attachment, pages 2-10)
3. UCC proposal regarding the language core requirement (attachments, pages 11-24)
4. Public Safety update on emergency procedures
5. Adjournment

The meeting will be followed by a Gala Reception hosted by the Faculty Welfare Committee/AAUP
Prof. Larry Miners called the meeting to order at 3:36 p.m. explaining that Prof. Schmidt was ill and as a previous General Faculty chair, he had agreed to step in.
1. **Announcements**

Prof. David McFadden, on behalf of the MLK convocation committee announced that a series of events was being planned for the week of January 27th. He wanted faculty to know that the featured speaker would be Wil Haygood, author of the book on which the film *The Butler* was based. For more information, contact Prof. Kris Sealey or Mr. Fred Kuo.

Prof. Miners reminded faculty of the gala reception sponsored by the FWC/AAUP after the meeting.

2. **Approval of the minutes of September 20, 2013**

GFS Susan Rakowitz announced that she had received corrections from Prof. Rick DeWitt to his remarks at the end of the last meeting and those corrections would be incorporated into the minutes.

   **Motion [Caster/Miecznikowski]: to approve the minutes of 9/20/13 as corrected.**
   The motion passed unanimously.

3. **Proposed Handbook amendment from the Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee**

Prof. Mike Andreychik, Chair of the Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee (FDEC) presented the amendment. He explained that the FDEC had been charged with re-examining their membership in light of the dissolution of University College. As a result, they were proposing a two-part amendment. One proposal was to remove the slot designated for the Dean of University College, given that University College no longer exists. The other was to take one of the four slots now allotted to the College of Arts & Sciences (CAS) and the School of Engineering (SOE), and to designate it specifically for SOE, so that each school would have at least one designated seat on the committee. He explained that the committee felt that even though faculty in SOE were eligible for the CAS slots, it was difficult for them to be elected given their small size. But the committee felt that it was important that engineering faculty be represented on the committee as faculty from all of the other schools are.

At this point the floor was opened for questions. Prof. Joan Weiss asked whether the committee was concerned that they would now have an even number of members. Prof. Andreychik said that they had not discussed the numbers.

   **Motion [Andreychik/Lane]: remove from section I.C.b.15. of the Faculty Handbook, "The Dean of University College or the appointed representative of the same shall be an ex officio member with a right to vote."**

There was no discussion, and Chair Miners reminded the faculty that proxies were not eligible to vote on Handbook amendments, and a 2/3 majority was required for passage.

   **Motion passed overwhelmingly.**

Prof. Betsy Bowen asked whether giving SOE a seat on this committee would have implications for other Handbook committees. Prof. Andreychik said that their only concern had been the FDEC.

   **Motion [Andreychik/Sauer]: to edit section I.C.b.15 of the Faculty Handbook as follows (deletions struck through, insertions underlined):**

   "...four three from the College of Arts & Sciences, one each from and the School of Engineering, at most one faculty member from the School of Engineering may serve at any one time, one each from the School of Nursing, the School of Business, and the Graduate School of Education & Allied Professions."

Prof. Irene Mulvey asked how many full time faculty were in SOE, and a voice from the back of the room answered that there were about 10.
Prof. Paul Lakeland spoke against the motion, saying that he was not opposed to the representation of SOE on this committee, but that he was concerned about the larger issue that Prof. Bowen hinted at with her question. The composition of committees should reflect the size of schools, and it would be a problem if CAS, with more faculty than the other schools put together, were in the minority. He suggested that the question of representation on committees should be considered in the context of all committees.

Prof. Cheryl Tromley asked whether Prof. Lakeland was suggesting that all schools together should have less representation than CAS and Prof. Lakeland responded that he thought the larger issue of committee representation should be considered.

**Motion passed by the required 2/3: 66 in favor, 29 opposed.**

4. **Proposed Handbook amendment regarding voting rights for faculty members on leave**

Prof. Shawn Rafalski, Chair of the Academic Council, presented this amendment. He explained that over the last few years, the Academic Council Executive Committee had reviewed the Handbook for potential revisions, and this was one of the items they ended up bringing to the Council. This policy was probably originally designed to keep those on leave from being encumbered by coming in to campus to vote, but it ends up disenfranchising faculty on leave. The recommended change was to let those on leave vote by proxy as anyone who can't attend General Faculty meetings may do. What is unchanged is not counting those on leave in the calculation of a quorum. He noted that the original policy predates email; now faculty don't need to come to campus in order to keep abreast of issues coming up for vote.

Prof. Joel Goldfield asked whether this change meant that a faculty member on leave could be in the room and not be counted as part of the body. Prof. Rakowitz explained that the motion meant that the minimum number of people required for a quorum would still be determined (each semester) based on the number of full time faculty minus the number of faculty on leave. Then if a question was raised about whether there was a quorum at any particular meeting, all full time faculty in the room would be counted.

Prof. Suzanne Chamlin asked whether the proposal referred to faculty on leave or on sabbatical or both. Prof. Rafalski said it referred to both.

**Motion [Rafalski/Steffen]: Amend the Faculty Handbook section I.A.4 by deleting items b. and c., adding underlined text, and re-lettering d.:**

b. Faculty members have a contractual obligation to attend meetings of the General Faculty, except when on leave. A faculty member on leave may vote or designate a proxy to vote on his or her behalf in a General Faculty meeting, but is not counted in determining a quorum. An active faculty member [continue to end].

**Motion passed unanimously.**

5. **Update from the Faculty Salary Committee regarding current healthcare discussions**

Prof. Irene Mulvey, Chair of the Faculty Salary Committee (FSC) made the presentation. She began by thanking the 2012-2013 FSC (Profs. Deb Strauss, Dennis Keenan, John Miecznikowski, and Marcie Patton) which started working on this matter, the 2013-2014 FSC (Profs. Keenan and Patton, along with newly added Profs. Walter Hlawitschka and Ryan Munden) which took up the work, and the healthcare subcommittee (Profs. Michael Tucker and Susan Rakowitz).

She explained that she understands that people were at many different levels of understanding the issues at hand. She was going to try to make the presentation as clear and complete as possible for
everyone. She referred to the memo from the FSC to the General Faculty dated 10/14/13, and said that the FSC sent the memo again last night because they had learned that many faculty hadn't read it because its urgency wasn't clear.

At this point she began going through a powerpoint presentation which is appended to these minutes. Last March the administration informed the FSC of their intention to rebid the administration of our healthcare. The FSC immediately responded that the design of the healthcare plan cannot be changed without faculty approval and the administration concurred. With the help of a consultant, Mercer, they rebid our current plan to three large national carriers—Anthem, Aetna, and Cigna.

A healthcare subcommittee (Profs. Mulvey, Rakowitz and Tucker) formed by the FSC met with the administration in late summer and early fall. The process didn't work as quickly as the faculty had hoped and as decisions became imminent in October, the whole FSC joined in meetings with the administration and the consultant from Mercer. The process was collegial, with lots of data and information shared with the faculty. Slide 3 shows the objectives of the process from the materials provided by Mercer.

Regardless of carrier, dental and vision plans will be unbundled from the medical/pharmacy components of the plans. This change is meant to decrease the value of the basic medical/pharmacy plan in the face of the Affordable Care Act's tax on so-called Cadillac plans that is scheduled to kick in in 2018. Note that the option 1 premiums shown on a later slide include the dental coverage that is currently part of option 1 so that faculty can make an apples to apples comparison with 2013 premiums. If faculty choose to forego dental coverage, those premiums will be lower. In addition, two lower cost options will be added, primarily with staff in mind. These options will have the same medical/pharmacy coverage. They will cost less on a monthly basis, but may cost more to use.

The next 2 slides lay out the FSC’s essential concerns; they were about plan design and cost-share amounts. The FSC insisted on a written assurance that the plan as administered by Aetna will be equivalent in all material respects to the plan as administered by Anthem. That guarantee was received and forwarded to the faculty last night. Furthermore, last May the faculty agreed to move from 10% to 20% cost-share based on the university's predictions about 2014 increases. The FSC insisted that the new cost-share amounts be in the ballpark of what was predicted in May; ultimately the cost-shares presented for Aetna are all below the predicted amounts.

Even with the plan design unchanged, some disruption is inevitable due to the network of doctors not being identical. Slide 7 indicates that had Aetna been our carrier last year, the percent of paid claims that were in network (94%) would have been the same as it was for Anthem. Mercer notes that at least 85% overlap in networks is considered good, but we understand that for those who are affected, no amount of disruption is minimal. The FSC has been hearing lots of different anecdotal comments about Aetna’s network. Prof. Mulvey suggested that people check the website for their own doctors and medications. She offered to help people who might be having trouble navigating the website.

Slide 9 shows the cost-shares for the equivalents of option 1, the HSA, and the 2 new options under Aetna. Last year's predicted cost-shares for option 1 are also listed. As is the case now, there will be a basic medical/pharmacy option, and an option with enhanced prescription coverage. Human Resources (HR) will have open enrollment information sessions.

Prof. Mulvey said that the FSC’s unanimous position is that on balance, switching to Aetna will be better for employees and for the university. The FSC has tried to serve the faculty’s interests to the best of our ability. We’ve tried today to tell you what we know and what we think about it. We have tried to make our presentation rational and dispassionate. We made our recommendation, but we are not personally invested in the outcome.
She then explained that since the materials were sent out, the FSC has received a number of email and direct inquiries. They've been responding to individuals, but she wanted to address some of those questions here, on the assumption that many faculty had similar questions.

Question 1: What about the language in the Faculty Handbook? The most relevant statements are that: "the University provides a high quality Health Care Plan…with benefits equivalent to Blue Cross-Blue Shield Century Preferred Plan…” and that "The faculty shall be advised at least 90 days prior to any proposed change in the plan of benefits and any proposed comparable plan of benefits shall be submitted for approval to the General Faculty”.

She assured the faculty that the FSC is keenly aware of this language and it has been discussed at meetings (both with the administration and with the FSC only) since we first learned that our current plan was being put out to bid last March. Our discussions on this issue have been extremely detailed and exhaustive.

First, does this proposal even need to be put to a vote? That depends on whether or not this is a change in the plan of benefits. The administration would argue that it is not a change in the plan of benefits and so no vote is required. Rather than fight about this, the FSC simply insisted that we wanted to err on the side of giving the faculty voice on the decision and so we informed the administration that we would be bringing this matter to the General Faculty for a vote (side-stepping and avoiding the argument about whether the faculty are required to vote on this matter, and what weight a negative vote would carry).

Second, what about the notification requirement? Well, the FSC was informed and notified the faculty last spring about the rebidding process. On 9/17/13 (more than 90 days before the January 1 changeover date, the FSC was informed of the administration's preference for Aetna. The FSC wasn't comfortable informing the General Faculty until we were more satisfied regarding the concerns presented earlier (cost-share amounts and written assurances of plan comparability).

What we all agree on is that there is enough ambiguity in the language that it can be argued either way; we do not see an airtight case for claiming that the administration didn't meet their Handbook obligations. For these reasons, the FSC does not think it would be helpful to go down this road.

Question 2: What about the Consumer Reports article I've heard about that may rank Anthem better than Aetna in CT? The article sent to Prof. Mulvey by Prof. Tucker this morning, compares plans, not just carriers, and our plan design isn't changing. Furthermore, the comparison in question is about HMOs, but our plan is a PPO. The listing of plans in Connecticut includes Aetna's PPO, but not Anthem's, so it's not clear how relevant this article is to us. Nonetheless, if people feel that it might be important, today's vote could be put off while the article is distributed to the faculty.

Prof. Mulvey went on to say that a number of faculty have contacted the FSC with individual concerns. We have helped many faculty look for their providers, etc. on the Aetna website. Many faculty express a sort of global worry, which is completely understandable since people feel very strongly about their health care; health care is personal. I have heard from one individual who appears to have serious disruption issues and this concerns me very much. But, I’m not sure that individual matters should torpedo the proposed change. There may be other individuals who will fare much better with the proposed change (particularly as it includes the two new lower-cost options). My feeling is that individuals with genuine problems should be put in touch with Heidi Kouble, our Benefits Manager, and the FSC can provide support to try to address these problems in order to help these individuals.

She noted that there really are two ways to think about this. Of course, everyone should look into whether their personal providers are in the Aetna network and how their drugs are listed in Aetna’s formulary. This is a very important consideration. Can we expect every single detail for every single individual to be equal to or better than what it was under Anthem? That seems unrealistic.
But, there’s a global perspective as well. What’s best for the faculty as a whole? What’s best for the University community? This isn’t a vote on our MOU/contract, which affects only faculty. This is about health care, which goes beyond the faculty and covers all employees. The two new lower-cost, more flexible options (open to faculty) are, in fact, the administration’s attempt to do something about monthly premium costs for staff members whose annual salaries are not at all comparable to faculty. This is an attempt to provide options for lower monthly premiums.

Question 3: Can the vote be postponed? I understand that many faculty feel rushed. I have run into people who knew we sent a memo but hadn’t read it. I have run into people who have been diligently trying to look into the new plan and still have more questions. I have run into people who think this is no big deal (a no-brainer, I’ve been told). In other words, the FSC is aware that there are many, many different opinions on this whole deal. If faculty want more time to look into things, then we could recess this meeting and table a vote on this motion until the meeting reconvenes. What will people be able to do in the meantime? I don’t think the FSC can provide any more information, which will be relevant to the whole faculty. The anecdotal stories I am hearing don’t really add up to a unified opinion on Aetna versus Anthem. The questions I am getting need to be addressed to Heidi and HR. It’s not appropriate for the FSC to be ferrying questions and answers for individuals to and from HR. The appropriate place to get detailed information is HR. I don’t know how many people think it’s important to postpone the vote for that.

The FSC’s position is that the administration has tried to find a somewhat more economical solution to health care. We can accept that and have these premiums and two new lower-cost, more flexible options. If we reject it, do we pay higher premiums to maintain Anthem? The FSC would go back to the table, but it's not clear what would happen. The FSC thinks the switch to Aetna is a good option. We recommend that the faculty approve the change. But, ultimately, as everyone understands, the General Faculty will make its decision by majority vote.

The floor was then opened for questions. Prof. Don Greenberg asked when the changes would take effect and whether they required a majority or 2/3 vote. Prof. Mulvey said that the new plan would begin on January 1, 2014, and because this was not an amendment to the Handbook, she thought it required a simple majority. She deferred to the Faculty Secretary who concurred.

Prof. Steven Bayne asked whether the big increase in the HSA premium was due to the switch in carriers. Prof. Mulvey said that it was not. Prof. Tucker added that Mercer, the healthcare consultant, said that the HSA was underpriced at its 2013 rates.

Prof. Dawn Massey asked whether we had premium rates for Anthem and Cigna. Prof. Mulvey said that we didn't have numbers for Cigna because they were out of the running. The Anthem premium numbers we were given basically matched the predictions the FSC had offered last spring. Overall, without any changes, Anthem's costs were expected to increase by 11%. All three carriers came in below that predicted increase- Anthem by .3%, Aetna by 2% and Cigna by 5%.

Prof. Ginny Kelly asked whether the policies on out-of-network expenses would be the same. Prof. Mulvey said that the out of pocket maximums for out-of-network expenses were the same.

Prof. Lakeland asked about the meaning of the vote- if the administration doesn't believe it's necessary because this isn't a change in benefits, is our vote a measure of our pleasure/displeasure, or could it materially affect the administration's plans. Prof. Mulvey said that it could be both. The FSC feels it's important for the faculty to weigh in; it would be a terrible precedent to allow a change like this to occur without faculty approval.

Prof. Eileen Reilly-Wiedow said that she has had experience with all three carriers and that Anthem was by far the best. She asked whether we would be responsible for the difference between what doctors charge and what Aetna reimburses. She also expressed concerns about out-of-state coverage and doctors dropping out of Aetna's network. Prof. Mulvey explained that Prof. Reilly-Wiedow had
emailed these questions earlier and she had passed them on to the administration. Vice President Mark Reed had responded quickly to the FSC and his response had been forwarded to Prof. Reilly-Wiedow. VP Reed had explained that the rates paid are negotiated under each plan, so experiences under a different plan may not be comparable. Prof. Mulvey added that they had heard from another faculty member who had exactly the opposite experience with Aetna. Prof. Tucker explained that in-network doctors are under contract to accept the rates negotiated with Aetna; employees do not have to pay anything over those negotiated rates.

Prof. Olivia Harriott asked how the lower cost plans would compare to plans available on the new exchanges. She also asked for details on the wellness programs. Prof. Mulvey said that she didn't have details on the wellness programs, only that Mercer had rated Aetna better than Anthem for wellness programs.

Prof. Brian Walker asked how much the university would be saving. Prof Tucker thought it was about $1 million.

Prof. Goldfield asked whether we would have recourse if we make the switch and then determine that there's a problem. Prof. Mulvey said that she thinks we do. The FSC insisted on a guarantee in writing from the administration that the plans would be the same. They gave us that guarantee (which the FSC forwarded to the faculty last night), and we can hold them to it. She added that she feels they made the guarantee in good faith.

Prof. Janie Leatherman said that she was getting contradictory information in trying to locate doctors on Aetna's website. Prof. Mulvey offered to help her.

SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, S.J. asked Prof. Mulvey to explain to the faculty that we are self-insured. We just pay a carrier to act as an interface with our healthcare providers. Prof. Mulvey agreed with the SVPAA's characterization of our coverage.

Prof. Christine Earls asked whether the plan was a POS or PPO. Prof. Mulvey said that it's a PPO, though we were instructed to select a POS when searching for doctors on the website.

Prof. Massey said that she was confused about the numbers- if we're saving $1 million and that's a 2% savings, that would suggest that our healthcare spending is $50 million. Prof. Mulvey said that last year's healthcare spending was about $15 million, and offered to show Prof. Massey some tables. but didn't have the numbers immediately accessible to clarify. [After the meeting, Prof. Tucker determined that the projected savings with Cigna were close to $1 million, but were about $352,000 with Aetna.]

Motion [Mulvey/Lane]: The General Faculty approve the change in administration of our current health care plan to Aetna.

Motion passed: 88 in favor, 28 opposed, 15 abstaining

A Motion [Epstein/ Crabtree] of thanks to the FSC was met with a warm ovation.

At this point, Chair Miners asked whether the body wanted to move on to the next agenda item or adjourn.

A motion to adjourn [Lakeland/Greenberg] was uncontested at 4:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Prof. Susan Rakowitz
Secretary of the General Faculty
Objectives of the re-bidding process:
- Evaluate options for slowing the rate of increase of medical costs.
- To improve visibility and effectiveness of members as medical consumers.
- Help navigate changes due to health care reform and ensure plans are compliant.
- Identify benefit components that are driving increased plan utilization.
- Improve employee health and well-being.
- Help simplify and streamline the administration process.

Essential FSC Concerns
- Plan design is mandated by the Faculty Handbook. There can be no changes to plan design without faculty approval.
- In response to FSC request, the administration provided written assurance that the plan as administered by Aetna will be equivalent in all material respects to the plan as administered by Anthem.
- The only thing changing is the administration of our current plan.

Background/Process
- Last March, the administration informed the Faculty Salary Committee (FSC) of their intention to re-bid the administration of our current health care plan.
- FSC formed a Health Care Subcommittee which met with the administration in the summer and early fall.
- In October, the entire FSC joined with the Health Care Subcommittee as decisions became imminent.
- The process was open and collegial. Lots of information was shared. The consultant from Mercer attended meetings and answered our follow-up questions.

Summary
- Dental and vision will be unbundled from medical/pharmacy and will be administered by Anthem.
- The administration of our current medical/pharmacy plan will be switched from Anthem to Aetna.
- In addition, two new, lower-cost, flexible options for medical coverage will be available.

Essential FSC Concerns
- Cost-shares for faculty in 2014 under Aetna’s administration should be no more than what was predicted last spring.
- In a later slide, we show 2014 cost-shares are all less than what was predicted last fall.
- In addition, two new lower-cost options will be available.

Provider Disruption Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ANTHEM</th>
<th>AETNA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Match</td>
<td>$19,347,560</td>
<td>$19,025,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Match</td>
<td>$1,284,915</td>
<td>$1,248,641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information on searching Aetna’s network of doctors is in the FSC’s 10/14 memo.

Information for searching Aetna’s drug formulary is in the FSC’s 10/14 memo.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014 ANNUAL COST SHARES</th>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 Single</td>
<td>$1,977</td>
<td>$1,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 Two-person</td>
<td>$3,927</td>
<td>$3,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 Family</td>
<td>$5,258</td>
<td>$5,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSA Single</td>
<td>$1,860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSA Two-person</td>
<td>$3,767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSA Family</td>
<td>$5,045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New-Coinsurance PPO single</td>
<td>$1,553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New-Coinsurance PPO 2-person</td>
<td>$3,154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New-Coinsurance PPO Family</td>
<td>$4,238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New-Lower Cost HSA Single</td>
<td>$1,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New-Lower Cost HSA 2-person</td>
<td>$2,427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New-Lower Cost HSA Family</td>
<td>$4,334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MOTION.** The General Faculty approve the change in administration of our current health care plan to Aetna.

**FSC Perspective.**
Any change is liable to cause concern. All the information that the FSC reviewed indicates that, on balance, once the initial work of open enrollment and choosing plans takes place in November, the new carrier will be better for employees and the University. The administration expects lower administrative costs, better network discounts for services, better reports to see how to reduce cost increases, better wellness programs, and other efficiencies. In addition, the two new options provide lower-cost, more flexible options for employees.
For item 3, UCC Proposal Regarding the Language Core Requirement

Proposal and Supporting Materials:

General Faculty directive to the UCC with excerpts of minutes of 10/12/12          Pages 11-14
Proposed text as approved by the UCC (12/4/12) and Academic Council (2/25/13)  Page 15
Rationale from the UCC                                                     Pages 15-17
Excerpts of minutes of UCC: 11/6/12, 12/4/12                                Pages 18-21
Excerpts of minutes of Academic Council, 2/4/13, 2/25/13              Pages 22-24

General Faculty directive to the UCC with excerpts of minutes of 10/12/12

On October 12, 2012, the General Faculty passed the following motion:

The General Faculty directs the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) to review the core language requirement, in consultation with the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures and the Program in Classical Studies, and to draft a proposal for a core language requirement that will apply to all Fairfield undergraduates.

Fairfield University
General Faculty Meeting
October 12, 2012
Minutes of Meeting (Excerpts)

Approved by the General Faculty on November 9, 2012.

4. Consideration of language requirement for DSB

Prof. Irene Mulvey said that current General Faculty Secretary Prof. Susan Rakowitz asked her, as immediate past GFS, to review this agenda item and the work done on it last year for the General Faculty. A very long process brought this item to the General Faculty last spring, when the motion in the packet was tabled until fall. The DSB Curriculum Committee sent a proposal modifying the core language requirement for DSB undergraduates to the DSB faculty, which endorsed it and sent it on to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. The UCC approved it and sent it to the Academic Council. The Council had a subcommittee spend a couple of meetings unsuccessfully trying to find a compromise and then passed the proposal in April. Any matter passed by the Council can be put on the General Faculty agenda by a petition of at least 30 members of the General Faculty. Such a petition brought the issue to the General Faculty on 4/27/12 and during that meeting, a motion to overturn the AC’s decision to modify the core for DSB students was tabled to the first General Faculty meeting in the fall.

She explained that during the GFS transition this summer, she and Prof. Rakowitz talked about trying to find a resolution that would have broad support. Because this involves the core, it's essential to move thoughtfully. With the current DSB exception, all schools except CAS now have exceptions to the core language requirement. It may therefore be time to revisit the core language requirement. She and Prof. Rakowitz had drafted an amendment to the motion currently on the floor.
Motion [Mulvey/Downie]: to amend the current motion by substituting the following text: The General Faculty directs the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) to review the core language requirement, in consultation with the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures, and to draft a proposal for a core language requirement that will apply to all Fairfield undergraduates.

Prof. Naser asked about the fact that the motion directed the UCC to work with the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures (DMLL), but not with the schools. Several people said that the undergraduate schools are all represented on the UCC.

Prof. Mary Ann Carolan said that she is the chair of DMLL and was not consulted. She is against the amendment and would like to return to the tabled motion.

Prof. Ellen Umansky said it would be helpful to know why the Academic Council passed the motion.

Prof. Vin Rosivach said that he first wanted to point out that the language requirement can be met with Latin and Greek, not just with the DMLL offerings. He went on to say that he was uncomfortable with the stage-managing of the meeting. He was troubled by the appearance of a motion that the body hasn't seen.

Prof Paul Lakeland said he was in favor of the motion to substitute. He noted that it is within the purview of any member to propose any amendment; the body can vote it down if we wish. If we vote on the motion from April, however we vote, it will be divisive. The present motion works toward a solution that will unite rather than divide.

Prof. Cheryl Tromley said that she was in DSB so she has a stake in this issue, but she also sees a bigger issue. She is deeply involved in faculty governance and in that context she wanted to put aside the specific questions of the amendment and focus on governance issues. We cannot know everything about important and complex issues that come before the General Faculty so we elect our colleagues to represent us. We trust them to work for what's best for the entire university. This system has served us quite well in the past. In this case, the UCC became experts in this issue. They made a judgment, as did the Academic Council after careful consideration. Do we want to go down the path where any disagreement with our elected bodies comes to the General Faculty, substituting our less informed judgment for our colleagues' more informed judgments? If we can't trust our colleagues to work on our behalf, we're sunk.

Prof. Giovanni Ruffini said he was caught off guard by this amendment and he shared Prof. Rosivach's concern about stage-managing. He is the chair of UCC and was not consulted.

Prof. Beth Boquet spoke in favor of the amendment, based particularly on the work she was engaged in after the April General Faculty meeting. As she worked with the academic deans' offices and advising offices to think about how to implement the changes for the current first year class, it became clear that there was a substantial lack of clarity around the vote and what was at stake. Remanding the motion would allow for broader consideration of the issues at stake.

Prof. Carolan spoke in response to Profs. Tromley and Lakeland. She said that this vote affects the core, and wondered what the chances were that we would find a solution for all schools. She was especially skeptical that the schools would agree to intermediate language for all students.

Prof. Bob Epstein said that he spoke with all due respect for his colleagues and felt that all were seeking what's best for their vision of the curriculum. With that preface, he said that he didn't see the current motion as any sort of attack on our structures. It's not cloak and dagger, but a path to a potentially beneficial compromise. He was on the UCC when the DSB's request first came through; it did go through proper channels. But one expects communication with the General Faculty, and
more so on this issue because it's about fragmentation of the core. He suggested that it's a serious problem if the required language core only exists in one school.

Prof. Rosivach picked up on the phrase "cloak and dagger," noting that we had a published motion and then the chair called on Prof. Mulvey who presented a motion that none of us have seen.

Prof. Chris Huntley spoke against the amendment but with conflicting emotions. He said he liked the spirit of it, but didn't want to conflate it with the tabled motion. He saw them as separate issues.

Prof. Mulvey denied wearing a cloak or carrying a dagger. She reiterated that she and Prof. Rakowitz had discussed the amendment and she noted that the tabled motion would return to a common core language requirement just for DSB and CAS rather than looking broadly at the language core. She echoed Prof. Lakeland’s opinion that the current motion will divide us no matter which way it goes.

Prof. Joel Goldfield echoed Prof. Huntley. He had no problem with the spirit of the amendment, only with the fact that it looked only at one piece of the core.

Motion [Lakeland/Naser]: To call the question.
Motion to call the question passed.

Motion to amend passed 83-58-4.

Motion [Ruffini/Crabtree]: To amend by inserting "and the Program in Classical Studies" after "Department of Modern Languages and Literature".

Dean Robbin Crabtree spoke in favor of the amendment and Prof. Mulvey said it was a good idea.

Motion [Dennin/Miners]: To call the question.
Motion to call the question passed.

Motion to amend passed.

Prof. Regan said that the wording of the motion seemed to be ambiguous. It might imply that each school would have the same language requirement, but he wasn't sure that was the case. Prof. Keenan reread the motion.

Prof. Goldfield asked why we wouldn't want representatives from all core areas to be consulted given that there are many interdependencies in the core.

Prof. Carolan said that we shouldn't kid ourselves– we're talking about revising the core at Fairfield, we can't pretend otherwise. She realizes that there are exceptions in SOE and SON and now DSB.

Prof. David Downie suggested amending the motion to include consultation with the deans of all the schools, but several people pointed out that the deans are on the UCC.

Prof. Tromley said that it was misleading to see this as an attack on the core. It was initiated by changes made by DMLL.

Prof. Joan Van Hise agreed that we're not looking to change the core; DMLL made changes that affected everyone and we're looking to reset.

Prof. Lakeland said that obviously there are issues that could affect what we think about the whole core but the current motion asks the appropriate body to review the issues and make a proposal that will come back to the General Faculty.
Prof. Ahmed Ebrahim explained that DSB's proposal arose when the percent of DSB students placed into elementary language rose from 10% to 60%. Having to take four semesters of language instead of two leaves business students with only two free electives. He was in favor of the change for DSB students because it allows students to double major or minor. The current motion might lead to that change being made available to all students.

Prof. Carolan responded to the claims from DSB faculty that DMLL had changed the core. The core is unchanged, but outside evaluators said that the previous DMLL structure of elementary and two different levels of intermediate language was untenable. The evaluators recommended just two levels—elementary and intermediate. The department uses an external test and benchmarking for placement. She said that we seen a decline in the preparation of incoming students.

Prof. Lakeland called for a point of order; he noted that the recent speakers raised points appropriate to the previous motion. We should only discuss whether we're referring this to committee.

Prof. Ruffini said he was puzzled by Prof. Lakeland's previous comment about the UCC bringing a proposal to the General Faculty. He said there was no guarantee of that. The UCC might reject the General Faculty's motion or send something to the Academic Council that might be rejected.

Prof. Joe Dennin said that in his ideal world, the core is for everyone. The language core is now no longer universal, but it's not clear that it can be. He noted that the UCC and AC votes on DSB's proposal were very close.

Prof. Jerelyn Johnson spoke in favor of the motion. She had served on the UCC through the DSB proposal and found the process unpleasant. But the current motion is different, it's trying to find a cohesive solution.

**Motion [Tucker/Caster]: To call the question.**  
**Motion to call the question passed.**

Prof. DeWitt raised a point of information asking whether the motion was calling for a common core or just a policy that might allow for different cores. Prof. Keenan reread the motion.

**Motion passed 110-35-5.**
Proposed JOR text as approved by the UCC (12/4/12) and Academic Council (2/25/13)
(New text in bold, deletions struck through.)

Area V: Modern and Classical Languages
(1) 2 semesters (at least at the intermediate level) of any language listed among the offerings of the Modern Languages Department or the Greek and Roman Studies Program.

Nursing Core Requirement:
Nursing students must complete the core curriculum that is required of all Fairfield undergraduates with one exception. Nursing students enroll in either the two semesters of foreign language or the two semesters of fine arts.

Dolan School of Business Core Requirement:
For students in the Charles F. Dolan School of Business, Area V of the core requirements is two semesters of the same language at any level.

College of Arts and Sciences Core Requirement:
2 semesters (at least at the intermediate level) of any language listed among the offerings of the Modern Languages Department or the Greek and Roman Studies Program.

Dolan School of Business Core Requirement:
For students in the Charles F. Dolan School of Business, Area V of the core requirements is two semesters of the same language at any level.

School of Nursing Core Requirement:
Nursing students must complete the core curriculum that is required of all Fairfield undergraduates with one exception. Nursing students enroll in either the two semesters of foreign language or the two semesters of fine arts.

School of Engineering:
Students in the School of Engineering are exempt from the Area V core requirement.

Rationale from the UCC

TO: Bob Epstein, Executive Secretary, Academic Council
FM: Giovanni Ruffini, Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
RE: Area V Core Requirements
ON: December 5, 2012

On 10/12/2012, the General Faculty passed the following motion:

“The General Faculty directs the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) to review the core language requirement, in consultation with the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures and the Program in Classical Studies, and to draft a proposal for a core language requirement that will apply to all Fairfield undergraduates.”
Noting discussion at that General Faculty meeting pointing to potential ambiguity in the language of the motion, I asked the General Faculty Secretary for guidance as to the intent of the framers of the motion. I was advised that the UCC should do the best it could to interpret the motion. In subsequent discussion with the UCC, I informed my colleagues that I would rule in order any motion that either (a) proposed a “requirement that will apply to all Fairfield undergraduates,” or (b) proposed the same requirement for all Fairfield undergraduates. As you will see, our ultimate recommendation is responsive to the first interpretation, but not the second.

Since the October meeting of the General Faculty, I have met with and received written feedback from the Dean of the Dolan School of Business, the Chair of the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures and the Director of the Program in Classical Studies. I presented a list of possible motions to the UCC for debate without a pending motion at its November meeting, and asked for suggestions for other possible motions at that time. I then scheduled a formal debate on a motion to take place on December 4, 2012. At that meeting, the UCC approved by a vote of 8 to 6 with 1 abstention a motion to recommend to the Academic Council that the Journal of Record language governing Area V of the core curriculum be changed as follows:

**Area V: Modern and Classical Languages**

(1) 2 semesters (at least at the intermediate level) of any language listed among the offerings of the Modern Languages Department or the Greek and Roman Studies Program.

**Nursing Core Requirement:**

Nursing students must complete the core curriculum that is required of all Fairfield undergraduates with one exception. Nursing students enroll in either the two semesters of foreign language or the two semesters of fine arts.

**Dolan School of Business Core Requirement:**

For students in the Charles F. Dolan School of Business, Area V of the core requirements is two semesters of the same language at any level.

**College of Arts and Sciences Core Requirement:**

2 semesters (at least at the intermediate level) of any language listed among the offerings of the Modern Languages Department or the Greek and Roman Studies Program.

**Dolan School of Business Core Requirement:**

For students in the Charles F. Dolan School of Business, Area V of the core requirements is two semesters of the same language at any level.

**School of Nursing Core Requirement:**

Nursing students must complete the core curriculum that is required of all Fairfield undergraduates with one exception. Nursing students enroll in either the two semesters of foreign language or the two semesters of fine arts.

**School of Engineering:**

Students in the School of Engineering are exempt from the Area V core requirement.
Further elaboration of rationale from a 1/21/13 memo from UCC Chair Ruffini:

This action was the most difficult for the committee, in part because of the feeling shared by several of its members that the language of the motion passed by the General Faculty on October 12, 2012 (“to draft a proposal for a core language requirement that will apply to all Fairfield undergraduates”) contained an inherent ambiguity. As my memo to you of December 5 indicated, I indicated to the committee that I would accept any motion that would either (a) propose a set of requirements covering all undergraduates or (b) propose the same requirement for all undergraduates.

Prior to debate on this issue, I circulated to the committee four options which I believed were potentially viable motions. None of my options proposed the same requirement for all undergraduates, in part because I was not certain that that was the intended goal of the General Faculty motion, and in part because I did not think that any such motion would be mathematically viable given the numerical composition of the committee. Some members of the committee did disagree with me, off the record, but no one presented a motion on the record that would have proposed the same requirement for all undergraduates. Nor did anyone else present any other alternative motions.

The committee ultimately chose to move, debate and pass language which would uphold the committee’s decision of last year to reduce the Dolan School of Business Area V requirement (and, in the process, formalize the School of Engineering exemption from the requirement, which has been de facto but not de iure). Given the fact that the committee’s composition is in large part identical to its composition a year ago, the debate was unsurprisingly similar to last year’s debate and necessarily quite divided. The minority, speaking against the motion, typically argued that the step was an erosion of the core and an assault on the value of learning a foreign language. The majority, speaking for the motion, typically argued that the professional schools at Fairfield had special curricular needs, and that changes in the language placement practices had forced the DSB to seek this requirement reduction.

There was, however, a new element to this year’s debate: an emphasis on continuity of policy and an objection to the process which returned the issue to the committee. Several members spoke strongly against the General Faculty motion, declaring it inappropriate and/or opaque, and for this reason declared support for upholding last year’s decision. Other members -- including one who had voted against the change last year -- announced support for the change this year on the grounds that it represented bad policy to have three requirements in as many years.

In short, I would summarize the committee’s rationale for passing this motion by saying that the committee (a) chose to stand by its decision of the prior year for reasons of policy continuity, and thus affirmed its opinion that (b) the DSB’s case for a reduction in its Area V requirement was sound; and (c) found the General Faculty’s instructions to the committee to be too opaque to serve as the basis for any further action.
Excerpts of Minutes of UCC Discussions of Proposal

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING
Minutes of the meeting on November 06, 2012 (Excerpts)
Attending: Professors Mousumi Bose Godbole, Bruce Bradford, Shah Etemad, Anita Fernandez, Johanna Garvey, Jerelyn Johnson, Alison Kris, Scott Lacy, Larry Miners, Rajasree Rajamma, Shanon Reckinger, Vin Rosivach, Tommy Xie, Giovanni Ruffini (Chair), Deans: Don Gibson, Lynn Babington, Aaron Perkus (for Robbin Crabtree)

Language core requirement: 15-minute discussion without a pending motion
There was a general discussion of this complicated issue, that has previously come before the committee. Among the comments were the following:
- The core will never be uniform.
- The is universal, except for the language requirement.
- The exception for the language requirement for Engineering predates the Journal of Record.
- A question was raised whether the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures needed to come up with new options.

No motions made.

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING
Draft Minutes: December 4, 2012 (Excerpts)
Attending: Professors Mousumi Bose Godbole, Bruce Bradford, Shah Etemad, Anita Fernandez, Johanna Garvey, Jerelyn Johnson, Alison Kris, Scott Lacy, Larry Miners, Rajasree Rajamma, Shanon Reckinger, Vin Rosivach, Yohuru Williams, Tommy Xie, Giovanni Ruffini (Chair), Deans: Robbin Crabtree, Lynn Babington, Don Gibson, Aaron Perkus

Language core requirement
The Chair briefly introduced the agenda item, and he presented four possible motions the committee could consider and/or modify. The four motions were distributed to committee members prior to the meeting. The Chair noted that all four motions, as written, do not impact existing Core requirements in Engineering and the School of Nursing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Status quo</td>
<td>affirm previous decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Status quo ante</td>
<td>overturn previous decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Universal 1-year</td>
<td>CAS &amp; DSB = 2 semesters any level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Compromise</td>
<td>DSB = 3 semesters; CAS = 2 semesters at intermediate level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before opening the floor for discussion, the Chair explained that the final (non-procedural) vote will be conducted by secret ballot. Prof. Rosivach inquired about the rationale for a secret ballot. Rosivach questioned the impact of a secret vote in terms of collegiality and transparency. He empathized, however, with untenured faculty who may feel anxious about openly casting critical votes in the presence of senior colleagues and administrators.
Prof. Miners supported Prof. Rosivach’s comments and he urged committee members to “build bridges minus animosity.”

Prof. Johnson noted that colleagues (namely junior colleagues) reported discomfort and anxiety about the previous vote, including discussions leading to the final vote. She advocates secret ballot voting whenever a colleague requests it.

Prof. Rosivach MOVED that all future UCC votes be open votes (no secret ballots). Prof. Miners seconded the motion.

The Chair opened the floor for debate.

Professors Garvey, Johnson, and Kris spoke against the motion. They said that protecting junior faculty was a primary motivation for their vote. Garvey noted that the previous vote had several abstentions, which could have impacted the final result.

Dean Perkus spoke in favor of the motion. He argued that one’s election to the UCC carries responsibilities, which include highly influential votes. Perkus reiterated that highly influential votes should be open votes.

Prof. Williams spoke against the motion; he questioned whether an open vote is a precondition for collegial discussions.

Hearing no more discussion, the Chair called the vote.

Motion FAILED (3-10-0)

Prof. Bradford MOVED to approve the “status quo” motion, that the Journal of Record language on Area V be modified to read as follows, seconded by Prof. Rajamma.

Area V: Modern and Classical Languages

College of Arts and Sciences Core Requirement:
2 semesters (at least at the intermediate level) of any language listed among the offerings of the Modern Languages Department or the Greek and Roman Studies Program.

Dolan School of Business Core Requirement:
For students in the Charles F. Dolan School of Business, Area V of the core requirements is two semesters of the same language at any level.

School of Nursing Core Requirement:
Nursing students must complete the core curriculum that is required of all Fairfield undergraduates with one exception. Nursing students enroll in either the two semesters of foreign language or the two semesters of fine arts.

School of Engineering:
Students in the School of Engineering are exempt from the Area V core requirement.

The Chair opened the floor for debate.

Prof. Bradford said that the DSB demonstrated that regional competitors have less language requirements. He argued that, as a requirement, two semesters of language at the
intermediate level is a recruiting problem. He shared a personal anecdote about his children’s recent decision making strategies in choosing colleges other than Fairfield.

Prof. Rosivach spoke in favor of the motion. He said that once the vote was taken, the process was complete. After voting against the motion last year, Rosivach now will vote in favor because, he added, overturning the previous vote would be a horrible precedent. He advocated the status quo motion because it provides continuity and stability of policy, which allows program directors and chairs to better align curricular needs and resources.

Prof. Godbole spoke in favor of the motion. She said the previous process and final vote taught the committee that there is an appropriate language requirement for each of the schools (CAS, DSB, SoN, etc.). Godbole said that the status quo motion allows the DSB to better compete with other professional schools (recruiting and student preparedness for career).

Prof. Rajamma spoke in favor of the motion. She explained the preference she shares with DSB colleagues to encourage rather than force language study. She promoted student choice as a motivating factor for supporting the motion.

Prof. Johnson spoke against the motion. Without questioning the outcome, she noted that the previous vote was acrimonious. In Johnson’s opinion, due to the calendar the General Faculty did not have adequate time to consider this issue. She also disagreed with the focus on foreign language as the area of contention in the DSB Core. Johnson empathized with DSB concerns over balancing Core and program curricula, but she insisted that this issue is not solely a language issue. She urged colleagues to consider address the entire Core, rather than the language requirement in isolation.

Dean Gibson spoke in favor of the motion. He reminded the committee that the General Faculty voted on this issue. The status quo motion, according to Gibson, does not prevent DSB language study beyond the intermediate level. He argued that an “intentional” rather than “forced” language curriculum provides more flexibility for students, and that some students will still elect to study language beyond the introductory level.

Dean Perkus spoke in favor of the motion. He said that the previous process was complete and by the book. It was a long and deliberative process, and this reconsideration of the original process should not be used as an opportunity to change the Core.

Prof. Miners spoke in favor of the motion, recalling his knowledge of the institutional history at Fairfield. Despite what he characterized as his increasing support and appreciation of the Core, he is sensitive to the curricular needs of the professional schools. He said that we have established reductions in the language Core requirements for Engineering and the School of Nursing, so he supports the right of the DSB to pursue the same policy.

Prof. Williams spoke against the motion, and expressed support for Prof. Johnson’s previous comments. He argued that we do a disservice to the student who leaves Fairfield with only beginner level foreign language skills.

Prof. Godbole spoke in favor of the motion. She argued that two semesters may not give students proficiency, but that students will gain enough mastery to understand some nuances of what is happening in a conversation.
Prof. Johnson spoke against the motion. She disagreed with Prof. Godbole; Johnson explained that two semesters of language at any level will not allow the language program to serve DSB students in terms of what the language Core delivers (goals, objectives). She noted that neither “mastery” nor “exposure” are goals of the existing language Core curriculum.

Prof. Fernandez spoke against the motion. She said there is a large difference between studying two and four semesters of language. Fernandez would like specific details and data on the actual impact of Fairfield University language requirements on DSB recruitment; she also requested more details on the nature of language study at regional peer business schools.

Prof. Bradford responded to Prof. Fernandez. He said, “the numbers aren’t out there.” He noted that he previously referred to anecdotal evidence because there are no numbers on how many people opted out of Fairfield due to the language requirement.

Dean Gibson reiterated that from the DSB perspective, the status quo motion is about increasing flexibility, not reducing language requirements.

Prof. Rosivach reminded the committee that we do not need to rely on anecdotal evidence; we can get data.

Prof. Kris spoke in favor of the motion because she does not like the idea of redoing process that was completed last year.

Prof. Garvey spoke against the motion. She expressed her understanding of the DSB issue with the Core. She spoke in favor of the process the brought this motion to the UCC agenda. She advised against anecdotal debating, which, she says, may lead to unraveling the Core. Garvey stated that she found convincing the statements made by Professors Johnson and Williams.

Dean Crabtree spoke against the motion. She said the General Faculty sent this business back to the UCC with the desire for a common Core language requirement in the face of a progressively splintering Core. While appreciating the difficulty of the discussion, Crabtree noted that the status quo motion is unsatisfactory to a large number of faculty. She added that arguments about freeing students from taking courses that presently do not interest them is the wrong direction.

Prof. Bradford disagreed with Dean Crabtree and noted that a majority of colleagues at the Spring General Faculty meeting voted for the current status quo.

Prof. Rosivach CALLED THE QUESTION, seconded by Prof. Minors

Motion Passes (9-4-1).

The Chair distributed paper ballots to committee members, and he called the vote by secret ballot.

The “Status Quo” Motion Passes (8-6-1).
Excerpts of Minutes of Academic Council Discussions of Proposal

Academic Council Meeting Minutes (Excerpts)
Monday, February 4, 2013

Present: Professors: Mousumi Bhattacharya, Joe Dennin, David Downie, Bob Epstein (Executive Secretary), James He, Dennis Keenan (Chair), Ginny Kelly, Wendy Kohli, Phil Lane, John Lasseter, Elizabeth Petrino, Shawn Rafalski, Susan Rakowitz (General Faculty Secretary), Joyce Shea, Roxana Walker-Canton, Dave Winn. Student: Rob Vogel. Administrators: Deans Lynn Babington, Robbin Crabtree, Don Gibson, SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, S.J.

(b) Language Core Requirement:

Prof Ruffini said that he and the majority of the UCC believed that the motion of the General Faculty for the UCC to ‘draft a proposal for a core language requirement that will apply to all Fairfield undergraduates’ was ambiguous. Did this mean that there should be a universal core requirement for all undergraduates or four separate core requirements for the four undergraduate schools? He proposed four possible motions for the UCC none of which required a uniform core. He noted that the core requirement for the SOE was not written down anywhere. One proposed motion tried to find a compromise by giving the DSB a three semester option to fulfill the language requirement.

Prof Rakowitz explained that when Prof. Ruffini contacted her in October asking about the intent of the framers of the motion, she didn't answer because it was the faculty discussion not the framers' intention that mattered once the motion passed. She did, however, say that Prof. Ruffini could ask the AC for clarification on the General Faculty motion.

Prof Epstein reiterated this point and felt the motion meant a single requirement for all undergraduates. He asked if the faculty motion was returned to the UCC, would they try to create a uniform language requirement for all undergraduates.

Prof Ruffini responded that the UCC felt it had done its job, that the core language requirement was decided and that it was being asked to do something that had been done. If the UCC was asked to reconsider the issue, he saw two possible outcomes: (1) there was a high probability that the UCC would pass a motion saying it had completed its job on this issue or (2) the result would be a collapse of the UCC discussion because there were not enough votes to pass any different motion.

Prof Epstein said that the UCC can be required to put a motion on the table for one uniform core language requirement and to discuss it.

Prof He said that the UCC had answered the question put forth by the General Faculty and understood that the UCC had decided to leave four core requirements.

Prof Ruffini’s reading of the UCC was that he could not imagine there being enough votes to pass a uniform language requirement.

Dean Crabtree raised the issue of what would the AC do if the UCC designed a proposal which then did not pass.

Academic Council Meeting Minutes (Excerpts)
February 25, 2013
Reconvened from Monday, February 4, 2013

Present: Professors Mousumi Bhattacharya, Joe Dennin, David Downie, Bob Epstein (Executive Secretary), James He, Chris Huntley, Dennis Keenan (Chair), Ginny Kelly, Wendy Kohli, Phil
7 (b) Language Core Requirement:

Prof. Epstein reintroduced this item, noting that the UCC appeared uninterested in conducting additional work on this issue. Without prejudging or expressing support for any option, he outlined several possible options that could apply to all students and address the concerns raised by DSB (for example, completing the intermediate level of a language that a student has studied previously or one year of a language not previously studied) and that others could be developed as well. In his view, given the vote of the general faculty, it would be appropriate for the Academic Council to consider creating a sub-committee to examine the issue.

Prof. Keenan outlined the options before the Academic Council. These included entertaining motions: to accept the report and proposal submitted by the UCC; to create a sub-committee of the Academic Council to discuss the issue; or to proceed along another path.

**MOTION (Lane/Downie):** To accept the recommendation of the UCC and change the language in the JOR regarding Area V of the core curriculum as follows:

Area V: Modern and Classical Languages

1. 2 semesters (at least at the intermediate level) of any language listed among the offerings of the Modern Languages Department or the Greek and Roman Studies Program.

**Nursing Core Requirement:**

Nursing students must complete the core curriculum that is required of all Fairfield undergraduates with one exception. Nursing students enroll in either the two semesters of foreign language or the two semesters of fine arts.

**Dolan School of Business Core Requirement:**

For students in the Charles F. Dolan School of Business, Area V of the core requirements is two semesters of the same language at any level.

**College of Arts and Sciences Core Requirement:**

2 semesters (at least at the intermediate level) of any language listed among the offerings of the Modern Languages Department or the Greek and Roman Studies Program.

**Dolan School of Business Core Requirement:**

For students in the Charles F. Dolan School of Business, Area V of the core requirements is two semesters of the same language at any level.

**School of Nursing Core Requirement:**

Nursing students must complete the core curriculum that is required of all Fairfield undergraduates with one exception. Nursing students enroll in either the two semesters of foreign language or the two semesters of fine arts.

**School of Engineering:**

Students in the School of Engineering are exempt from the Area V core requirement.

Prof. Lane spoke in favor of the motion, stating that the issue had received sufficient attention to take a decision. He would prefer that all students follow the DSB requirement but could accept the UCC proposal as a compromise.
Dean Gibson spoke in favor of the motion, stating that the issue had been discussed in detail by UCC, a fully functioning and representative faculty body, on multiple occasions and that UCC had based its conclusions, and taken votes, following extensive deliberations and review of relevant data. He noted that several competitive Universities with common undergraduate core requirements had certain variations within their core language requirements. In his view the current system was working well, citing, as an example, the impact on applications and enrollments and an increase in the number of DSB students taking critical languages.

Joe Dennin spoke in opposition to the motion. If the University is to have an undergraduate core curriculum, then the core should be standard for all students. This did not imply support for a particular language requirement, only that it be common.

Dean Babington spoke in favor of the motion, endorsing points made by Dean Gibson.

Prof. Rakowitz spoke in opposition to the motion. The UCC had not examined the specific issue as instructed by the vote of the general faculty. In addition to supporting a common core, she opposed the proposal due to concerns about the impact on students who seek to transfer between schools.

Prof. He spoke in favor of motion, noting that the appropriate processes had been followed and that it was time to put off further consideration of the issue for a while.

Prof. Epstein spoke in opposition to the motion. The process has not followed the appropriate processes as the UCC had not responded to the specific instructions given by the vote of the general faculty to examine options to create a language requirement that would apply to all undergraduates. Since the UCC had not acted on the instructions given it by the general faculty, it was up to the AC, as a representative of the general faculty, to carry out these instructions. Doing so would follow the path set forth by a legitimate vote of the GF; while choosing not to examine the issue would be a violation of appropriate governance. In addition, the proposal was an attack on the core, which the University advertises as a key part of its educational strengths.

Prof. Shea spoke in favor of motion. As a strong supporter of the core, and a member of the faculty of the School of Nursing, which also supports the core, she believed that the relevant issues go beyond the discussion of the language requirement. Thus, the motion should be approved and plans made for a more comprehensive discussion. In addition, it was important for the language issue not to divide the faculty further, given the importance of maintaining a united faculty this year.

SVPAA Fitzgerald spoke in favor of motion. He noted that the UCC had held extensive and deep conversations about a situation involving competing goods and that many Universities, including Jesuit schools, have variable core requirements. Attention must also be paid to the impact of various requirements on both the competition for students and the reality of what the requirements produce. Most students taking 4 semesters of a language do not become bilingual. The relevant issues should continue to be discussed, particularly within College of Arts and Sciences, but approving this motion was appropriate at this time.

Prof. Huntley spoke in favor of motion, albeit reluctantly. He expressed support for both a common core and a requirement to reach sufficiency in a language other than English. However the issue had gone through UCC twice. In addition, a requirement that DSB students take 16 hours of a language vs. 18 hours of their major was not appropriate. Passing out of a foreign language requirement may also be inappropriate. Thus, the entire issue needed extensive discussion and study but at this point in time the proper decision was to approve the motion.

**MOTION PASSED: 11 in favor, 2 opposed, 0 abstentions**