ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, April 3, 2006
Canisius 209 at 3:30 PM

1. Presidential courtesy.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary.
   a. Approval of minutes of meeting of March 6, 2006 (attached)
   b. Correspondence
      i. Memo from AVP approving some and not approving one AC motion (attached)
   c. Oral Reports

4. Council Committee Reports.

5. Petitions for immediate hearing.

6. Old Business.
   a. Follow-up Report from the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees on their March 23 meeting with the Academic Affairs Subcommittee of the Board

   a. Three proposals from the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (attachments)
      i. Guidelines for UCC advisory committees reviewing courses
         [See attached pages 11,12 and attached UCC 12/6/05 minutes (item 4.c.i)]
      ii. Request form and template for (1) US Diversity course submissions and (2) World Diversity course submissions
         [See attached page 11, US Diversity materials, World Diversity materials, and attached UCC 12/6/05 minutes (item 4.c.ii) and attached UCC 3/7/06 minutes (item II.B.a)]
      iii. A change to the Social Science core requirement for Social Science majors
         [See attached page 11 and UCC minutes 12/6/05 (item 5) and 3/7/06 (item II.C.)]
   b. Program Proposal for Corporate Cohort Program in Organizational Communication leading to a Master of Arts in Communication [Materials sent separately; See also attached summary from EPC chair (p 22)]
   c. Proposal for a minor in Accounting Information Systems (attachments)
      [See attached proposal on pages 22-24, DSB 1/25/06 minutes (item 6.A), UCC 3/7/2006 minutes (item II.A), EPC 3/23/2006 minutes (item 4)]
   d. Five Year Review of Full-Time Engineering Program [Materials sent separately; See also attached EPC 2/16/2006 minutes (item 2) and attached summary from EPC chair on page 35]

8. Adjournment

ATTACHMENTS AND PENDING ITEMS ON BACK
Attachments
For item 3.a.: Draft minutes of the 3/6/2006 Academic Council meeting (p 3-8).
For item 3.b.i.: Memo from AVP dated 3/28/2006 (p 9-10)
For item 7.a.: Memo from UCC chair dated 3/22/2006 (p 11)
Guidelines for UCC Advisory Committees (p 12); US Diversity Form/Criteria/Template (separately stapled);
UCC minutes from 12/6/2005 (pages 13-17)
UCC minutes for 3/7/2006 (pages 18-21)
For item 7.b.: Summary of Discussion from EPC Chair (p 22)
For item 7.c.: Proposal for Accounting Information Systems Minor (pages 23-25)
DSB 1/25/2006 Faculty Meeting Minutes (26-28)
UCC Minutes 3/7/2006 (pages 18-21)
EPC Minutes 3/23/2006 (pages 29-31)
For item 7.d.: EPC Minutes 2/16/2006 (pages 32-34)
Summary of Discussion from EPC Chair (p 35)

Minutes and packets of previous Academic Council meetings are at: www.faculty.fairfield.edu/gfs/academiccouncil.htm

Items Pending
A. Recommendations in report in Spring 2002 from Faculty Athletic Committee concerning (i) amounts of time student-athletes are absent from classes for trips/athletic activities, (ii) demands placed on student athletes for year-round training, (iii) number of scheduled athletic events that conflict with the Universities final exam schedule, and (iv) amount of money spent on various athletic programs. (See agenda and attachments for 12/4/02 AC meeting, and item 6.b of 3/3/03 AC meeting.)

B. Issues raised at the 10/4/99 AC meeting concerning faculty participation on the finance/budget committee. (See minutes of AC meeting of 11/4/99; 10/29/99 letter from Phil Lane attached to 5/1/00 AC agenda; excerpt of GF minutes of 11/13/92 attached to AC 5/1/00 agenda; AC motion of 11/6/00.)

C. Quinquennial review of distribution of AC seats. (See GF minutes of 3/24/00; next review due spring 2005).

D. Report from Committee on Procedural Guidelines and Guiding Principles for Faculty Compensation. (Report scheduled for October 2003.)

E. Distance learning issues. (See item 7 of AC minutes of 5/5/03.)

Ongoing Items
1. Report by AVP to AC each semester to inform the council of any approved exceptions to the Athletic Department’s policy of not scheduling athletic events that conflict with final exams.

2. Implementation of AC recommendations concerning issues raised by AHANA students.

ACADEMIC COUNCIL MINUTES OF MEETING MARCH 6, 2006 CNS 209

Faculty Members: W. Abbott, J. Buss (Recording Secretary), R. DeWitt (Executive Secretary), F. Dohm (Chair), D. Gibson, D. Greenberg, I. Haug, J. He, D. Keenan, P. Lakeland, G. Lang, J. Lange, M. Ligas, I. Mulvey (Secretary of the General Faculty), S. Rakowitz, D. Sapp, K. Steffen.


The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m.

1. **Presidential Courtesy**

2. No items.

3. **Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty.**

4. Nothing to report.

5. **Report from the Executive Secretary**

   a. R. DeWitt moved to approve the minutes of February 6, 2006. Rakowitz seconds. Given no substantive changes and few typo corrections, a vote to approve was called. Vote on the

   **MOTION:** to approve the minutes. **MOTION PASSED 14-0-0.**

6. **Council Committee Reports.**

   There were none to be presented.

7. **Petition for Immediate Hearing.**

   Secretary Irene Mulvey distributed a handout and explained that the Executive Committee of the Academic Council requests a Petition for Immediate Hearing so that the Academic Council can direct the Committee on Conference with the Trustees to put on their agenda for their next meeting with the Academic Affairs Subcommittee of the Trustees (scheduled for March 23) the two motions passed by the General Faculty at their meeting on March 3rd.

   R. DeWitt (Executive Secretary) **made a**

   **MOTION:** to reorder the agenda and to put this Petition for Immediate Hearing as the second item under New Business.

   S. Rakowitz seconds the motion. Given no discussion on this motion it is voted upon.

   **Vote on the Motion: 14 – 0 – 0.** **MOTION PASSED.**
Old Business

a. Three faculty-approved items for the Journal of Record rejected by the Administration.

AVP O. Grossman stated that two of the items (Master of Science in Accounting and Master of Science in Taxation) had been rejected by the administration, because the description of them had contained provisions about the pay of adjuncts. The administration had found such conditions in the approval of new programs inappropriate for the Journal of Record. The issues surrounding these conditions have since been resolved. He noted that the Journal of Record is vague about the listing of new programs and the conditions that are stipulated about them. He referred to a Journal of Record entry from 4/25/1988 saying that only programs with conditions attached to their acceptance be included in the Journal of Record.

Since the issues that had caused the initial rejection by the administration have been resolved, R. DeWitt made the following

**MOTION.** “Issues surrounding the provision that adjuncts be paid in accordance with the Memo of Understanding have been resolved.”

This motion was seconded by P. Lakeland. O. Grossman stated that placing some provisions (conditions) on the acceptance of new programs are warranted in some cases but in others they are not. He views some of these conditions as akin to riders that are added to national legislation. This is not to say that conditions should never be included when approving new programs but in some instances they may be excessive. He mentioned several scenarios. G. Lang commented that in many cases the conditions are certainly warranted and usually they are not as bizarre as the AVP suggests. O. Grossman agreed.

D. Greenberg calls the question. D. Keenan seconds. The vote to call the question passes 15-0-0.

**MAIN MOTION PASSES 15-0-0.**

S. Rakowitz stated that the Journal of Record entry from 1988 that O. Grossman mentioned concerning new programs needed to be altered. She proposed the following motion:

**MOTION.** Amend the 4/25/1988 Journal of Record entry regarding the listing of new programs to say that “the approval of all new programs should be entered into the Journal of Record.”

Seconded by R. DeWitt. D. Greenberg asked if this motion is out of order given that it is not an agenda item. After a short discussion F Dohm rules that the motion can be considered and due to a lack of further discussion a vote on the motion occurs.

**MOTION PASSES 15-0-0.**

The third rejected item, concerning the “Guiding Principles for Faculty Compensation,” was not discussed.
7. **New Business**

a. **Interdisciplinary Minor in Catholic Studies.**

P. Lakeland explained how, over the past three years, this proposal has moved through the appropriate faculty committees and it has been approved by each of them. In this program students will have to take five courses. It follows a traditional Catholic Studies approach. It already has an advisory board in place. W. Abbott asks whether it would consider all varieties of Catholicism or just Roman Catholicism. Lakeland replied that the university does not use Roman on any of its documents so neither will this new program, even though its focus will be on Roman Catholicism.

**MOTION [Keenan/Rakowitz]. To accept the program for an Interdisciplinary Minor in Catholic Studies.**

**MOTION PASSES 15-0-0**

* **Petition for Immediate Hearing.**

The Council took up the Petition for Immediate Hearing concerning the two motions passed by the General Faculty at its meeting on March 3, 2006.

I. Mulvey quickly reviewed the two motions passed by the General Faculty. The executive committee of the Academic Council thought it was appropriate for the AC to discuss these two motions and decide what the next step should be. R. DeWitt makes the following motion:

**MOTION [DeWitt/Greenberg]. The Academic Council instructs the Committee on Conference with the Trustees to put on the agenda for the 3/23 meeting with the Academic Affairs Subcommittee of the Trustees the two motions passed at the General Faculty meeting on 3/3 and to include the Faculty Salary Committee at this meeting as appropriate.**

P. Lakeland, a member of the Committee on Conference with the Trustees says he believes this is important but will likely happen in any event.

**MOTION PASSES 15-0-0**

b. **Two Proposals from the Faculty Research Committee**

Proposal #1. Consistent language in the Guidelines for Summer Fellowships and Guidelines for Senior Summer Fellowships.

M. Wallace, Chair of the Faculty Research Committee, explained how there is an inconsistency in the Guidelines for Summer Research Stipends and Guidelines for Senior Summer Fellowships. The former disallows applicants for either summer contiguous to sabbatical leaves. The Senior Summer Fellowships do not have this stipulation. The Research Committee wants to change the wording of the Senior Summer Fellowships to make the two guidelines consistent. Thus they suggest the following wording in the Guidelines for Senior Summer Fellowships:

...
MOTION. Faculty members approved for sabbatical leave will not be eligible for (summer stipends) either summer contiguous to the academic year of the sabbatical leave.

I. Mulvey pointed out that there are some wording changes that are needed in the documents but the aim of the request is to achieve consistency in the two documents and this can be done. There was some confusion as to the summers that would be affected. For instance, what happens to an individual that has a two semester sabbatical leave spanning the spring and fall semesters of different academic years? (O. Grossman pointed out that these are very rare.) Are two summers affected by a one semester sabbatical leave or just the summer that is contiguous to the sabbatical leave?

MOTION PASSES 15-0-0.

Proposal #2: Handbook changes in Sabbatical Leave Policy.

The Faculty Research Committee suggests the following change in the Faculty Handbook (Ninth edition, 2002; page 29 II.B.2.a).

MOTION. [Keenan/DeWitt] Replace the first paragraph under a. Sabbatical leaves with the following: “Sabbatical leaves are reserved for tenured faculty members. Tenured faculty who have not been awarded a pre-tenure research leave are eligible for their first sabbatical after 10 semesters of active service at Fairfield University. Tenure faculty who have been awarded a pre-tenure leave are eligible for their first sabbatical after 10 semesters of active service at Fairfield University following their pre-tenure leave. Tenured faculty are eligible for any subsequent sabbatical after serving twelve semesters since their last sabbatical leave.

AVP O. Grossman pointed out that the phrase “at Fairfield University” is a key aspect of this proposal. Often people come to Fairfield and expect to count service at other institutions as part of the time needed to be accumulated to be eligible for a sabbatical leave. Also, the amount of time one needs to be at Fairfield before one is eligible for a pre-tenure leave is not specified and this is open to interpretation. G. Lang stated that the present Handbook revision does not address that issue. D. Sapp agreed. This proposal deals only with sabbatical leaves and not pre-tenure leaves.

MOTION PASSES 15-0-0.

Irene Mulvey suggests to M. Wallace that the Research Committee should look at the language concerning pre-tenure leaves and, if needed, make proposals for changes.

c. New wording proposed by the Rank and Tenure

MOTION. [Lang/Haug] Amend the language in the Rank and Tenure Guidelines timetable section 11 as follows: (new language is underlined).

11. By April 1
   The Committee recommendation for or against the appeal will be forwarded to the applicant. The Committee recommendations for all
applicants will be presented to the President. The Academic Vice President will make his/her recommendation to the President and provide the Committee with a copy.

The rational for the change is to bring the wording in the document into line with the current practice.

**MOTION PASSES: 15-0-0**

d. **FDEC proposal concerning the privacy of teaching evaluations.**

At its Feb 15, 2006 meeting the Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee passed the following motion, which they bring to the Academic council for consideration.

**MOTION.** [Greenberg/Buss] That the statistical and qualitative results of the student evaluations of individual faculty members’ teaching be sent directly to the individual faculty member without being viewed by anyone else, unless and until the individual faculty member chooses to make those results known.

Professor P. Behre made a brief presentation explaining how the FDEC is concerned about inappropriate use of student evaluation forms over the long-run. These evaluations are the property of the faculty and the use of these evaluations should be determined by the faculty. Admittedly what is needed is a more valid means of evaluating teaching effectiveness and the FDEC members are engaged in that process. They have attended conferences and surveyed other schools. It is important to realize that before a new form is developed the current forms should not be put to uses they were not intended for and that they be used at the discretion of the individual.

J.Lange asked how an individual can use the current evaluations to document continual improvement in teaching effectiveness. P. Behre responded that the current forms are used in a variety of ways; to aid the individual in their own development as a teacher, to provide evidence of teacher effectiveness to Rank and Tenure, to support one’s case for merit, to aid the university in its assessment efforts, and to re-hire adjuncts. Is the current form adequate for these uses? The current evaluation form is a student satisfaction survey not a teaching/learning assessment tool.

Professor Lakeland asked how the present motion would change things. Currently no individual is forced to submit their evaluations to anyone else. However, if you do not submit them, it is implicitly assumed that they are not very good. You can submit an alternative. There is a need to move to a new evaluation and to move administrators away from using the current form. D. Greenberg asked if anyone gets to see the evaluations without the faculty member’s permission. Apparently through the system developed by C. Naser, department members can see the evaluations of others in their department but without any names attached. D. Greenberg said that many faculty believe that when their evaluations are sent electronically to the Dean without explicit permission for others to use this data, this may not be what is happening. People just assume that when they have not given their permission when they send the evaluations electronically that these evaluations will not be used by persons other than the Dean.

O. Grossman expressed his pleasure that the FDEC is looking into developing a new evaluation instruments. Given the technological changes that are taking place, with the ease of transferring data, changes in practice must occur. One can hope that use of evaluations remains voluntary but
technological changes rule against this. There are two Journal of Record entries relating to teaching evaluations; one in 1981 and the other in 1985. The 1985 entry specifies that evaluations were to be done in every section of every course in every school.

I Mulvey also looked at the Journal of Record and archived minutes of General Faculty meetings. In 1981 when the evaluations were first introduced, there were two implicit assumptions. First, after the tallies were completed no data would be kept. Data was supposed to be destroyed. Second, according to minutes of the General Faculty, the implementation of the evaluations was fairly “loose” whereby faculty were expected to add or delete questions, as appropriate. Now it appears that the registrar “owns” the data and it can be used in many different ways.

W. Abbott noted that even though evaluations are to be given in every class this is not the practice. Consequently the scores are biased on the high side. K. Steffen commented that an inadequate instrument is being data mined without letting the faculty know how it is being mined. The faculty no longer controls its use. Does the motion create a moratorium on this practice? P. Behre replied that it should stop the automatic transfer of the data. Its use for merit is still going to occur. The motion will not stop that, but a faculty member will have to agree to submit the data.

G. Lang recalled the faculty vote back in 1981 and how contentious it was. There is no question that the evaluations were to be informative only. To be used by individual faculty to improve their teaching. Over time it became part of our culture. Dean Snyder does review the teaching evaluation forms. They are part of the merit system. Dean Snyder replied that the evaluations are needed to supplement evidence of effective teaching. We need to have consistency across departments. Also, for reaccreditation, documentation of teacher effectiveness is needed. If the current form is all we have, what else can be used? C. Naser has developed a system to analyze the data. Some of the features in his program are good. Other features are not so good. He is trying to show departments what can be done with the data that is available. Each department can work with him to help analyze the data in useful ways.

P. Lakeland agreed that we need data for accountability. But what we have is “creeping accountability.” At the start, the evaluations were for faculty use only. Today we have moved far from that point. However, the faculty was never asked collectively if we would approve of these other uses. While you do not have to submit your evaluations to the Rank and Tenure Committee, you still must provide evidence of effective teaching. If neither the teaching evaluations nor some alternative to them is sent to Rank and Tenure, then evidence of teaching effectiveness has not been substantiated so the candidate is not likely to get promoted.

K. Steffen raises issues about use of the data. K. Nasser’s approach is “here are some uses that can be made with the numbers.” Instead, the faculty should decide collectively what it wants from the data. The faculty has lost control on how the data should be used. The question was put to a vote and the

**MOTION PASSES: 14-0-1.**

**MOTION [Greenberg/Abbott] to adjourn.**

**MOTION PASSES: 11-1.**

Respectfully Submitted
J. Buss
Acting Secretary
Date: March 28, 2006
To: Rick DeWitt, Faith-Anne Dohm, Irene Mulvey
From: Orin L. Grossman
Re: Academic Council motions

Thank you for forwarding on March 26th the motions passed by the Academic Council on March 6, 2006. In keeping with policy in the Journal of Record, I am responding on behalf of the administration.

Motion:
Issues surrounding the provision that adjuncts be paid in accordance with the Memo of Understanding have been resolved.
   This motion is approved for inclusion in the Journal of Record

Motion:
Amend the 4/25/1988 Journal of Record entry regarding the listing of new programs to say that “the approval of all new programs should be entered into the Journal of Record.”
   This motion is approved for inclusion in the Journal of Record

Motion:
To accept the program for an Interdisciplinary Minor in Catholic Studies.
   This motion is approved for inclusion in the Journal of Record

Motion:
Faculty members approved for sabbatical leave will not be eligible for (summer stipends) either summer contiguous to the academic year of the sabbatical leave.
   This motion is approved for inclusion in the Journal of Record

Motion:
Amend the language in the Rank and Tenure Guidelines timetable section 11 as follows: (new language is underlined).
   11. By April 1
      The Committee recommendation for or against the appeal will be forwarded to the applicant. The Committee recommendations for all applicants will be presented to the President. The Academic Vice President will make his/her recommendation to the President and provide the Committee with a copy.
   This motion is approved for inclusion in the Journal of Record

Motion:
That the statistical and qualitative results of the student evaluations of individual faculty members’ teaching be sent directly to the individual faculty member without being viewed by anyone else, unless and until the individual faculty member chooses to make those results known.
   This motion is not approved for inclusion in the Journal of Record. In an era of increased public and internal scrutiny of assessment tools for a wide variety of purposes, including accreditation, Rank and Tenure, and merit reviews, it is increasingly important that the university is able to state to various internal and external stakeholders that we do
in fact review and assess appropriate information. This is not the time to add language to
the Journal of Record that would seem to isolate the faculty from appropriate collegial
and decanal review.

Much has been made of the inadequacy of the present evaluative tool. I agree
with that assessment and as long ago as January, 2001, I recommended that, as merit was
coming, it would be wise to review the tools used in making judgments. The way to deal
with an inadequate tool is to change it and I encourage the faculty to review the number
of commercially available tools. In the meantime, we must use what we have as wisely
as possible and this language would not be a helpful addition to the Journal of Record.
To the Academic Council:

I am writing as Chair of the UCC to request the Council’s approval of items reviewed and approved by the UCC at its past three meetings. I include the motions passed by the UCC, and also the minutes of the meetings.

1) The UCC approved a procedure for advisory committees to follow in review of courses submitted for review (e.g., to the two Diversity subcommittees and to the Core Science Review Committee). Having a clearly outlined procedure for such bodies and the UCC to follow would greatly facilitate this process. See minutes of the December 2005 meeting, and the attached file.

I am asking that the Academic Council move to approve the guidelines and that this document be included in the Journal of Record.

2) The UCC approved a request form and template for course submissions to the US Diversity subcommittee (December 2005 minutes) and a form + template for course submission to the World Diversity subcommittee (March 2006 minutes). See the attached files for these materials. In the past, there has been no standard form and no clear description of how these committees evaluate a course and make their recommendation to the UCC. Having the process clearly spelled out for both faculty submitting courses and committee members reviewing those courses would greatly improve this review process.

I am asking the Academic Council to move to approve the request form and template for each of the Diversity subcommittees and to have these materials included in the Journal of Record.

3) The UCC approved a motion to no longer require students with a major in the social sciences (whether a single major or double major that includes the social sciences) to take two social science core courses outside of the major. See minutes from December 2005 and March 2006. Rationale: this issue came to us from the Deans’ offices in both A&S and the DSOB, most specifically for students with a double major that includes at least one social science. I polled the chairs of the departments involved, and the majority felt that this requirement is not one that they support, even for students with a single major in a social science.

I am asking the Academic Council to approve a motion as follows: to eliminate the restriction that majors in the social sciences may not use courses in the department in which they are majoring to fulfill the social science requirement in the core.

The effect of this motion would be to remove the “Note” after the description of the social science requirement in the core in the Journal of Record and in the Catalog.

This change does not prevent the individual social sciences departments from requiring their majors to take a second social science if they feel it would be to their advantage.

Thank you for your attention to these matters, and best wishes,

Johanna X. K. Garvey
Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, 2005-06
Guidelines for UCC Advisory Committees

1. The UCC is grateful to advisory subcommittees like the Core Science Review Committee and the two advisory subcommittees on diversity courses for analyzing courses and seeing if they meet the criteria for core requirements. The subcommittees provide more specialized expertise and can devote more attention to evaluating courses than the full UCC can do.

2. The UCC has traditionally deferred to the expertise of these subcommittees when evaluating their recommendations. But in order to fulfill its oversight role, the UCC needs enough information to be able to see if it agrees with a subcommittee’s recommendation.

3. Therefore, in any recommendations forwarded to the UCC, we ask that the subcommittees provide minutes of their meetings that include:

   a. Information on when it met and who attended.

   b. The title, catalog number and catalog description of any course under consideration.

   c. The committee’s recommendation on whether the course meets the specifications for core credit.

   d. Enough of a discussion of the course so that the UCC understands the basis for the recommendation. Please frame such a discussion around your rules and your specifications that a course has to meet.

4. If a subcommittee recommends approval of a course for core credit, the subcommittee will inform the UCC of its action and supply the material listed above in 3a-d.

5. If a subcommittee recommends rejection, it will notify the UCC of its decision. It also will directly notify the applicant, detail its rationale (by supplying the material listed above in 3a-d), and inform the applicant of three available options:

   a) revise the application and resubmit; or
   b) drop the effort to gain core approval; or
   c) appeal the negative recommendation to the full UCC. Any appeal must include the material listed in 3a-d (above) and respond to any shortcomings listed by the subcommittee.

What the UCC does not want is a simple statement that the advisory committee recommends approval of a course. That doesn’t allow us to perform our oversight role.

The UCC appreciates the work of these subcommittees and does not want to substitute its judgment for that of the subcommittee. It needs the information outlined above to perform its Handbook oversight role.
Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
minutes of the meeting of December 6, 2005

Attending: Professors Bayne, Brill, Cavanaugh, Dew, Davidson, Escobar, Garvey, Harriott, He, Rosivach, Salafia, Sergent, Shea, Simon; Academic Vice President Grossman, Deans Quell, Snyder; Ms. Fitzgerald. Prof. Borycka was present for item 3 below.

1. Minutes:

The minutes of the meeting of November 1, 2005 were approved unanimously as circulated.

2. Announcement:

Prof. Garvey, the chair, announced that Prof. Shea had been chosen by the Committee on Committees to replace Prof. Epstein for the remainder of her term on the UCC, until 2007.

3. Library Review of New Programs:

Prof. Garvey invited Prof. Boryczka, chair of the Library Committee, to address the UCC. Prof. Boryczka conveyed a proposal from the Library Committee that the membership of the UCC be expanded to include “One member from the library’s professional staff shall serve as an ex officio member on issues related to the procurement and allocation of library resources.” Prof. Borycka explained that the proposed new member could provide input in the area of library resources when the UCC considered new programs that would require such resources; and that the proposal was in line with a recommendation of the Connecticut Board of Governors for Higher Education that members of the library professional staff be members of committees dealing with institutional planning.

Prof. Escobar asked if the intent was to have the new member attend every meeting of the UCC. Prof. Boryczka replied that the member would attend when the subject was pertinent. Prof. Simon pointed out that like all committee members, ex officio ones are expected to attend every meeting, and wondered if it might be easier simply to invite someone from the library staff when appropriate.

Prof. Rosivach said that input from the library would be more appropriate when new programs are considered by the Educational Planning Committee, which is concerned with issues of resource allocation; it would also allow library input in the case of graduate programs, which would not come before the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. Rather than a Handbook amendment, he suggested that the Routing Procedures in the Journal of Record be revised to add review of new programs by the Library Committee. Prof. Boryczka agreed that this would be more effective, as did Prof. Salafia, who felt that a formal requirement like this was better than simply inviting guests, since such informal arrangements are too easily forgotten. Answering a question from Prof. Davidson, Prof. Rosivach said that the Library Committee should recommend the change in Routing Procedures to the Academic Council.
4. Diversity Courses:

As it began reviewing the first of the recommendations from the diversity subcommittees the UCC spent some time laying out the ground rules for its discussion. Prof. Garvey read from earlier UCC minutes a description of the information the UCC requested from its subcommittees. Prof. He, last year’s chair of the UCC, explained that there had been considerable confusion over the subcommittees’ work, and that the UCC moved last year to get some uniformity of procedure in place; the present recommendations were the first under these procedures, and they will give us a chance to see what needs to be changed. It was agreed that the UCC would use last year’s guidelines in reviewing the recommendations before it, and would then consider changes in those guidelines.

4a. US Diversity Courses:

NS 250: Dean Quell said that the course was intended for registered nurses who are transferring into the Bachelor of Nursing program; these are adult learners with scheduling problems, and designating this course is intended to accommodate their schedules to the University’s core requirements. Prof. Dew noted that the diverse population served by the students will contribute to the goal of diversity education. At several points during the discussion members observed that the materials provided them under current guidelines were inadequate, but the consensus was to accept the subcommittee’s recommendation, on the assumption that the subcommittee had done its work. The vote to accept the subcommittee’s recommendation for approval was unanimous.

GM 252: Prof. He observed that by last year’s guidelines there was no need to discuss this course since it had not been recommended by the subcommittee. When Prof. Davidson noted that the minutes of that meeting seem to suggest that there would also be votes on courses not recommended by the subcommittees Prof. Simon, to simplify things, moved to accept the subcommittee’s negative recommendation, noting that the subcommittee’s minutes in this case were a good model spelling out how the course did not meet the diversity criteria. The vote to accept the subcommittee’s negative recommendation was unanimous.

AE 397: Prof. Simon noted that we would again have to trust the judgment of the subcommittee since we had not asked them for more detailed information. Prof. Escobar noted that it was possible that the subject matter of the course could change with the interests of the professor. Prof. Rosivach moved that the approval be amended to apply only to the current course content, and that if the content changed the course needed to be resubmitted. When asked how this would be policed Prof. Rosivach noted that this was a possible eventuality with any course that evolves over time or changes its professor, but he expressed his belief that people are honorable, and that if this or any course changes its content it would no longer be offered for the diversity requirement. The subcommittee’s recommendation for approval was unanimously accepted as amended.

CO 329: Prof. Davidson noted that the materials supporting this recommendation met our expanded expectations. The subcommittee’s recommendation for approval was unanimously accepted.
4b. World Diversity Courses:

Prof. Garvey told the UCC that the World Diversity subcommittee had met in October to consider courses, chaired by the subcommittee’s former chair, Prof. A. Katz; Prof. Katz had not sent anything from that meeting on to the UCC, and without the subcommittee’s recommendations the UCC could not proceed; Prof. Davidson agreed. The UCC then considered the recommendations from the subcommittee’s November meeting chaired by its current chair, Prof. Lange.

_AE/EV 275:_ The UCC, relying on the subcommittee’s recommendation, voted unanimously that this course could be used for the World Diversity requirement.

_AE 276:_ Dean Snyder observed that there was a danger that the diversity requirements would be marginalized if they were turned over to adjuncts to handle, something that might not be noticed as we handled the courses one by one, but which should be considered in terms of overall impact. Prof. Cavanaugh noted that this was the fourth time this course had been submitted for World Diversity credit and asked rhetorically what was going on. Prof. Simon said that the subcommittee’s minutes clearly show that the subcommittee did its work in relation to this course. The UCC voted unanimously to accept the subcommittee’s negative recommendation, that this course not be used for World Diversity credit.

4c. Guidelines for the Future:

i. Prof. Simon suggested to the UCC that a set of guidelines which his subcommittee (with Profs. Sergent and Steffen, and Ms. Fitzgerald) had prepared on the content of recommendations from the Science Core subcommittee might be a useful as a template for reports from the two diversity subcommittees as well. Prof. Davidson said that these recommendations were just what we wanted, and moved that they be adopted for all three subcommittees.

In discussing the motion, Prof. Simon asked whether, when a subcommittee recommends rejection, that that decision should go back to the applicant or to the UCC. Prof. Garvey felt that the chair if the subcommittee would do a better job explaining where the problems lay. Prof. Davidson felt that both positive and negative recommendations should come to the UCC. Ms. Fitzgerald asked if subcommittees had been overruled in the past, and Prof. Garvey said that they had. Prof. Rosivach suggested that subcommittees return negative decisions to the proposers for changes or for appeal to the UCC; felt that even in these cases the negative recommendation should also come to the UCC, to alert the UCC. AVP Grossman noted that Prof. Rosivach’s suggestion allowed the applicant to modify a proposal before it was formally rejected.

Prof. Simon incorporated these various recommendations in his draft, which now read:

4. The UCC is grateful to advisory subcommittees like the Core Science Review Committee and the two advisory subcommittees on diversity courses for analyzing courses and seeing if they meet the criteria for core requirements. The subcommittees provide more specialized expertise and can devote more attention to evaluating courses than the full UCC can do.

5. The UCC has traditionally deferred to the expertise of these subcommittees when evaluating their recommendations. But in order to fulfill its oversight
role, the UCC needs enough information to be able to see if it agrees with a subcommittee’s recommendation.

6. Therefore, in any recommendations forwarded to the UCC, we ask that the subcommittees provide minutes of their meetings that include:

   e. Information on when it met and who attended.

   f. The title, catalog number and catalog description of any course under consideration.

   g. The committee’s recommendation on whether the course meets the specifications for core credit.

   h. Enough of a discussion of the course so that the UCC understands the basis for the recommendation. Please frame such a discussion around your rules and your specifications that a course has to meet.

4. If a subcommittee recommends approval of a course for core credit, the subcommittee will inform the UCC of its action and supply the material listed above in 3a-d.

5. If a subcommittee recommends rejection, it will notify the UCC of its decision. It also will directly notify the applicant, detail its rationale (by supplying the material listed above in 3a-d), and inform the applicant of three available options:

   a) revise the application and resubmit

   b) drop the effort to gain core approval

   c) appeal the negative recommendation to the full UCC. Any appeal must include the material listed in 3a-d (above) and respond to any shortcomings listed by the subcommittee.

   What the UCC does not want is a simple statement that the advisory committee recommends approval of a course. That doesn’t allow us to perform our oversight role.

   The UCC appreciates the work of these subcommittees and does not want to substitute its judgment for that of the subcommittee. It needs the information outlined above to perform its Handbook oversight role.

Prof. Davidson’s motion to accept Prof. Simon’s draft was approved unanimously. Prof. Rosivach moved that the UCC recommend these procedures to the Academic Council for inclusion in the Journal of Record; this motion was also unanimously accepted.

ii. Prof. Garvey distributed to the UCC copies of a template prepared by the US Diversity subcommittee for the review of courses submitted for the US Diversity requirement. Prof. Escobar moved to approve the template, and to recommend to the World Diversity subcommittee that it adopt a similar template. Prof. Davidson said that the school’s curriculum committee should be included on the cover sheet. Prof. Simon asked if consideration for the diversity requirement could take place at the same time
that the course was being reviewed by the school curriculum committee. Prof. Sergent noted that the flowchart would have to be adjusted to take into account the guidelines just approved by the UCC (item 4c.1 above). Prof. Davidson said that the template should make it clear that the UCC makes the final decision on whether a course can be used for either diversity requirement; Prof. Escobar added that this was important since the Registrar received this information from the chair of the UCC. The motion to approve the template, with the changes indicated, and to recommend its use to the World Diversity subcommittee was unanimously approved.

Prof. Davidson added that the UCC needs a list of criteria from the World Diversity subcommittee comparable to that which we now have from the US Diversity subcommittee.

5. The Social Science Core Requirement for Social Science Majors Continued:

Prof. Garvey summarized the e-mails she had received from the chairs of the several Social Science departments on this issue; there was overwhelming sentiment that the requirement be changed. Prof. Salafia expressed his personal view that the rationale for the requirement of a second social science for social science majors had long since fallen by the wayside, and that the requirement should be dropped. In view of the lateness of the hour Prof. Rosivach moved to table this item. Prof. Salafia asked what would happen then; Prof. Rosivach replied that the UCC would discuss the matter at a later meeting, at which time someone would make a motion upon which the UCC would vote. The vote to table discussion was unanimous. The UCC then voted to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

Vincent J. Rosivach
secretary pro tem
Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Meeting – Draft Minutes
CNS 100, 3/7/06

Present: Steve Bayne, Mousumi Bhattacharya, Sara Brill, Mike Cavanaugh, Ron Davidson, Ed Dew, Jesús Escobar, Johanna Garvey (Chair), Olivia Harriott, James He, Aaron Perkus, Terry Quell, Ron Salafia, Joyce Shea, Jim Simon, Vin Rosivach,

The meeting began at 3:34 PM

I. Approval of minutes for February 7, 2006
Vin Rosivach moved to approve the minutes; Ron Salafia seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Johanna Garvey announced that there will be a Brown bag lunch on Wed. 3/22 at noon in room 322 in Nyselius-DiMenna library on the diversity courses. Discussion of the process for preparing & submitting a diversity course.

II. New Business
A. Proposal for a new minor in Accounting Information Systems, Bruce Bradford presenting (attachments)
Bruce Bradford gave a brief presentation of the AIS Minor proposal. He stated that accounting has been taught using old manual “legacy” system. He said that all information is stored in databases and that students don’t have enough knowledge of databases. He stated that IS/OM has open space in their system; the minor will put emphasis on database systems and will allow students to develop a specialization within accounting.

Vin Rosivach inquired about double counting of courses in the minor. Bradford responded that A11 and IS 100 are business courses, IS 240 is for IS majors AC 203 is required for accounting majors, IS 260 is an elective for IS students that can’t be counted towards the major, and AC 365 is an elective for accounting majors Bradford stated that for the accounting major, AC 11 and 12 and six specific courses are required.

Ron Salafia asked Bradford if he was comfortable with the removal of AC12 and addition of IS100 and Bradford responded yes.

*Vin Rosivach moved to approve the new minor and James He seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

B. World Diversity (WD) Subcommittee
a) Approval of the Template for World Diversity Course Submissions (attached)
The UCC reviewed the template, schematic and the request form for WDCS. Johanna Garvey noted that the committee would like something firm in place before the last Friday of September for spring designation and the last Friday in January for summer/fall designation.

Steve Bayne noted absence of 3a-d. on the template. Garvey stated that the World Diversity committee was referring to the requirements that UCC developed. Garvey suggested that it be revised to include minutes of the UCC meeting.

Referring to the template, Ed Dew questioned why Native American meets the world diversity requirement. Ron Davidson responded that they represent transplanted East Asian (nonwestern) culture.

Johanna Garvey questioned the word “will” meet this diversity requirement on the World Diversity Criteria column (see template). She said it sounds inclusive of all courses (e.g. Russian literature courses). She suggested the word be changed to “can” meet. Ron Davidson suggested that the WD Committee handle this matter.

* Vin Rosivach moved to change the language on the template from “will” to “can.”

* The motion was seconded by Joyce Shea.

Aaron Perkus asked if comparative courses count as world diversity courses. Ron Davidson argued that world diversity courses should be predominantly nonwestern.

Rosivach added that comparative courses might work if they fit within these parameters.

Mousumi Bhattacharya explained that WD courses should have immersion experiences. She added that a music course was rejected because it had world and American music but wasn’t reflective enough.

Aaron Perkus asked about the status of courses that were approved and then taught by a different individual. Mousumi Bhattacharya stated that the World Diversity Committee conducted a review on the issue last year and asked if courses with the WD designation are still being taught and still maintain the WD requirements. Vin Rosivach said that it is assumed that we are honorable people and would withdraw the course.

Joyce Shea asked if a statement could be included that states that the WD designation for a course will hold so long as the syllabus and course objectives don’t change.

Aaron Perkus stated that courses have learning outcomes. He added that he didn’t understand why the UCC doesn’t mandate that learning outcomes be consistent throughout the sections of a course.

* Vin Rosivach moved to accept the pages (template, schematic and request form) as amended; Sara Brill seconded. The motion passed unanimously.
b.) Review of courses recommended by World Diversity Subcommittee (minutes attached)

a. Global Business Policy (AE 276). Joanna Garvey stated that the correct title of the course is “Ethical dimensions of global business policy.”
* Jesús Escobar moved to accept the course as a WD course; Jim Simon seconded. The motion passed unanimously. Vin Rosivach reminded the committee that the course goes into effect in the Fall 2006 and not 2007.

b. Arab-Israeli Conflict (HI 371) Johanna Garvey informed the UCC that the course is currently being offered and two seniors are enrolled in the course to fulfill the WD requirement for graduation. Vin Rosivach suggested that the two seniors in the course get WD credit; the other students cannot use it for WD credit. Mousumi Bhattacharya reported that assessment, not content, was the issue. Ron Salafia suggested that the UCC exclude concern for the student and focus on the course because the Dean can override the requirement. Mousumi Bhattacharya said that not all assessment concerns were addressed, but the course was given approval with a rider. She said that the original version was rejected because of lack of clarification on how learning outcomes would be achieved. Jim Simon and Ed Dew both suggested the committee invite the instructor to write to the committee and explain how the course meets the concerns and give the decision to the WD committee. Aaron Perkus said that learning outcomes were missing from the syllabus and that it would be a poor practice to approve a syllabus without learning outcomes.

Vin Rosivach reminded the committee that the WD template was approved today and thus was not available to the instructor. Rosivach also recommended that the UCC not approve the course. He also noted that there is no final exam in the course, which is required. Ron Salafia expressed his discomfort with a mid-semester approval and recommended that the committee not approve the course.

Ron Davidson stated that the course perspective is nonwestern, but content on culture is missing. Mousumi Bhattacharya stated that the World Diversity Committee considered Israel to be geographically nonwestern. Davidson pointed out that the qualification of HI 371 as world diversity is dubious, given its emphasis on Isreal, which is a European immigrant culture, largely predicated on European lines. The course syllabus gives little indication that Palestinian culture is given adequate coverage, rather it reflects a focus on Isreali politics and policies.

Terry Quell said that it is difficult for a Dean to accept a course as WD for a couple of students and not others.
* Mousumi Bhattacharya moved that the UCC accept the course for next semester with a rider that the instructor modify the course as suggested by the World Diversity Committee. Jim Simon seconded. Vote: Y: 4, N: 6, A: 4; the motion was defeated.

Vin Rosivach added that the course is a political history course and doesn’t meet the criteria to be considered a WD course. Jim Simon said that societal perspectives were present and that the UCC should follow through with the recommendation by the WD committee. Sara Brill inquired about the role of the UCC in the approval of WD courses. Ron Davidson stated that this is one of those “gray” instances where the UCC would get involved in the approval process.

* Vin Rosivach moved that the committee invite Prof. Coury to resubmit the course using the new guidelines approved at this meeting and provide Prof. Coury with feedback on his submission from this meeting. The motion was seconed by Ed Dew and passed unanimously.

C.) Social Science Core for Social Science Majors

Ron Salafia reported that the psychology department is split on the social science core issue.

* Vin Rosivach motioned to eliminate the restriction that majors in the social sciences may not use courses in the department in which they are majoring to fulfill the social science requirement in the core. He said the effect of this motion would be to remove the _Note_ after description of the social science requirement in the core in the _Journal of Record_ and in the _Catalogue_, p. 30.

Note: This change does not prevent individual social sciences departments from requiring their students to take a second social science if they feel it would be to their advantage.

The motion was seconded by Ron Davidson. The motion passed: 16 yes, 1 abstention.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:07 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Olivia Harriott
SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION
From Chair or EPC
For AC meeting 4/3/2006

Cohort Program – Master of Arts in Communication

This program was presented by Dr. Robbin Crabtree. Her presentation is summarized in the minutes.

The post – presentation discussion concentrated on these points:

• The program has been run as a pilot program for two years and is well – established.
• The program is viable for the foreseeable future.
• The number of contact hours

The primary discussion by the EPC concerned the number of contact hours as described on page 21 of the proposal. The EPC felt that this point was not clearly explained and approved the proposal unanimously with the caveat that more detail on how the number of contact hours was attained needed to be provided.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 17, 2006
TO: Educational Planning Committee
RE: Proposal for a new Accounting Information Systems Minor
FROM: Bruce Bradford for the Accounting Department

Description, overview and summary:
The Accounting Department proposes a new minor in Accounting Information Systems (AIS) after consulting with the IS/OM Department. This new 18-credit minor will consist of the following six courses:

AC 11 Introduction to Financial Accounting
IS 100 Introduction to Information Systems
AC 203 Intermediate Accounting I
AC 365 Accounting Information Systems
IS 240 Systems Analysis and Logical Design
IS 260 Database Systems.

Following the precedent of the Accounting minor, the Accounting Information Systems minor will allow Accounting majors to double count AC 203 for their major and this minor. The Information Systems majors will be allowed to double count IS 240 for their major and this minor.

Need and opportunity:
The use of computers to record and process accounting data has become standard practice. Recognizing the need for accounting majors to develop a deeper understanding of computer use in business, several schools in our region have developed programs to fill this need. Boston College offers an AIS track within it Accounting Major. Bryant University offers an AIS undergraduate major. Bentley College has developed both AIS undergraduate major and Masters of Science programs.

Rationale:
The Accounting Information Systems minor will provide both Accounting and Information Systems majors with information that will enhance their professional knowledge and skills. Accounting majors will learn about the impact of technology on their chosen profession including how information is currently being recorded and processed by database application programs such as real-world accounting software systems. They will be introduced to the emerging use of the Internet for financial reporting, design of decision support systems and the principles of database management.

Information systems majors will learn about business activities associated with transaction cycles, regulation of the financial reporting process, and the internal control of accounting information. Special consideration will be given to Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 and the increased requirement for documentation of internal controls under section 404 of that Act.
For Accounting majors to fully participate in this minor, it is important for them to have the background provided by IS 240. Likewise, the Information Systems majors would benefit from AC 203. However, IS 240 and AC 203 are requirements of the Information Systems major and Accounting major, respectively. This proposal follows precedent by allowing Information Systems majors to double count IS 240 and the Accounting majors to double count AC 203 for their majors and this minor. This precedent was established for Finance majors with an Accounting minor. AC 203 was, at that time, required for the Finance major and the Accounting minor. Finance majors were allowed to double count AC 203 for their major and minor.

**Objectives:**
There are two objectives for the proposed minor. First, Accounting majors are provided with extensive knowledge of the accounting information system and principles of database management used to design and maintain that system. Second, the Information Systems majors are provided with knowledge of the special needs of accounting data. The Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 and the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 require that adequate internal controls over accounting data be designed into the accounting information system to provide assurance of the accuracy and reliability of the data.

**Impact:**
The proposed minor will complement the Accounting major and the Information Systems major. It is assumed that some Accounting majors will migrate from an Information Systems minor to the AIS minor and some Information Systems majors will migrate from the Accounting minor. This will occur only if the new minor more closely fits their interest than the current minor. Both the Accounting Department and IS/OM Department are aware that this migration may occur and have no reservations about this outcome.

**Program detail:**
The proposed minor consists of six 3-credit courses in accounting and information systems. Both AC 11 and IS 100 are part of the business core. AC 11 provides students with an introduction to generally accepted accounting principles and the financial reporting process. IS 100 provides students with a description of the management information system and introduces Microsoft Access as an example of a database management system.

AC 203 expands on AC 11 and discusses the procedures allowed by regulation for recording a variety of accounting transactions and valuation issues associated with preparation of the financial statements. AC 365 focuses on developing a behavioral model that describes accounting transactions in terms of cycles of related activity, authorizations required, and control of information and resources involved. The central theme of this course is the documentation of internal controls required by Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 under section 404. Due to time constraints, critical topics such as database management, enterprise resource planning, and e-commerce can only be superficially covered. Approximately one week is spent on each of those three topics.

IS 240 and IS 260 are a pair of related courses that build on issues introduced to Accounting majors in AC 365. IS 240 provides students with the principles and experience of analyzing real business needs and designing an information system to meet those needs. IS 260 builds on IS 240 by designing and building a modern database management system.
These six course work together to provide the students with a cohesive body of knowledge that represents a specialty area within the Accounting discipline. This minor, in conjunction with their major, should provide students with an excellent foundation for a business career or for further academic work.

**Administrative structure and governance:**
The proposed minor will be administered by the Department of Accounting through its Chairperson. All decisions about course requirements and changes will be made only with the agreement of the IS/OM Department. Any count of AIS minors for administrative purposes should be attributed equally to the Accounting and IS/OM Departments.

**Resources:**
All courses are currently being offered by Fairfield University. No additional courses or sections of courses should be required for the proposed minor.

**Projections for the future:**
The proposed minor should remain a minor for the foreseeable future. This program will help the students follow their interest and prepare for successful careers in business. I envision this minor as remaining rather a small program. However, it is a program that allows us to offer potential students options similar to other universities in the northeast at no additional cost.

If the students wish to go further with their education, Bentley College and the University of Albany offer Masters of Science degree programs in Accounting Information Systems. Excellent doctoral programs in Management Information Systems are available at Michigan State University, Arizona State University, and many other fine universities. The proposed minor would provide an excellent foundation for future academic work.
1. Dean’s Report

Dean Solomon welcomed the faculty back for the start of the spring semester. He announced that Dick Tyler underwent heart by-pass surgery; Michael Tucker is on medical leave awaiting a liver transplant; and Gerry Cavallo is also on medical leave for heart surgery. He asked that we keep them in our thoughts and prayers.

The DSB Advisory Council has been revised and revitalized. The Advisory Council formed sub-committees for Corporate Partnership, Development, and Academic and Global Programs. The Academic and Global Programs Committee is chaired by Kevin Piccoli, Executive Vice President Bank of New York. The Committee had a conference call with the Chairs on December 14th. As a result of the conference call, the Committee developed three initiatives that they would like to move forward on. The Corporate Relations Committee, chaired by Ernie Pittareli, CEO of Sailfish Capital, will have a conference call with the Chairs on February 2nd. They are looking to work with DSB Chairs and faculty on ways to enhance our endowment.

Dean Solomon reported that we are looking for future speakers for the Dolan Lecture Series and asked faculty to submit any suggestions to him.

Cendant Mobility will be offering our full MBA program on-site at CENDANT. The program will be the same as we offer on campus but will be a five year program. Dana Wilkie and Art McAdams have been visiting CENDANT to speak with prospective students. The program has been approved by the State of Connecticut.

University Governance Issues – There have been concerns regarding the amount of input faculty have in decision making. Dean Solomon feels that the School needs to have a greater profile and asked that it be discussed in the departmental meetings.

EIDOS Assessment Implementation – Dean Solomon gave an overview of the EIDOS Assessment Implementation and asked that syllabi and student assignments be uploaded on to the EIDOS System. Any faculty needing assistance should contact Curt Naser. Dean Solomon stated that concerns regarding confidentiality have arisen. He explained that the only use for this data is for the sole use of program assessment and not individual assessment. The issue will be discussed in the Assessment and Continuous Improvement Committee.
Professor Cheryl Tromley raised a question regarding student privacy especially on the graduate level. Dean Solomon answered that the matter came up and will be discussed in the Assessment and Continuous Improvement Committee and gave his own assurance that student privacy would be respected.

2. The November 4, 2005 meeting notes were reviewed and a motion to accept was made by Professor Milo Peck and seconded by Professor Arjun Chaudhuri. The motion was carried.

3. General Faculty Announcements
None

4. Question Period – Questions by One Faculty Member of Another or of the Dean.
None

5. Previous Business – None

6. New Business
A. Approval of Accounting Information Systems Minor – Professor Bradford, seconded by Professor Kravet made a motion to approve a new minor in Accounting Information Systems. (attached)

Professor Lucy Katz asked if this minor would be open for non-business students. Professor Bradford said that it is open for anyone but targeted to Accounting and Information Systems majors. He gave an explanation for the rationale for the minor.

Professor Katz asked why the six courses did not include core IS courses and was concerned about the inconsistency. Professor Bradford explained the students would still have to take pre-requisites in order to take the IS courses.

Professor Koutmos suggested that perhaps the explanation should state that it is designed for Accounting and IS majors.

Professor Tromley asked if it makes sense to have a 3 course minor. Professor Bradford further explained the rationale for the reason for the courses chosen for the minor.

Professor Peck asked if the maker of the motion would amend the motion to include IS100. Professor Bradford was concerned about going outside of what the Journal of Record requires.

Professor Chaudhuri feels that since this is going to UCC it is better to give more information. He spoke in favor of the amendment.
Professor Koutmos asked if this would create a problem with Academic Council.

Professor Tromley asked why not remove AC11 and AC12 and state that they are pre-requisites.

Professor Kravet stated that a line should be added that states students outside of the Dolan School of Business are required to take IS100.

Professor Gibson asked if this is unprecedented or if other minors are similar. Professor Bradford answered that there are other minors similar and the Accounting minor has the same number of courses.

Professor Massey, seconded by Professor Tromley, made a motion to amend the pending motion to replace AC12 with IS100. The motion was voted on and carried.

The amended motion to approve the Accounting Information Systems Minor as Amended was voted on and passed unanimously.

Dean Solomon thanked the Committee for their work on developing the minor and bringing it forward.

B. Approval of OM 140 - Professor Huntley, seconded by James He, made a motion to approve OM 140 Introduction to Project Management course. (attached)

Professor Huntley gave an explanation of the course and the rationale for designing the course. He explained that the course was designed in response to the careers our students would be seeking. The course provided formal teaching in how to set up and control a project including practical experience. The course would count towards the IS major and is open to all Business majors.

The motion was voted on and passed unanimously.

A motion to adjourn was made, seconded and passed. The meeting adjourned at 3:45 pm.
Educational Planning Committee
Meeting Minutes
3/23/06

Members Present: Rao V. Dukkipati, Ginny Kelly, Jean Lange, Roselie McDevitt, Mark McGregor, Ed O’Neill, Jerry Sergent (Chairperson), Margaret Wills, Edna Wilson.

Invited Guests: Bruce Branford, Robbin Crabtree, Ray Poincelot

1. Approval of minutes from 15 December 2005

Ed O’Neil moved to approve the minutes; Ginny Kelly seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously with the deletion of sixth paragraph under item 2. Follow-up regarding the Minor in Catholic Studies, namely: “Jean Lange inquired about the Catholic Studies electives being too broad”. This line was removed.

2. Approval of minutes from 16 February 2006

Mark McGregor moved to approve the minutes; Ed O’Neil seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously as written.

3. New Program: Master of Arts in Communication

Robbin Crabtree was invited to answer any questions on the program. She reiterated few developments on this program:

- Department of Communications approved this program unanimously
- Arts & Sciences curriculum committee discussed this program at great length and approved it
- Arts & Sciences faculty discussed this program and approved it overwhelmingly

She pointed out the nature of the program, its value, quality and innovative nature of the program

Jerry Sergent asked Robbin Crabtree to clarify the program format [contact hours with the students] on page 21 of the Program Proposal dated November 2005. Robbin Crabtree indicated that the program adapted a hybrid format. It accomplished in three ways:

- Class room base time at site of 21-28 hours per semester
- On-line conferencing with the individual student or with some students in groups
- Groups doing projects with face to face meetings sometimes with the instructor

Edna Wilson and Robbin Crabtree co-chair the program committee. Teaching faculty sit on the committee as well as representatives from arts & sciences faculty. The group serves as an advisory to the department. Edna Wilson noted that in addition to teaching the session, the committee get together to resolve logistics.

Jerry Sergent asked Robbin Crabtree on the ratio of adjunct faculty to the full time faculty. Robbin Crabtree indicated the adjunct faculty teaches two of the six courses or
about one third of the courses are taught by the adjunct faculty. Most faculties have PhD degrees with significant corporate and international organizational experience. For instance, this semester, Robbin Crabtree noted that there are three full time faculties and one part time faculty.

Edna Wilson pointed out that the uniqueness of the Program is that revenue is put back into the academic division and currently looking at three year sustainability. There is no burden on the full time faculty. Robbin Crabtree noted that there is a good sense of collegiality.

Jean Lange asked Robbin Crabtree about the guidelines for class size. Robbin Crabtree replied saying that there is a cap of 15 to 20 presently. Not below 15 because of the revenue issue.

Maggie Willa asked Robbin Crabtree – what kind of feedback is received from the students. Robbin Crabtree responded by saying very satisfactory comments from the students. Some students said: This course has changed my life addressed the diversity issues and some students said they went thro personal transformation.

Robbin Crabtree pointed out that the department is currently formalizing the assessment process: program goals, learning objectives, student assessments and faculty on reflection etc. Direct assessment methods are being formalized for the coming three years. The instruments were not finalized at the corporate level and at student level.

Jean Lange moved to approve the program; Mark McGregor seconded.

_The EPC accepted the Program unanimously with the recommendation to clarify the number of contact hours in more detail as outlined on page 21 of the Program Proposal dated November 2005._

4. **New Minor: Accounting Information Systems (AIS)**

Bruce Branford pointed out that the program proposal is unique in that it does not require additional resources; very beneficial to the students and no cost to the University.

Jean Lange asked Bruce Branford if there has been an interest expressed by the students. Bruce Branford responded saying there has been quite an interest expressed by the students. This minor gives an opportunity to learn more about data base.

Edna Wilson moved to approve the New Minor; Ed O’Neil seconded.

_The EPC approved unanimously the New Minor: Accounting Information Systems (AIS)._ 

5. **Five year review of full-time undergraduate engineering program**

Jerry Sergent asked the members whether they have received a copy of the original program proposal along with the five-year review report. Jerry Sergent also asked the members if the members were able to assess the extent to which projections/goals or expectations have been met. There was no further discussion.
Edna Wilson moved to approve the program; Ed O’Neil seconded.

*The EPC unanimously approved the five year full-time Engineering Undergraduate Program.*

Ed O’Neill moved that the meeting be adjourned. Rao Dukkipati seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Rao V. Dukkipati
Educational Planning Committee
Meeting Minutes
2/16/06

Members Present: Rao V. Dukkipati, Orin Grossman, Ginny Kelly, Roselie McDevitt, Mark McGregor, Ed O’Neill, Jerry Sergent (Chairperson), Marie-Agnes Sourieau, Tim Snyder, Edna Wilson,

1. Approval of minutes from 15 December

The committee decided to delay the approval of these minutes because the majority of committee members who attended the 12/15/05 meeting were absent.

Dr. Sergent welcomed Dr. McDevitt to the committee.

2. Five year review of full-time undergraduate engineering program

Dr. Hadjimichael presented the report prepared for the five-year review of the undergraduate engineering program. Dr. Hadjimichael indicated that the report included the minutes of the 2/7/06 Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meeting and the 1/5/06 Dean’s Council meeting where this report was discussed. Dr. O’Neill noted that there were no details presented in the minutes from the Dean’s Council meeting. Dr. Hadjimichael indicated that very little discussion ensued at this meeting relative to the report.

Dr. O’Neill asked about the 3/2 program and wondered why it was not mentioned within the five-year report. Dr. Hadjimichael indicated that it is still a very viable program and that he would add reference to this in the report prior to sending it to the Academic Council.

Mark McGregor asked how the engineering students do in terms of completing the core and how they integrate the liberal arts core with the engineering curriculum. Dr. Hadjimichael indicated that all engineering students complete the entire core with the exception of the foreign language requirement that is waived for these students.

Mark further inquired as to the nature of the integration of the Jesuit and university mission into the engineering graduate programs. Dr. Hadjimichael indicated that both the Jesuit and the university mission are well integrated into the engineering graduate programs.

Dr. O’Neill asked about the endowment that is held by the engineering department. Dr. Hadjimichael indicated that the endowment is sustained primarily through program-level initiatives. The endowment was predominantly funded when a former faculty member left his estate to the school of engineering. These funds are used primarily for funding scholarships for part-time students.

Dr. McDevitt noted that the five-year review guidelines indicate that the department must present a copy of the original program proposal along with the five-year review report. No such proposal was made available to the EPC. Therefore the committee was unable to assess the extent to which projections/goals/expectations have been met.
Dr. Snyder concurred and asked where the program is relative to what was predicted within the original proposal.

Dr. Hadjimichael indicated that the program is slightly ahead of what was originally predicted in terms of enrollment. He stated that there were between 15 and 20 students per year coming into the program. The program is deliberately kept small, but Dr. Hadjimichael thought that they were approximately 20 students over the original projection.

Dr. Snyder asked how the economy might affect the engineering program. Dr. Hadjimichael indicated that the economy does affect enrollment and that the program seems to be most viable when the economy is stable (in neither a struggling or prosperous position). Dr. Snyder asked what percentage of students have their tuition covered by the corporations for whom they work. Dr. Hadjimichael indicated that this occurs for approximately 65 – 70% of the students in the program.

Dr. O’Neill noted the large number of undeclared majors and asked when they are obligated to declare a major. Dr. Hadjimichael indicated that students take the Fundamentals of Engineering course early on and usually declare their majors by April of their freshman year.

Mark McGregor asked about the alliances that the school of Engineering have with local community colleges. Dr. Hadjimichael indicated that students who come through this program are often some of the top students. This program requires that the Community College assign a liaison to work with the faculty at Fairfield to insure that these students are well prepared to transfer into the Fairfield program.

Dr. Snyder asked if the program has had any success in breaking the gender barrier existent within the field of engineering. Dr. Hadjimichael indicated that Fairfield has a Student Women Engineer’s (SWE) charter within the local Engineering Student Society. Fairfield currently has approximately 12 female engineering students (16 – 18% of the total engineering student body).

Dr. Hadjimichael left the meeting and Dr. Sergent opened the floor to discussion.

Dr. Snyder indicated that we may wish to table our discussion of the five-year report pending receipt of the original proposal as indicated with the review guidelines.

Dr. O’Neill concurred and suggested that without the original proposal we are not able to accurately assess the progress made within the program, as we cannot review comparative data.

**Motion #1:**

Dr. McDevitt moved that we table our discussion and vote on the review of the engineering program until we can review the original program proposal.

Dr. O’Neill seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
Motion #2:

Dr. Wilson moved that we request that reference to the 3/2 program along with recommendations that we might make as a result of our review of the original proposal be added to the five-year review report prior to its being sent to the Academic Council.

Dr. Snyder seconded this motion. The motion passes unanimously.

Dr. Sergent will investigate the possibility of us receiving the original proposal on line and will lead discussions via email. In addition, he will communicate with Dr. Mulvey to ascertain an accurate and reasonable timeframe for our information as we proceed. Finally, Dr. Sergent will invite Dr. Hadjimichael to our next meeting to be available to address any questions we might raise.

3. New program proposal – Master’s degree in Communication for Corporate cohorts

Dr. Crabtree was out of town. Dr. Wills was prepared to represent Dr. Crabtree but was ill. Dr. O’Neill moved to table the discussion of this program until such time as a department representative can be present to present the program. Dr. Snyder seconded this motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Policy on visitors/representatives to EPC meetings

In response to an email from Dr. Mulvey regarding the Faculty Handbook policy on visitors and observers at committee meetings a discussion ensued. The committee discussed the issue and agreed to follow appropriate handbook procedures. Thus, the EPC committee consents to allow the chair to invite observers or presenters to participate in EPC meeting discussions without voting privileges.

Dr. O’Neill moved that the meeting be adjourned. Dr. Snyder seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ginny Kelly
SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS
From EPC Chair
For AC Meeting 4/3/2006

Five – Year Review of the Full – Time Undergraduate Engineering Program

This program was originally discussed at the February meeting. Dr. Evangelos Hadjimichael presented the review and answered questions from the members. This discussion is summarized in the minutes of the February meeting.

At that meeting, the EPC requested that Dr. Hadjimichael provide the following information:

- The original proposal for the Full – Time Undergraduate Engineering Program so that EPC members could relate the Five – Year review to that proposal
- Additional data regarding the 3/2 program whereby students spend the first three years at Fairfield University and the last two at either Columbia, RPI, Stevens Institute of Technology, or UConn.
- A comparison of the projections in the original proposal to present – day status

Dr. Hadjimichael provided these items to the EPC prior to the March meeting. The data regarding the 3/2 program showed a steady flow of students in the neighborhood of 6 – 8 students/year chose this option.

The comparison of present – day status indicated that the School of Engineering had met or exceeded the projections contained in the original Proposal.

With this additional information, the EPC approved the Five – Year review unanimously.