Minutes of Meeting
Monday, December 5th, 2005
CNS 209
3:35pm – 4:15pm
[Approved by the Academic Council on February 6, 2006.]

Faculty Attending (16): Abbott, DeWitt (Executive Secretary), Dohm (Chair), Greenberg, Gibson, He, Keenan, Lang, Lange, Ligas, Mulvey (Secretary of the General Faculty), O’Neill, Rakowitz, Sapp, Steffen (Recording Secretary), Yarrington

Administrators Attending (6): AVP Grossman, Deans Hadjimichael, Novotny, Simões, Snyder, Solomon

Absent (1): Dean Wilson

Regrets (2): Professors Gibson, Haug, Lakeland

The meeting was called to order at 3:35pm.

1. Presidential Courtesy: The AVP had nothing to report.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty: Mulvey had nothing to report.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary:
   a) DeWitt called for a motion to approve the Nov. 7th, 2005 minutes.

   AVP Grossman: The sentence in the second to last paragraph that ends: “students need broadly-defined free expression and academic freedom” should read: “students need broadly-defined free expression.”

   DeWitt: My comment on the middle of page 3 about the Handbook language on Rank and Tenure should be changed from: “… the language, as it currently exists, is being misinterpreted by the AC” should read: “… the language, as it currently exists, is being misinterpreted.”

   Yarrington: Professor Haug was present, but did not sign the attendance sheet.

   MOTION: (Rakowitz/Yarrington) to approve the Nov. 7th 2005 AC minutes as corrected.
   VOTE ON MOTION: 13-0-0. Motion Passes.

   b) DeWitt had no further correspondence or oral reports

4. Council Committee Reports: None

5. Petitions for Immediate Hearing: None
6. Old Business

   a) Proposal for a new track in the Graduate Nursing Program: Nurse Anesthesia

      Lange: I would like to say thank you to members of the Academic Council for quickly replying with your concerns. I hope all of you had time to review the changes. I believe we have addressed all the concerns from the minutes and emails we received. I have added a time-line to clarify what happened since last February. I have addressed the issues regarding the director’s title brought up by Professor Lang. Nancy Moriber will be the program director, a position described as “Track Coordinator” here at Fairfield. For consistency, we used “Track Coordinator” for this document. We have added a table of contents and page numbers. To help Academic Council members better understand the review the program received, a copy of the accreditation requirements and standards from NCOA have been included. With regards to governance issues the procedures followed will be Fairfield University procedures as stipulated in the contract negotiated with BHNAP. We have added more detailed minutes from the SON general faculty meetings and February 9th curriculum committee meeting. Sue Campbell organized another curriculum meeting held on the Monday before Thanksgiving and the minutes from that meeting are included. Most of the nursing faculty were able to attend these meetings and the support for the proposed new program was clear and strong. Can I answer any other questions at this time?

      MOTION (Lang/DeWitt): that the Academic Council approve the Nurse Anesthesia track in the Graduate Nursing Program.

      Discussion:
      Lang: When this proposal was first brought before the Academic Council many issues came up from different angles. The revision under review was clear and substantive, real questions were answered with good discussions. I hope it sails!
      Mulvey: I was impressed with the response to concerns, our routing procedures are in place to provide academic integrity in the process for revising and/or introducing new programs. What we have now is what we wanted and this proposal was reviewed and revised exactly the way it should be.
      Seeing no further questions the Chair brought the Motion up for a vote.

      VOTE ON MOTION: 13-0-0. Motion Passes.

   b) Items in Journal of Record that may not have been sent to the administration for approval

      Gen. Fac. Sec. Mulvey: The correspondence included in your packets shows the process by which Orin and I worked out what to add and/or cut from the JOR. We reviewed items from the last four and half years, starting from the end of Kathy Nantz’s term as Secretary of the General Faculty. Twenty items were reviewed. Four items, detailed on p11 of the Academic Council packet for this meeting, were determined by the Academic Council Executive Committee to not be policy statements and therefore should be removed. The AVP had no objection to removing these four items from the Journal of Record. Sixteen other items, detailed on pp 6-10 of the Academic Council packet for this meeting, were sent to the AVP for approval and/or rejection by the Administration. Thirteen of these items were approved by the AVP for inclusion in the JOR. The Administration rejected three items, numbers 7, 8, and 9, from the list sent to them. Regarding the rejection of item 7, the executive committee does not suggest challenging this decision since there is a more or less identical item from 1982 already in the Journal of Record. Item 8 is a statement of faculty
position and the Academic Council Executive Committee does not feel it is worth challenging this rejection. Item 9 is already in the current Memorandum of Understanding and so at this time is jointly agreed policy.

I am continuing the review of the Journal of Record. At this time, we are in agreement that every item in the Journal has been approved by both the faculty and the administration, so important progress has been made providing closure to the Petition for Immediate Hearing brought to the Council by the AVP last May. I am continuing the review of the JOR; there are some items still to be added after being sent to the administration for approval or rejection and I expect to have the Journal of Record completely up-to-date by our next meeting in February.

The Executive Committee is looking for comments or suggestions from members of the Academic Council regarding the desirability of a repository for positions taken by the General Faculty and/or the Academic Council. There are a number of important faculty positions which, since they are non-policy statements do not belong in the Journal of Record, but we shouldn’t lose the historical perspective that such statements document regarding the concerns and desires of the Faculty.

Greenberg: What is the mechanism for Faculty approval of an item followed by an Administrative rejection? Does the item automatically come back to the Academic Council?

Lang: It is my understanding that the item does come back to the Academic Council and if consensus cannot be reached the ultimate arbiter would be the Board of Trustees. On the question of faculty comments and position statements it would be great to have these preserved in one place with easy access so faculty would not need to dig through minutes. I encourage the Faculty Secretary to gather such position statements and keep them in a logical separate space.

AVP Grossman: Is there a mechanism that makes it clear what types of motions are meant to be reviewed by the administration?

DeWitt: There is no clear statement – but the consensus opinion has been that items that involve policy would be sent on for approval.

Lang: The feeling is indeed that motions that impact policy would be forwarded on but there is not always consensus on what this means. What counts as a policy versus a position or recommendation? Anything the faculty wants in the Journal will be sent to the administration. The administration could always ask that any motion go into the Journal of Record. Most administrators want as little as possible in writing.

DeWitt: Members of the Council are asked to provide the Executive Committee with their suggestions for maintaining a long-term record of faculty positions and commentary not deemed appropriate for the JOR.

7. New Business

a. rescheduled to next meeting because of unavailability of members of EPC at this time.

b. Reviewing text of a new addition of the Faculty Handbook

Gen. Fac. Sec. Mulvey: The AVP’s office would like to print copies of the Faculty Handbook. Four or five amendments have been passed since the last edition and the procedure in the Handbook is for the President (or his designee) to print the document after it has been reviewed for accuracy by the Academic Council (or its designee).

**MOTION.** (Greenberg/Keenan): The Academic Council authorizes the Executive Committee of the Academic Council to review the galley proofs for a new edition of the Faculty Handbook”

**VOTE ON MOTION:** 13-0-0 motion passes
c. Evacuation Procedures for Individuals with Disabilities

Lang: This item comes to us because of a personal concern. I considered the scenario described because of a student in one of my classes. I could imagine a third floor of Bannow hallway filled with smoke, the elevators all have returned to the first floor, and I am left standing with a wheelchair bound student at the top of the stairs. What am I supposed to do? Abandon the student on the third floor? Other schools have very detailed instructions for such scenarios and also have fire and smoke proof rooms etc. to help in such situations. I have been at Fairfield for over 30+ years and have only had 2 students who might have needed evacuation assistance. However I have never felt comfortable relying on public safety or in trusting my own judgment. Such situations should not be left up to individual faculty to make such decisions in a time of crises. I would like to make the following motion:

**MOTION** (Lang/O’Neill): “The Academic Council calls on Student Services to provide faculty and advisors of students with disabilities who would require assistance to evacuate a building with a detailed, individualized procedure to assist in such an evacuation”

Discussion
DeWitt: Would these instructions go to all faculty?
Lang: No, the procedure would go to faculty who had the specific student in their classes. This is a relatively small number of individuals and should be easy to do.

Dean Snyder: Working with disabled students requires lots of training and understanding. For example, a blind person might not want you reaching out and touching them in a time of crisis. I would ask Professor Lang if he has consulted Student services, specifically David Ryan-Soderlund on this matter?

Lang: I contacted them and got only what you have in the packet. I did not get any specific information regarding the potential incident described. What we received from David is useful in a general context. I am still on the third floor; I need clear guidelines based on specific disabled students and the very real threat of a 3rd floor evacuation.

Dean Snyder: This problem points out a large problem, which is the lack of communication between different areas of the University.

Dean Solomon: Before this body takes a step we should take what Dean Snyder has said into account, David Ryan-Soderlund has been more than willing to talk about these issues. Before we tell them what policy should be we should consult with them.

Irene: I agree that David can be very helpful; we ask him to speak every year at New Faculty Orientation but his memo in the packet is his response to this issue. Memo is generic and unhelpful, it doesn’t deal specifically with the issue that George brought up. To quote from the memo: “aid everyone to the best of their ability” I feel the response is lacking in detail that George is clearly seeking.

Abbott: Can you describe some examples of greater specificity?
Lang: Wheelchair patients – no mobility and a heavy chair? Carry them in the chair with two people, one in front and one in back, very specific information on specific problem. The website listed on the agenda with this agenda item is remarkably comprehensive.

Keenan: Are we just creating another bureaucratic layer? So few students – could we just have each faculty member consult with their students on an as-needed basis?

Lange: It’s good to be pro-active – best to provide information if at all possible, if it is out there why not share the information? Use for common types of disabilities – wheelchair, blind, etc.

Greenberg: This is a huge liability issue and their needs to be a more detailed plan. The Administration should have moved on this years ago.

AVP Grossman: Did this question come from George?
Irene: Ryan-Soderlund’s memo is in response to a query from a meeting of the A&S chairs. I believe that George had sent his concern to this body through the chair of his department.
AVP Grossman: I propose that we bring Ryan-Soderlund in to give a presentation to the Academic Council. We will also pass this question by our risk management group for review.
DeWitt: The concerns of the Dean and AVP are not incompatible – if Ryan-Soderlund has questions then we can just move forward and see how Ryan-Soderlund responds.

Seeing no further questions the Chair brought the motion to a vote.

**MOTION (Lang/O’Neill): “The Academic Council calls on Student Services to provide faculty and advisors of students with disabilities who would require assistance to evacuate a building with a detailed, individualized procedure to assist in such an evacuation”**

**VOTE ON MOTION:** 12-0-1 Motion passes.

**MOTION TO ADJOURN (Greenberg/Keenan) passed unanimously.**

Meeting was adjourned at 4:45pm

Respectfully submitted:

L. Kraig Steffen
Recording secretary

[Approved by the Academic Council on February 6, 2006.]