ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, October 3, 2005
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 April 4, 2005 (attached)
   b. Approval of minutes of meeting of May 2, 2005 (attached)
   c. Approval of minutes of meeting of September 13, 2005 (attached)

4. Council Committee Reports.
   a. Subcommittee on Academic Grievance (attachment)

5. Petitions for immediate hearing.

6. Old Business.

7. New business
   a. Review of distribution of Council seats (Pending Item C)
   b. Subcommittee to consider Handbook descriptions of non-tenured positions
   c. Discussion of the Strategic Plan (attached)
   d. Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees

8. Adjournment

Attachments
- For item 3.a: Draft minutes of AC meeting 4/4/2005 (pages 3-5)
- For item 3.b: Draft minutes of AC meeting 5/2/2005 (pages 6-11)
- For item 3.c: Draft minutes of AC meeting 9/13/2005 (pages 12-16)
- For item 4.a: Report Subcommittee on Academic Grievance (pp. 17-26)
- For item 7.d: Memo from Pres. von Arx, S.J., and Draft #6 of Strategic Plan (dated 9/14/2005) included separately

PENDING ITEMS ON BACK
**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.

Note: Minutes of this meeting were not turned in by the Recording Secretary, Professor Dave Winn. These minutes were reconstructed by the Secretary of the General Faculty from notes taken during the meeting.

Attendance: Professors George Lang, Dave Winn, Susan Rakowitz, Rick DeWitt, Olivia Harriott, Joan Weiss, Phil Greiner, Kathy Nantz, Dennis Keenan, Kraig Steffen, Mark Ligas, James He, Jo Yarrington, Don Greenberg, Ingeborg Haug, Faith-Anne Dohm; Deans Tim Snyder, Other deans???:; Academic Vice President Orin Grossman; Guest: Professor Joy Gordon (?)
Regrets: Professor Carl Seheraga

1. Presidential Courtesy.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
   a. MOTION. To approve the minutes of 3/14/2005 as circulated. MOTION PASSED 10-0-5.
   b. Executive Secretary Rick DeWitt reported that Dean Solomon had sent a memo in response to the Council Subcommittee on compliance with the Guiding Principles.

   MOTION. (DeWitt/Greiner) to reorder the agenda to deal with New Business now. MOTION PASSED 15-0-0.

7.a. Two requests from the College Merit Committee

Professor Susan Rakowitz, Chair of the College Merit Committee, reported on the history of this agenda item (See packet for this meeting pages 8-27). There are two requests, but both are involved with the status of the Guiding Principles and Procedural Guidelines for Faculty Compensation at Fairfield (a.k.a. Guiding Principles), a document created by a joint faculty/administration committee over the course of many, many months. Prof. Rakowitz reminded the Council of how much hard work went into creating the Guiding Principles and that the Guiding Principles were developed and agreed to by faculty and administrators working together. Both sides made genuine compromises to arrive at the final document, which was officially approved by the joint faculty/administration committee that created it, the Academic Council, and the General Faculty.

The College of Arts and Sciences faculty created the College Merit Committee (CMC), 5 elected faculty members and the dean, ex officio, on 10/19/2004 and charged this
committee “to create a college-wide compensation plan consistent with the Guiding Principles document passed at the 9/17/04 General Faculty meeting.” The CMC created a merit plan (pages 10-15 of the packet for this meeting) and this plan was approved by the College faculty on 2/9/05. Subsequent correspondence (from AVP Grossman to the entire College faculty, from the CMC to AVP Grossman, from AVP Grossman to the College faculty, the CMC, and Dean Snyder) clarify the issue of disagreement, namely the CMC’s position that as long as the College merit plan satisfies the Guiding Principles, then there is no legitimate reason for the plan to be rejected by the administration; the administration position that the Guiding Principles are important but that they are only one of many documents and that being in compliance with the Guiding Principles is not a sufficient condition for the plan to be accepted by the administration. At the College faculty meeting on 3/9/05, a motion was passed directing the CMC to submit the college plan to the Academic Council for review by the subcommittee on Compliance with the Guiding Principles and, if the Council subcommittee indicates the need for revision, that the CMC is to recommend specific revision to the College faculty.

**MOTION.** That the Academic Council Subcommittee on Compliance with the Guiding Principles review the College merit plan, which was accepted by the College faculty on 2/9/05.

**MOTION PASSED.**

In light of the ongoing disagreement on the status of the Guiding Principles, the College faculty’s motion, passed on 3/9/05, further directed the CMC to ask the Academic Council to clarify the role of the Guiding Principles in defining what makes a merit plan acceptable. Prof. Rakowitz distributed a handout with (1) historical background on the implementation of merit pay and (2) the following motion which was made by Prof. Rakowitz and seconded.

**MOTION.**

Whereas the Board of Trustees Resolution of December 2001 explicitly recognized the importance of a collaborative process between the faculty and administration in developing a new compensation structure, and

Whereas Committee on Guiding Principles and Procedural Guidelines for Faculty Compensation, approved and created by the Academic Council and the General Faculty, was the instantiation of the Board’s explicit directive for collaboration between faculty, deans and AVP.

Whereas the “Guiding Principles for Faculty Compensation” was written by the joint committee to provide guidelines and universal principles for all merit pay plans, and

Whereas the joint committee’s final document “Guiding Principles for Faculty Compensation” was approved by both the Academic Council and the General Faculty,

A merit pay plan that is consistent with the “Guiding Principles for Faculty Compensation” and is approved by the faculty to which it will be applied cannot be rejected by the administration.
Discussion involved faculty members insisting that because the Guiding Principles are a jointly created document, that a merit plan consistent with the Guiding Principles cannot be rejected and administrators insisting that satisfying the Guiding Principles is not a sufficient condition for a merit plan to be accepted. A **MOTION** (Nantz/Lang) to call the question passed (12-2-1).

**MAIN MOTION PASSED** 10-0-5.

7.b. Routing Procedure for five-year review of programs

Prof. James He, chair of UCC, reported on this item (See packet pages 28-42 and one-page sheet handed out at the meeting). There was a brief discussion, mostly clarifying information in the packet and the procedure outlined therein.

**MOTION.** The Academic Council accepts the Guidelines for Review of Programs.

**MOTION PASSED.** 14-1-0.

7.c. Variance for an Untenured Chair in the Physics Department

The College of Arts and Sciences Governance Document mandates that a chair of a department must be a tenured faculty member. The Department of Physics contends that an untenured member of the department is the most appropriate person to chair their department at this time. There are complications because the department is in the midst of hiring at least one faculty member and, according to the CAS Governance Document, that a chair must be elected by the members of the department. It was decided to recess the meeting until next Monday, April 11, and to continue the discussion at that time.

All other agenda items (4 items under Old Business on the agenda) were put off until the meeting is reconvened on April 11, 2005.

Submitted by
Irene Mulvey
Secretary of the General Faculty
**PRESENT:** Professors Rick DeWitt, Faith Anne Dohm, Don Greenberg, Olivia Harriott, Ingeborg Haug, James He, Dennis Keenan, George Lang, Mark Ligas, Irene Mulvey (Secretary of the General Faculty), Kathy Nantz, Susan Rakowitz, Carl Scheraga, Kraig Steffen, Joan Weiss, Dave Winn; Deans Margaret Deignan, Vagos Hadjimichael, Jean Novotny, Timothy Law Snyder, Norman Solomon, Edna Wilson; Academic Vice President Orin Grossman

**REGRETS:** Phil Greiner

Professor Keenan called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm.

1. **Presidential Courtesy.**
   None.

2. **Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty**
   b. Nominations for the Committee on Committees are:
      GSEAP/Nursing: Sheila Grossman, Tracey Robert, David Zera
      At Large: Patrick Lee, Cheryl Tromley, Doug Lyon, Paul Caster
      Question by Dean Snyder concerning the role of Committee on Committees. Professor Lang stated that the committee reviews the names submitted, and, in effect, functions as a nominating committee. Candidates who are nominated from the floor do occasionally get elected, and it is not a disadvantage for faculty added in that manner.

      **MOTION:** (Nantz/Greenberg) To approve this slate of candidates **MOTION PASSED** (15-0-0).
   c. Reports by Chairs were due by May 1. Professors Mulvey commented that Chairs have been great this year reporting each month on Committee progress.

3. **Report from the Executive Secretary**
   a. i. Approval of the minutes of April 4, 2005
      These have not been submitted yet by recording secretary, Dave Winn.
   b. ii. Approval of the minutes of April 11
      corrections: AVP, pg. 6, paragraph 5, second from last sentence should say, “AVP Grossman also said that there is no current policy for faculty relating to conflict of interest; there is an administration policy.”

      **MOTION:** to approve minutes of 4/11/2005 as corrected passed (15-0-0).
   b. Correspondence
      None
c. Oral reports

None

4. Council Committee Reports

a. Academic Grievance Subcommittee

Professor Lang commented on the student grievance procedure printed in the current catalogue. Ensuing revisions end up becoming changes without due process. The Grievance procedure in 2004 – 2005 catalogue is different than the one in the Journal of Record. Lang suggested that the University incorporate the catalogue language in the Journal of Record. The Academy Honesty policy in the catalogue is in regards to grade penalty due to plagiarism or cheating. Professor Lang stated that the list of these inconsistencies is long, and wondered how the Council should handle it.

Dean Snyder questioned whether it substantially changes policy. Lang stated that it does, and the catalogue should be brought in accord with policy. AVP Grossman thought it was important that all published documents be in accord with policy. They should be clearly stated, the students should know about all such policies, and the university should follow the policies as indicated. Professor Rakowitz wondered about timing. The catalogue is being published soon so changes should be addressed immediately. Professor Winn suggested that all changes be done at the same time rather than piecemeal. Professor Keenan thought the Council should follow AVP Grossman’s suggestions, review the materials, and come back to Council to discuss them. Snyder thought that there should be shared decanal information/shared in a common file. He suggested that the place of infraction deals with the complaint, but then that infraction should be reported to the central school where file is held.

Professor Keenan requested that Professors Mulvey and Lang note what’s to be added, what’s being taken out so it will be clearer to see. These two should work with AVP Grossman and Associate AVP Malone. This matter should move to the first agenda items for next fall. Professors Simon and Dew should be part of the deliberations on plagiarism.

b. Subcommittee on Religious Holidays for University Calendar

Committee members: Professors Mulvey, Haug, Steffen

Professor Mulvey stated the committee did not meet face to face, but emailed. Professor Haug did extensive research at other like institutions, for informational purposes.

MOTION: (Haug/Scheraga) The Academic Council recommends that the information and the list of religious holidays in this subcommittee report be updated and published as a supplement to the University calendar each year.

Dean Solomon questioned whether Tuesday is Good Friday? etc. Professor Rakowitz questioned which holidays are work related. Professor Steffen stated that it was hard to differentiate or label major or minor holidays. Professor
Mulvey wondered whether the Council should bag the whole thing. Professor Keenan suggested that it be brought back after a clean-up. Professor DeWitt thought the motion was fine with updates. Professor Greenberg was opposed to the motion. He stated that it becomes harder to know what dates to respond to, and if professors are not responsive, will they be called to task for being prejudicial. Professor Mulvey thought that the list had gotten out of hand. Professor Nantz liked the list, especially if students say that their absence is a religious issue. She thought it helped in accommodating certain students. Dean Wilson thought the list was useful, perhaps there should be a list on the website. Dean Solomon made a point about de facto regulation, however these concerns are primarily for larger schools. It shouldn’t take the draconian turn here at Fairfield. He agreed with Professor Nantz, that this list and an awareness of the holidays would be an additional way to address concerns facing our students.

**Motion** to call the question passed: 15 – 0 – 0

**Main Motion passed** (9-4-2).

c. Subcommittee on Compliance with Guiding Principles

Professor Greenberg reported that the Subcommittee on Compliance with the Guiding Principles reviewed the merit plan (passed by the College of Arts and Sciences faculty on 2/9/05 and referred to this subcommittee by the Council on 4/4/05) and that the College Merit plan is in complete compliance with the Guiding Principles.

5. Petition for Immediate Hearing

AVP Grossman discussed governance and the Journal of Record. He stated that there are a number of items in the Journal of Records that he does not have any record of approving.

**MOTION:** (Rakowitz/Scheraga) To add this Petition for Immediate Hearing to the agenda at this time. **Motion passed** (15-0-0).

Handouts: Item #1 read, 3 pages from section in Journal of Record, third page is response to Professor Lang

AVP Grossman noted that a number of items that are in the Journal of Record appear to have been entered into the Journal without having been approved or rejected by the AVP’s office. He requested that the Executive Committee meet with him to clarify which items need to be addressed and rectified.

**MOTION:** That the Academic Council direct the Executive Committee to work with the Academic Vice President to determine which items in the Journal of Record have not received administrative approval and for the Executive committee to facilitate the submission of those items to the administration for approval or rejection. (Greenberg/Scheraga)

Professor DeWitt noted that it is often unclear whether a motion has sufficient “oomph” to send to the AVP, and there is no explicit language in any of our documents specifying
what motions should go to the AVP. He suggested that the Council try to make it more clear what should go to the AVP...the Journal of Record is substantive. He suggested that AVP Grossman would be aware of the Journal of Record sections as he is a member of both the General Faculty and the Academic Council. Professor Lang wanted to know whether AVP Grossman wanted to discuss items which happened during his time as AVP. So, in effect, these issues of concern are during a restricted time period. He understands administrative approval if there is a policy issue. He also stated that the Journal of Record is sometimes not a university policy but reflects the opinions of the faculty. One of the problems with the Executive Secretary for Academic Council is that there is an annual re-election, so sometimes mechanical “stuff” gets slipped up on. Professor Greenberg thought that the relevant need was to clear up “policy” issues. He thought we should guard governance documents so that we can stave off attacks. Perhaps what is needed is looking at areas that the AVP missed that require attention. He guesses it seemed at times like a record of policy rather than opinion, but then if it’s purely opinion it looses its “oomph”. It seems that most issues should be about agreement. Nantz thought it was a good motion to address, especially concerning relevant issues and policies. It’s tough to decide how to manage it. It’s also hard to review it…perhaps it should have separate sections such as policy, opinion, etc.. One thing to take in consideration is a more casual, sharing of information with Faculty Secretary and the Executive Council. Professor Mulvey stated that it should be mostly about policy, agreed to by both and binding by both. The Administration does not have veto over the policies stated. If there are objections, a Letter of Objection from Administration should go to the Academic Council, the General Faculty, and if need be, the Board. There needs to be authoritative force.

**MOTION PASSED 15-0-0.**

**MOTION** to reorder the agenda to deal with 7F at this time.  
**Motion passed.**

7. New Business

f. Update on Academic Freedom issues.  
Professors Joy Gordon, George Lang, Rick DeWitt, Irene Mulvey met with President von Arx to discuss the issue of academic freedom, in light of the cancellation of the forum on same sex marriage. In this meeting, it was proposed and agreed that a committee be constituted to address issues of academic freedom and free expression and the following motion was a result of the meeting.

**MOTION:** (DeWitt/Lang) The Academic Council will create an ad hoc committee to address issues of academic freedom and free expression. The Committee is requested to propose policy regarding issues of academic freedom within the university. The committee will consist of four faculty elected by the academic council, two administrators appointed by the President, two students chosen by FUSA, and will be chaired by a fifth faculty member appointed by the President. The Committee shall make its recommendations to the Academic Council and the President by November 1.

**MOTION PASSED 15-0-0.**
Faculty Secretary, Irene Mulvey, was directed to put out a call for nominations.

6. Old Business

a. Proposal for a Third Year Review

Professor Weiss suggested corrections and changes in Section II, #3, middle of paragraph to remove “who will serve as Chair of this committee” and in Section II, #6, pg. 2 signed by members of the third year review committee, “The details of any suggested improvements will be explained in the report”. Professor Lang wanted to try and bridge the gap between the committee and the schools. However, he believed that the document was diluted when tenure is not mentioned. Professor DeWitt thought it morphed from a document with teeth to one that does not address relevant issues. Professor Nantz was not in favor of any third year review committee, but does not want to see it come back again to Council. Professor Stefflen saw this document not as a hindrance, but as neutral, and helpful. Professor Yarrington considered this a living document. Professor Haug stated that this was considered a prelude to 6th year up and out. Professor Scheraga stated that lawyers did not monkey with document. He noted that there was considerable debate back and forth in the General Faculty. In lieu of this, Professor Lang thought people should not be surprised by the Rank and Tenure Committee decisions. Professor Scheraga thought there was nothing new in the document and that the process is transparent and it both challenges and protects the candidate.

**MOTION:** (Yarrington/Scheraga) that the Academic Council sends the Proposal for Third Year Review to the General Faculty with a recommendation for approval.

**MOTION PASSED** 10-1-3.

b. Code of Ethics

Professor DeWitt indicated that if the language regarding possible sanction was removed, then the faculty would have no objection to the Code of Ethics, but if the language is not removed, then the faculty cannot approve the Code of Ethics. There was general consensus among Council members with this point of view.

7. New Business

a. Motion for EPC re course offerings listed for the 2 upcoming semesters

The Council will take this up next fall.

b. Suggested Handbook changes from the Faculty Athletic Committee

The Council will take this up next fall.

c. Changes to the Handbook and the R&T Guidelines from R&T Committee

The Council will take this up next fall.

d. Masters of Arts Degree in Communication.

The Council will take this up next fall.
e. Direction from the Committee on Conference with the Trustees
   It appears that the Conference Committee will not be meeting with the Academic Affairs subcommittee of the Board in June since the Board is planning a multi-day retreat. Prof. Lang thought the faculty should meet with the Trustees or at least send a letter. Dean Snyder thought it was essential that we meet with the Board face to face. However, the committee is not invited to the retreat.

   **MOTION.** (DeWitt/Nantz) The Academic Council directs the Executive Committee to poll Council members by email concerning possible issues to raise with the Board of Trustees. Following this email poll, the Council directs the Executive Committee to decide which issues to suggest to the Committee on Conference for discussion with the Board at the upcoming summer Board meeting.

   **MOTION PASSED.** 14-0-0

8. A Motion to adjourn was made, seconded, and passed without objection.
   Meeting adjourned at 5:07 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Jo Yarrington
Recording Secretary
Present: Professors Bill Abbott, Rick DeWitt, Faith-Anne Dohm, Don Gibson, Donald Greenberg, Ingeborg Haug, James He, Dennis Keenan, Paul Lakeland, George Lang, Jean Lange, Mark Ligas, Irene Mulvey (Secretary of the General Faculty), Ed O’Neill, Susan Rakowitz, David Sapp, L. Kraig Steffen, and Jo Yarrington;

Deans Vagos Hadjimichael, Jeanne Novotny, (Interim Dean) Antonio Simoes, Norman Solomon, Timothy Law Snyder, and Edna Wilson;

Academic Vice President Orin Grossman;

Guests: President Jeffrey von Arx, S.J., Professor Meredith Wallace.

Professor Irene Mulvey called the meeting to order at 3:35 PM.

0. Professor Abbott selected at random the name of Professor O’Neill from those eligible to be Recording Secretary for this meeting. This position rotates alphabetically through the faculty members of the Council during the school year. Professor Dohm was unanimously elected Chairperson and Professor DeWitt was unanimously elected Executive Secretary for the school year. Heartfelt congratulations were extended to both members of the new Executive Committee.

1. Presidential Courtesy. Academic Vice President Grossman extended a warm welcome to the continuing members of the Council and to the new members joining the Council this year. There was no message from the President.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty. Professor Mulvey welcomed the members of the Council and expressed her availability by voice or email to all members throughout the year. She distributed a memorandum of the guidelines which should be followed when minutes of the Academic Council are prepared. She stated that the minutes should be available in draft form for the executive committee of the Council by the Friday of the week of the meeting. The Committee on Committees would be meeting this Thursday with ample volunteers to fill faculty committee vacancies which had been announced. There was a need for student members on some faculty committees, which had been filled, in a timely fashion by the new FUSA President. She referred the members to the website she maintains http://www.faculty.fairfield.edu/gfs/ which has all General Faculty Secretary information on the Council, the General Faculty, and the Faculty Committees.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary. None.

4. Council Committee Reports. None.
5. Petition for Immediate Hearing. None.


   a. Elect faculty representatives to the Honorary Degree Committee.
      Professor Mulvey distributed a ballot with 5 faculty who responded to her request for nominations. The Executive Secretary, Professor DeWitt, later on reported that

      the nominees elected by the Council to be faculty representatives to the Honorary Degree Committee were Professors Ingeborg Haug, Sister Julianna Poole, and Error! Contact not defined.

   b. Faculty Representation on the Search Committee for the Dean of GSEAP
      Academic Vice President Grossman said that the search committee would be chaired by AVP Grossman and would consist of 9 additional persons, 5 faculty members and 4 additional people he would appoint. In his recollection it had been the recent past practice that the 5 faculty were chosen with 4 from the school whose new Dean was sought and one professor from an outside school. Professor Haug stated that her school had met to discuss their representation and wished for her to bring the names of the 5 professors who were Chairs of their departments as the 5 faculty on the Search Committee. AVP Grossman stated that all decanal search committees he knew had one professor from another school. Dean Snyder remarked that he thought a professor from Arts & Sciences would be a good representative on the committee as the different schools have to work together and the outside perspective would be beneficial. Professor Lang commented that he recalled when he was Faculty Secretary the search committee selecting Dean Simoes contained Professors Lucy Katz and Christopher Mooney who were from different schools, and he agreed that outside representatives were a good idea for this committee. Professor Greenberg said it was imperative to have outside the school representation. Professor Yarrington said that the Handbook does not state the number on the committee must be 9 and if it were 11, it would be possible to have the 5 Chairs from GSEAP, one outside faculty representative and the Academic Vice President could appoint 5 other members. Professor Greenberg stated that the larger the size of a committee the more cumbersome it becomes and the size 9 seems to work best.

Professor Keenan moved and Professor Rakowitz seconded the motion that

**MOTION.** the Academic Council directs the Secretary of the General Faculty to send a call for nominations or
volunteers to the Search Committee for the Dean of GSEAP, with responses to be received by Friday of this week, the faculty representation to consist of 4 from the GSEAP and 1 from outside the school.

Academic Vice President Grossman said that he interpreted the Faculty Handbook wording concerning the composition of the search committee as preventing him from appointing a faculty member to serve. Professor Keenan said this had been discussed over the summer and it was his personal opinion that the Academic Vice President could appoint a faculty member. Professor Mulvey strongly disagreed with that interpretation and agreed with the AVP’s interpretation.

Professor Lang called the question which passed 14-0-1 and the MAIN MOTION PASSED 15-0-1

c. Changes to Research Committee Guidelines Professor Wallace from the Research Committee arrived and spoke about the desire of the committee to have the guidelines reflect the consensus that time spent teaching at another university not be counted in the new wording suggested for the Pre-tenure Research Leave Program Guidelines.

Professor Keenan stated that, if a faculty member had been teaching at Fairfield for 3 or 4 years, they would be excluded from eligibility. Academic Vice President Grossman agreed that would be the case and saw nothing wrong with conditions which would exclude some from eligibility. Professor Lang stated his desire for the wording in the guidelines to conform to the terminology in the Faculty Handbook and the Journal of Record and reference to “tenure-track” should be replaced by “full-time” or “visiting” or appropriate terms, which are defined in the Handbook. Professor Rakowitz commented that a faculty member who taught full-time elsewhere for 3 years and taught at Fairfield for 2 years would be eligible for this program in their 6th year with the current wording. Academic Vice President Grossman stated that there were consequences to starting fresh at Fairfield versus negotiating credit for prior teaching experience. Professor Steffen said that in the sciences the visiting faculty who are hired full-time usually have a 4 course load and they are disadvantaged because of lack of support for research space/equipment. After 3 or 4 years if they were hired full-time with tenure aspirations they would be ineligible with these guidelines. Professor Rakowitz stated that someone who negotiated 3 or 4 years of prior service would be eligible sooner for a normal sabbatical.

President Jeffrey P. von Arx, S.J. arrived at about 4:20 pm and Chairperson Dohm recognized him and provided Presidential courtesy, if he desired. He extended a warm welcome to the Council and stated that the Strategic Plan would be rolled out at the end of this week or early next week. It did not contain many details; mainly goals and visions, with the implementation details coming later on. It would be available on an intranet site for the University community to read and comment on by the end of October.
He would chair a small editorial committee consisting of Barbara Kiernan, Nancy Dallavalle, James Estrada, and Mark Reed to consider any revisions before it would go to the Board of Trustees in early December. He anticipated that the Trustees might desire more financial planning than currently included in the plan.

Returning to the agenda topic, Professor Lang wanted the wording to match the Handbook phrasing. He said that the scenario of a visiting faculty member with a Ph.D. who had aspirations for a permanent position with tenure should be aided by Fairfield in launching his career with lab space/equipment. Dean Snyder wanted the minutes to reflect that it was the practice now to give visiting faculty lab space and equipment and support for professional travel to help their careers.

Professor Wallace stated that the Research Committee wanted the Summer Research Stipend Guidelines to clarify that a recipient could not receive support simultaneously from the Ignatian Residential College and the Faculty Research Committee for a project. Professor Sapp mentioned that he thought that the Dolan School of Business also had summer research stipends, which also might cause a project to be multiply supported. Dean Solomon confirmed that was the case. The Research Committee might also want to use wording to prevent this. Dean Snyder suggested using language which was more generic: “what other support are you requesting for the summer?” Professor Sapp said it might be possible for a faculty member to receive funds from 3 sources for one project for the summer and this should be prevented.

Professor Wallace stated that the Research Committee wanted the Senior Summer Fellowship Guidelines to clarify that a recipient could not receive this support during the summer before or after the academic year of a sabbatical leave. Professor Haug moved and Professor Steffen seconded the motion that

**MOTION.** the Academic Council approves the new wording of the Faculty Research Committee’s Guidelines for the Senior Summer Fellowship

Dean Snyder spoke against the motion saying that for many faculty members the best time for serious scholarly work is during a summer adjacent to a sabbatical leave. Professor Yarrington spoke against the motion agreeing that she could foresee the time during a summer adjacent to a sabbatical leave would be spent on scholarly work related to the sabbatical and deserved to be eligible for support with this fellowship.

Professor Lang moved to **table this motion.**  **MOTION TO TABLE THE MAIN MOTION PASSED 16-0-0**

Professor DeWitt moved and Professor Yarrington seconded the motion that
MOTION. the three revisions of guidelines are referred back to the Research Committee for additional work.

Professor Mulvey spoke in favor of the motion but she wanted the Research Committee to provide a rationale for each change in the guidelines they would be requesting. She said that this agenda item was added quite late and, due to the timing, she was not able to request rationale from the committee before our consideration.

The **MOTION PASSED PASSED 16-0-0**.

Professor O’Neill, seconded by Professor Steffen, made a **MOTION TO ADJOURN**, which **PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 PM.

Submitted by
Ed O’Neill
Recording Secretary
JOURNAL OF RECORD:
Student Academic Grievance Procedure:

Purpose:

The purpose of a Procedure for the review of academic grievances is to protect the rights of students, faculty, and the University by providing mechanisms for equitable problem solving.

Types of Grievances:

A "grievance" is defined as a complaint of unfair treatment for which a specific remedy is sought. This procedure is concerned solely with academic grievances. It excludes circumstances, which may give rise to a complaint for which explicit redress is neither called for nor sought, or for those for which other structures within the university serve as an agency for resolution.

Academic grievances either relate to procedural appeals, or to academic competence appeals, or to issues of academic dishonesty.

Procedural appeals are defined as those seeking a remedy which no issue of the quality of a student's work is involved. For example, a student might content that the professor failed to follow previously announced mechanisms of evaluation.

Academic competence appeals are defined as those seeking a remedy because the evaluation of the quality of a student's work in a course is disputed. Remedies would include but not be limited to awarded grade changes, such as permission to take make-up examinations or to repeat courses without penalty.

Academic dishonesty appeals are defined as those seeking a remedy because of a dispute over whether plagiarism or cheating occurred. Remedies would include but not be limited to removal of file letter, change of grade, or submitting new or revised work.

Time Limits:

The procedure herein defined must be initiated within a reasonable period (usually a semester) after the event, which is the subject of the grievance.

Procedure - Informal:
Step one: The student attempts to resolve any academic grievance with the faculty member, department chairperson or other individual or agency involved. If, following this initial attempt at resolution, the student remains convinced that a grievance exists, she or he advances to step 2.

Step two: The student consults the chairperson or division head when appropriate, bringing written documentation of the process to this point. If the student continues to assert that a grievance exists after attempted reconciliation, he or she advances to step 3.

Step three: The student presents the grievance to the dean of the involved school in which the course was offered, bringing to this meeting documentation steps one and two. If the dean's attempts at mediation prove unsuccessful, the student is informed of the right to initiate formal review procedures.

Procedure - Formal:

Step one: If the student still believes that the grievance remains unresolved following these informal procedures, she or he initiates the formal review procedure by making a written request for a formal hearing through the dean to the Academic Vice-President. Such a request should define the grievance and be accompanied by documentation of completion of the informal process. It should also be accompanied by the dean's opinion of the grievance.

Step two: The Academic Vice-President determines whether the grievance merits further attention. If not, the student is so informed. If so, the Academic Vice-President determines whether it is a procedural or competence appeal. If, however, the grievance does merit further attention, the academic vice president determines whether it is a procedural, competence, or academic dishonesty appeal. In addition, in some instances it may be possible for the academic vice president to settle the grievance.

- If it relates to a procedural matter, the Academic Vice President selects a dean (other than the dean of the involved school) to chair a Grievance Committee. (See section on Committee Structure below.)

- If it relates to an academic competence matter, the Academic Vice-President requests from the dean involved the names of two outside experts to serve as a consultant panel in determining the merit of the student's grievance.

- If it relates to an academic dishonesty, the academic vice president will convene a committee comprised of a dean and two faculty chosen by the
process to select faculty members to a Grievance Committee to review
the material and the sanctions.

Step three:

• For procedural appeals, the Grievance Committee takes whatever steps are
deemed appropriate to render a recommendation for resolving the
grievance. The committee adheres to due process procedures analogous to
those in the faculty handbook. (See addendum #1.)

• For competence appeals, the Academic Vice-President contacts the
outside panel members and requests that they review the case in relation to
its content validity.

• For academic honesty appeals, the academic vice president will
request that the committee present a written report of their findings
relating to the validity of the charge and the sanctions.

Step four: The recommendation from either the Grievance Committee or
the panel is forwarded to the Academic Vice President in written form,
accompanied, if necessary, by any supporting data that formed the basis of the
recommendation.

Step five: The Academic Vice-President renders a final and binding
judgment, notifying all involved parties. If the grievance involves a dispute over
a course grade given by a faculty member, the Academic Vice-President is the
only university official empowered to change that grade, and then only at the
recommendation of the committee or panel.

Structure of the Student Grievance Committee:

The structure of the Student Academic Grievance Committee will be the
same as the existing Academic Honesty Committee, as follows:

- Two faculty members to be selected from a standing panel of eight
faculty members elected by the general faculty. The faculty member against
whom the grievance has been directed will propose four names from that panel;
the student will strike two of those names, and the two remaining faculty
members will serve.

- Two students to be selected from a standing panel of eight students
elected by the student government. The student(s) (grievant(s)) will propose four
names from that panel; the faculty will strike two of those names, the two
remaining students will serve.
In the event that any faculty member or student selected through the foregoing process is unable to meet, another elected member of the panel will serve as an alternate.

The committee will be chaired by a dean (other than the dean of the involved College/School) to be selected by the Academic Vice-President. The dean so selected will have no vote except in the event of a tie, and will be responsible for overseeing the selection of the review committee, convening and conducting the committee meetings, and preparing the committee's report(s) and other appropriate documentation.

The election of committee members should take into account the possibility of the need for response on 24-hour notice (particularly at the time of commencement), and availability should, in such instances, be a prime consideration in committee member selection.

Addendum #1

**DUE PROCESS PROCEDURE**

a. Both the student and the faculty member shall have the right to be present and to be accompanied by a personal advisor or counsel throughout the hearing.

b. Both the student and the faculty member shall have the right to present and examine witnesses and to cross-examine witnesses.

c. The administration shall make available to both the student and the faculty member such authority as it may possess to require the presence of witnesses.

d. The hearing committee shall promptly and forthrightly adjudicate the issues.

e. The full text of the findings and conclusions of the hearing committee shall be made available in identical form and at the same time to both the student and the faculty member. The cost shall be met by the university.

f. In the absence of a defect in procedure, recommendations shall be made to the Academic Vice-President by the committee as to possible action in the case.

g. At any time should the basis for an informal hearing appear, the procedure may become informal in nature.

Adapted from the Faculty Handbook
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Academic Grievance
Procedures for review of academic grievance protect the rights of students, faculty, and the University by providing mechanisms for equitable problem solving.

A grievance is defined as a complaint of unfair treatment for which a specific remedy is sought. It excludes circumstances that may give rise to a complaint for which explicit redress is neither called for nor sought, or for which other structures within the University serve as an agency for resolution.

Academic grievances relate to procedural appeals or to academic competence appeals, or to issues of academic dishonesty. Procedural appeals are defined as those seeking a remedy where no issue of the quality of the student’s work is involved. For example, a student might contend that the professor failed to follow previously announced mechanisms of evaluation.

Academic competence appeals are defined as those seeking a remedy because the evaluation of the quality of a student's work in a course is disputed. Remedies would include but not be limited to awarded grade changes, such as permission to take make-up examinations or to repeat courses without penalty.

Academic dishonesty appeals are defined as those seeking a remedy because of a dispute over whether plagiarism or cheating occurred. Remedies would include but not be limited to removal of file letter, change of grade, or submitting new or revised work.

The procedure defined here must be initiated within one semester after the event that is the subject of the grievance.

Informal Procedure

Step one: The student attempts to resolve any academic grievance with the faculty member, department chairperson or other individual or agency involved. If, following this initial attempt at resolution, the student remains convinced that a grievance exists, she or he advances to step 2.

Step two: The student consults the chair, or other individuals when appropriate, bringing written documentation of the process up to this point. If the student continues to assert that a grievance exists after attempted reconciliation, he or she advances to step 3.

Step three: The student presents the grievance to the dean of the school in which the course was offered, bringing to this meeting documentation of steps one and two. If the dean’s attempts at mediation prove unsuccessful, the student is informed of the right to initiate formal review procedures.

Formal Procedure
*Step one:* If the student still believes that the grievance remains unresolved following informal procedures, she or he initiates the formal review procedure by making a written request through the dean of the school in which the course was offered for a formal hearing in the academic vice president’s office. Such a request should define the grievance and be accompanied by documentation of completion of the informal process. It should also be accompanied by the dean’s opinion of the grievance.

*Step two:* The academic vice president determines whether the grievance merits further attention. If not, the student is so informed. If, however, the grievance does merit further attention, the academic vice president determines whether it is a procedural, competence, or academic dishonesty appeal. In addition, in some instances it may be possible for the academic vice president to settle the grievance.

- If it relates to a procedural matter, the academic vice president selects a dean (other than the dean of the involved school) to chair a grievance committee. *(The structure of the committee is outlined in the Journal of Record maintained by the Secretary of the General Faculty.)*

- If it relates to an academic competence matter, the academic vice president requests from the dean involved the names of two outside experts to serve as a consultant panel in determining the merit of the student’s grievance.

- If it relates to an academic dishonesty, the academic vice president will convene a committee comprised of a dean and two faculty members from outside the department in which the course was offered chosen by the process to select faculty members to a Grievance Committee to review the material and the sanctions.

In addition, in some instances it may be possible for the academic vice president to settle the grievance.

*Step three:*

- *(Bulleted now)* For procedural appeals, the Grievance Committee takes whatever steps are deemed appropriate to render a recommendation for resolving the grievance. The committee adheres to due process procedures analogous to those in the faculty handbook.

- For competence appeals, the academic vice president contacts the outside panel members and requests that they review the case in relation to its content validity.

- For academic honesty appeals, the academic vice president will request that the committee present a written report of their findings relating to the validity of the charge and the sanctions.
*Step four:* The recommendation from either the grievance committee or the panel is forwarded to the academic vice president in written form, accompanied, if necessary, by any supporting data that formed the basis of the recommendation.

*Step five:* The academic vice president renders a final and binding judgment, notifying all involved parties. If the grievance involves a dispute over a course grade given by a faculty member, the academic vice president is the only university official empowered to change that grade, and then only at the recommendation of the committee or panel.