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 October 3, 2005 (attached)
   b. Correspondence
   c. Oral Reports

4. Council Committee Reports.
   a. Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Academic Freedom and Free Expression (attachment)

5. Petitions for immediate hearing.

6. Old Business.

7. New business
   a. Handbook Change from Rank and Tenure Committee (attachment)
   b. Proposal for restructuring the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees (attachment)
   c. Proposal for a Masters of Science in Nursing: Nurse Anesthesia (materials sent under separate cover)

8. Adjournment

Attachments
- For item 3.a. Draft minutes of AC meeting 10/3/2005 (p. 1-3)
- For item 4. Report of Committee on Academic Freedom and Free Expression (p. 4-10)
- For item 7.a. Handbook change from Rank and Tenure Committee (p. 11-12)
- For item 7.b. Proposal for restructuring the Conference Committee (p.13)

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.

Administrators: A.V.P. Grossman, Deans Hadjimichael, Novotny, Simoes, Snyder, Solomon, Wilson

The meeting was called to order at 3:33 pm.

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

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty
The Secretary reported that: the next faculty meeting is 10/28; all committees are at full strength except for a one-semester opening for someone from the School of Business on the UCC; all committees have elected chairs except for the Library and Athletics committees which are scheduled to meet and elect chairs this week. Once all committees are fully staffed and have chairs, the faculty directories will be printed and distributed.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
   a) The Executive Secretary reported on ongoing agenda item number 1. Correspondence from the AVP indicates conflicts between athletic events and final exams on 12/14 and 12/17.
   b) Approval of minutes of meeting of April 4, 2005: Prof. Mulvey, who had constructed the minutes because the Recording Secretary, Prof. Winn, had not turned in minutes, asked which Deans, besides Snyder, had attended this meeting. Deans Solomon and Novotny said that they had also been present. Prof. DeWitt thanked Mulvey for her work on these minutes. Motion (O’Neill/Haug) to approve passed.
   c) Approval of minutes of meeting of May 2, 2005: AVP Grossman said that the sentence on page 9, “Perhaps what is needed is looking at areas that the AVP missed that require attention” should be deleted because it was misleading. The issue is that some items had not been sent to the AVP, rather than that the AVP missed them. He asked to delete that sentence. With that change, Motion (O’Neill/Ligas) to approve passed, 10-0-4.
   d) Approval of minutes of meeting of September 13, 2005: Prof. O’Neill indicated that the third person accidentally replaced with computerese on page 13 was Joan von Hise. Dean Solomon said that in the middle of the third paragraph on page 15, the phrase “which also might cause a project to be multiply supported” should read “which also might cause a faculty member to be multiply supported”. Regarding the last line on page 14 prior to the President’s arrival, Prof. Rakowitz pointed out that she had said a faculty member who “negotiated 3 or 4 years of prior service should (rather than would) be eligible…”. With these changes, Motion (Steffen/Haug) to approve passed, 13-0-1.

4. Council Committee Reports: Subcommittee on Academic Grievance
Prof. Lang introduced the report by noting that there are a variety of policy statements in the Journal of Record (JOR), including statements on academic grievance, dependent leave, maternity leave, etc., that end up in other documents like the Catalogue or the Benefits Handbook. At some point, the origins of the statements may be lost, and then, when the other documents are edited, the policy standards laid out in the JOR may be changed. He suggested that policy statements transferred from the JOR to other documents be marked in some way to make it obvious that they cannot be casually edited.
Lang then went on to explain the committee’s process. Rather than simply insisting that the Catalogue language revert to JOR language, they looked at each discrepancy and made a recommendation regarding each, sometimes suggesting maintaining JOR language, and sometimes suggesting changes to the JOR. The packet includes a list of the discrepancies and the committee’s recommendations. Recommendations to maintain the JOR language don’t require a vote because they simply affirm current policy. Recommendations to adopt the Catalogue language in place of the JOR language require Council approval of the policy change.

Motion (Lang/O’Neill) to accept the changes recommended in the document.
Prof. Dohm suggested that we review and, if necessary, discuss, each item, prior to voting on the motion. The following discussion refers to pages 24-26 in the packet.

- Subsection headings: no objections
- Use of she or he: no objections
- Rerowing of “purpose”: no objections
- Prof. Haug asked that references to “academic competence” be changed to “academic/professional competence”. After a brief discussion, the chair ruled this request out of order.
- Adding “academic dishonesty”: no objections
- Explaining academic dishonesty: no objections
- Time limit: Dean Snyder asked why more than a semester might be required. He thought it problematic for students to be able to begin a complaint several years after an incident. Lang responded that the JOR language, which uses a semester as a guideline rather than a mandate, should give administrators leeway to object to a several year old complaint. But the committee felt that there could be extenuating circumstances requiring more than a semester, like study abroad. Dean Solomon noted that the Catalogue language of “must be initiated” could just mean sending notification that a complaint would be filed, and that would be easy enough to do despite study abroad. He too preferred the clarity of the Catalogue language in fairness to faculty and students. Lang pointed out that under the Catalogue wording, a student who wanted to file a grievance regarding a test given at the beginning of a semester would have to do so at the beginning of the following semester. Prof. Steffen extended the hypothetical case by imagining a student in a 2-semester course with a grievance arising during the first semester and therefore needing to be initiated during the second semester of the same course. Prof. Yarrington argued that students should be given a clear deadline, and then it should be up to them to negotiate extensions of that deadline with the Dean. Mulvey responded that the Catalogue language allows no room for negotiation. She then reminded the Council that the current policy is instantiated in the JOR language, and therefore, a motion would be required to change the policy to match the Catalogue language. Grossman said that he would like advice from the University attorney regarding which would be a better policy from a legal standpoint. Lang suggested that procedurally, a motion could be made to amend the policy to the Catalogue’s version, and then the Council’s recommendation could go forward to the attorney. DeWitt argued against such a motion, noting that broader issues were involved. For example, faculty do not currently have a timeline for making accusations of academic dishonesty, and so could hold off such an accusation for a semester in order to avoid a grievance. Dohm asked whether anyone had a motion to offer, and no one responded.
- Consulting the chair: no objections
- Clarification of relevant Dean: no objections
- Formal procedure, step 1: Snyder worried that this wording would be inconsistent with the previous clarification if a student from one school takes a course in another. Lang explained that the target Dean ought to be clear in the context of the prior sentence; the change here was concerned with the notion of a hearing being held in the AVP's office. Prof. Lange wondered whether the student’s dean would know of a grievance involving another school, and Snyder said that that information is shared. No further objections were raised.
- Formal procedure, step 2: no objections
- Consistency of bullets: no objections
- Reference to committee structure for grievance: Grossman said that he would prefer that students have access to the full procedure without having to go to the JOR. Lang explained that the committee had suggested two possible courses of action, and Grossman’s comment would favor the first (i.e., including the committee structure in the Catalogue). Motion (DeWitt/Keenan) to accept the first option in the committee’s recommendation on this point, passed 17-0-0
- Addition of bullet on dishonesty: Snyder commented that this was an important change because there isn’t currently a policy in the JOR on academic dishonesty. There were no objections.
- Statement on AVP settlement: no objections
• Bulleting change: no objections
• Adding academic honesty appeals: Motion (O’Neill/Steffen) to change “honesty” to “dishonesty,” passed 15-0-0.
• Snyder pointed out that the first and third bullets on page 18 of the packet are ambiguous regarding which Dean will serve on the committee. He suggested that those paragraphs should follow reference to the Dean with, parenthetically, “other than the Dean of the school in which the course was offered”. Motion (O’Neill/Ligas) to make the change suggested by Snyder, passed 16-0-0. Dean Wilson wondered whether the texts need to be reviewed more carefully for those sorts of discrepancies. Mulvey said that she would double check in preparing the texts. Wilson also asked whether the academic honesty document from the Dean of Freshmen’s office had been checked, but Dohm said that that was beyond the subcommittee’s charge.

As amended, the motion to accept the subcommittee’s recommendations passed, 16-0-0

Snyder asked whether the Catalogue will now follow from the newly revised JOR, and whether something will go to the Dean of Freshmen for consistency, as well as to the other Deans and relevant Vice Presidents. Mulvey echoed Lang’s preamble about the need to maintain JOR policy as JOR language gets transferred to different documents. DeWitt indicated that he would send the grievance information to the appropriate administrators, including the Dean of Students.

5. Petitions for immediate hearing: none

6. Old Business: none

7. New Business
   a) Review of distribution of Council seats (Pending Item C): Mulvey explained that with the addition of BEI, there was a concern about the representation of engineering faculty on committees, so the initial policy was that engineering faculty would be eligible for any math/science slot on committees. The understanding was that this policy would be reviewed later, and it may now be time for such a review. Motion (Lang/O’Neill) that a three person committee be formed to recommend a distribution of Council seats keeping the Council approximately at its current size and, as far as possible, giving proportional representation to the current schools, passed 16-0-0.
   b) Motion (DeWitt/Keenan) to reorder the agenda to take up 7d next, passed 14-0-1.
   c) Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees: Prof. Lakeland explained that it is customary for the Council to advise the Committee on Conference about agenda items, but the timing is difficult because the Trustees are meeting this Thursday, and the agenda was provisionally set prior to the first Council meeting. The current agenda includes: discussion of the incoming class enrollment and financial aid; discussion of the strategic plan; and an ongoing item listed as Board/Faculty relations. He asked whether there were other issues. Snyder suggested that it might be worth accompanying the incoming student data with information about the new faculty. Grossman explained that he does that. Wilson mentioned the support of the entire faculty for the 55 students from New Orleans. Grossman said that the President will tell the entire Board about that.
   d) Subcommittee to consider Handbook descriptions of non-tenured positions. Mulvey said that this issue appeared and disappeared sometime last year, but she thought there should be a three person subcommittee to look at the Handbook and at current practices for compliance with the Handbook. DeWitt/Greenberg moved such a committee, consisting of DeWitt, Lang, and Snyder. There was some discussion of including representation from the professional schools, but DeWitt said he didn’t think that was necessary because the committee would just be looking for discrepancies, and reporting them back to the Council. Motion passed 15-0-1.
   e) Discussion of the Strategic Plan: Mulvey announced her intentions to put the Strategic Plan on the General Faculty agenda for 10/28.

8. Motion (Greenberg/Lang) to adjourn, 5 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Rakowitz
Preamble:

The sub-committee on academic freedom (AFC) was established by the Academic Council in the spring of 2005 in the following motion: “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.”

The membership of the committee was:
Professors Bowen, Calderwood, Gordon and L. Katz.
Academic Vice-President Grossman and Mr. Mark Reed, Associate Vice-President for Student Services and Dean of Students.
Ms. Jessica Dibuono and Mr. William Entwistle.
Professor Lakeland (chair).

The committee held multiple meetings in May, June and July, and reconvened in September and October for a further series of meetings. The following were some of the guiding principles we employed in drafting this set of recommendations.

1. The definition of academic freedom was worded in such a way that it expressed the compatibility between the values of academic freedom and those of Catholicism as expressed in the University mission statement, respecting the freedom of all faculty, regardless of attachment to the Catholic tradition. In redrafting the definition we were guided in our general views about academic freedom by the various policies of the AAUP, particularly the 1940 statement as amended in 1970.

2. We were deeply concerned to clarify the limits of administrative discretion to act to suspend the normal principles of academic freedom or freedom of expression. We informally conducted research on intrusions into academic freedom, and we found little evidence of infringements of academic freedom where faculty are concerned. With particular reference to student life, however, we identified a number of informal ways in which freedom of expression is limited or influenced, for example, in the approval of posters or lack of clarity over the ways in which fire code restrictions concerning posted materials could be enforced. This university is extremely homogenous in terms of race, class, and religion, and it is already difficult for those with minority views or those who are in some fashion marginalized within the university to feel free to express their thoughts. For that reason we felt it particularly incumbent upon us to see that expression is not censored on the basis of the tastes and preferences of the university authorities. We believe strongly that there should be very few circumstances in which the administration should act to censor any form of expression, and those are mostly limited to expressions that violate the law, or violate the university's harassment policy. We feel that this is an important enough matter that the burden of proof that a particular curtailment of freedom of expression is appropriate should lie with the administration, rather than with the student.

3. Resolution of Disputes. While there is a broad consensus supporting academic freedom at Fairfield, there are nevertheless times when disputes over specific applications of the term can lead to serious conflict that is harmful to the parties involved and disruptive to the academic mission of the University. We therefore suggest the creation of a process for resolving disputes over academic freedom issues in a timely, fair and collegial manner, based on enhanced communication of the interests and concerns of all parties. The core of the process is mediation, in which a neutral third party, or mediator, facilitates the efforts of the main parties to reach an agreement. The mediator has no authority to, and should not, make a decision on the merits of the dispute. This process has proven itself effective in many organizational settings. Its success, however, depends on the skill of the mediator. Therefore we recommend a training program in order to create a group of persons who are able and willing to assist in such disputes.
4. Transparency and fairness. Our overriding concern was to establish principles that are transparent, fair, and consistently applied, in accordance with procedures that provide the opportunity for notice and hearing, and mechanisms that seek to resolve issues before they escalate. We believe that it is inconsistent with the university’s mission statement, as well as with basic principles of academic freedom, to permit arbitrary restrictions on speech or interventions that are ill-informed, policies that are inconsistently applied, or practices that undermine the cohesiveness of the university community.
A. Statement on Academic Freedom

The AFC recommends adoption of the following statement on academic freedom, and that it be placed in the Faculty and Student Handbooks, and used wherever in the university a statement on academic freedom is needed or thought desirable.

The statement on academic freedom, as formulated in the 1940 Statement of Principles endorsed by the AAUP and incorporating the 1970 interpretive comments, is the policy of Fairfield University. Academic freedom and responsibility are here defined as the liberty and obligation to study, to investigate, to present and interpret, and to discuss facts and ideas concerning all branches and fields of learning. Academic freedom is limited only by generally accepted standards of responsible scholarship and by respect for the Catholic commitment of the institution as expressed in its mission statement, which provides that Fairfield University "welcomes those of all beliefs and traditions who share its concerns for scholarship, justice, truth and freedom, and… values the diversity which their membership brings to the university community."

The AFC recommends that the following language be employed in the context of faculty contracts:

The University and the Faculty Member agree to uphold the rights and responsibilities of academic freedom, as formulated in the 1940 Statement of Principles endorsed by the AAUP and incorporating the 1970 interpretive comments. Academic freedom and responsibility are here defined as the liberty and obligation to study, to investigate, to present and interpret, and to discuss facts and ideas concerning all branches and fields of learning. No limitations are implied other than those required by general accepted standards of responsible scholarship and by respect for the Catholic commitment of the institution as expressed in its mission statement. This statement provides that Fairfield University “welcomes those of all beliefs and traditions who share its concern for scholarship, justice, truth and freedom, and it values the diversity which their membership brings to the university community.”

B. Academic Freedom and Students

Our committee makes the following recommendations on the role of academic freedom and freedom of expression relative to students.

Recommendation 1: Revised statement on students’ academic freedom

Academic institutions exist for the transmission of knowledge, pursuit of truth, development of students, and the general well being of society. Free inquiry and free expression are indispensable to the attainment of these goals. Fairfield University recognizes that academic freedom and responsibility, for students and faculty members, are required to realize the essential purposes of the University. Academic freedom and responsibility are here defined as the liberty and obligation to study, to investigate, to present, interpret, and discuss facts and ideas concerning all branches and fields of learning.

As constituents of the academic community, students should be free, individually and collectively, to express their views on issues of institutional policy and on matters of general interest to the student body.

College and university students are both citizens and members of the academic community. As citizens, students should enjoy the same freedom of speech, peaceful assembly, and right of petition that other citizens enjoy and, as members of the academic community, they are subject to the obligations which accrue to them
by virtue of this membership. Faculty members and administration officials should ensure that institutional powers are not employed to inhibit such intellectual and personal development of students as is often promoted by their exercise of the rights of citizenship both on and off campus. At the same time, the institution has an obligation to clarify those standards which it considers essential to its educational mission and its community life. These expectations and regulations should represent a reasonable regulation of student conduct, but students should be as free as possible from imposed limitations that have no direct relevance to their education.

**In the classroom**

As members of the academic community, students should be encouraged to develop the capacity for critical judgment and to engage in a sustained and independent search for truth. They do this within the requirements of the curriculum and the courses in which they are enrolled.

The professor in the classroom and in conference should encourage free discussion, inquiry, and expression. Student performance should be evaluated solely on an academic basis, not on opinions or conduct in matters unrelated to academic standards. This means that students are free to take reasoned exception to the data or views offered in any course of study and to reserve judgment about matters of opinion, but they are responsible for learning the content of any course of study for which they are enrolled. Students in professional programs are expected to understand and uphold the standards required in their profession.

**Outside the classroom**

Students bring to the campus a variety of interests previously acquired and develop many new interests as members of the academic community. They should be free to organize and join associations to promote their common interests. Students and student organizations should be free to examine and discuss all questions of interest to them and to express opinions publicly and privately. Students should be allowed to invite and to hear any person of their own choosing. Those routine procedures required by an institution before a guest speaker is invited to appear on campus should be designed only to ensure that there is orderly scheduling of facilities and adequate preparation for the event, and that the occasion is conducted in a manner appropriate to an academic community.

Students’ academic freedom extends to their ability to express their opinions in writing or through electronic means, and to distribute and post materials expressing their opinions. Any restrictions should be designed only to ensure the orderly use of space and facilities, or to provide reasonable restrictions on commercial messages.

Students should always be free to support causes by orderly means which do not disrupt the regular and essential operations of the institution. At the same time, it should be made clear to the academic and larger community that in their public expressions or demonstrations students or student organizations speak only for themselves.

**Recommendation 2: Placement of the statement**

We recommend that the revised statement on students’ academic freedom, follow the Mission Statement in the Student Handbook and be followed by this sentence:

“All policies in this Handbook are subject to the Mission Statement and the statement on academic freedom.”
Additionally we recommend that the statement be repeated in the “policies and procedures” section of the Student Handbook.

Recommendation 3: Identifying conflicts with the statement on students’ academic freedom

We identified the following policies in the Handbook that appear inconsistent with the proposed statement on students’ academic freedom. We recommend revision of those policies.

p. 51: Posting and Distribution

Because the free expression of ideas is an essential part of academic freedom, individual students and organizations are generally free to post and distribute information. We additionally make the following specific recommendations:

1. That there be no requirement for prior approval of postings. Instead, all postings will remain subject to the various rules as to place and size, restrictions on commercial postings, and the like, and other provisions for the safe and orderly use of facilities, and postings in violation of those rules may be removed.

2. That posters or flyers may not be removed by university administration except for limited reasons:

   a. Fire Code: To the extent that the Fire Code prohibits materials from being posted in certain locations, the administration must enforce those restrictions consistently and without regard to the content of the materials.

   b. Building maintenance: To the extent that cleaning and building maintenance requires the removal of posted materials, this must be done without regard to the words, pictures, or other content of the materials.

3. That the administration may not remove or prohibit the posting of materials, nor may it restrict or prohibit speakers or presentations on campus, based upon tastes, preferences, or religious or political beliefs. There are only two circumstances in which the administration may remove posted materials based upon their content:

   a. The administration may remove a poster or flyer if the administrator can demonstrate that there is a strong likelihood that it is in violation of the law. The Administration must demonstrate this to the University Council, and at that time the student or group posting the flyer must also be given the opportunity to be heard on the matter.

   b. The administration may remove a poster or flyer if the administrator can demonstrate that there is a strong likelihood that it is in violation of the university’s policy on harassment. The Administration must demonstrate this to the University Council, and at that time the student or group posting the flyer must also be given the opportunity to be heard on the matter.

p. 84 Windows/Doors

We recommend that the policy restricting students from posting material on their windows or doors be withdrawn, except for the prohibition on stickers placed on windows or doors. To the extent that fire codes prohibit postings, any restrictions shall be applied without regard to content. The anti harassment rules on p. 47 are sufficient as a way to discourage hostile posting.

p. 97 Co-Sponsorship

We make the following recommendations:
1. That the co-sponsorship policy should be moved to and incorporated into the section on speaker policy, and the whole amended as follows:

**Speaker Policy**

Fairfield University is committed to providing an academic environment that encourages students to seek truth, develop critical thinking, and make responsible decisions that influence their lives and the greater community in which they live. Therefore student organizations are encouraged to sponsor lectures and speakers, including individuals from outside the University community. Co-sponsorship of events is another means of contributing to the realization of these goals.

Co-sponsorship of student programs or events by individuals or groups not affiliated with the University, whether in the form of financial sponsorship, or support and assistance in the planning and promulgation of a university sponsored event, may be permitted, subject to limitations, including but not limited to the following.

The “locus of control” for an event must remain at all times with the student organization and its advisor, in cooperation with the Office of Student Life and University Activities. It is the dual responsibility of both the organization and the advisor to be advised about, and maintain control of all media, communications, and promotions of an event and ensure compliance with all policies governing student’s organizations and events. A co-sponsorship relationship that contravenes law or University policy is prohibited.

The procedures generally required before students may invite a speaker… (Speaker policy continues here as on p. 103 of the Student Handbook.

2. That the final determination of compliance be referred to the dispute resolution policy we recommend below.

*p. 102 Publicity*

The language in this section should be made consistent with any revisions to the language in the section on *Posting and Distribution*.

*p. 103 Responsibilities and Privileges*

We have some concerns with responsibility #2, which requires the submission of the active club membership for the current academic semester or year. We are concerned about clarifying how the membership list of student clubs are or could be used, particularly in times of increased scrutiny. Anonymous membership is sometimes necessary for free assembly and for maintaining the right to privacy and to free assembly. The policy needs some further thought.

*p. 103 Speaker Policy*

We recommend eliminating paragraph 3 of this section, which recommends that “strong consideration be given on an event by event basis to the advisability of apprising audience members whenever there are opposing views, generally, including means by which audience members may gain access to learning more about these opposing views.” While the University as an institution has a responsibility to present a range of viewpoints, individual presenters need not do so. Even to suggest otherwise is to inhibit the full expression of completely legitimate views and information.
Overall

We recommend that all information about student events be listed in one place in the Handbook to make it easier for individuals and organizations to know and comply with policies. An alphabetical index at the end of the Handbook would also help students identify policies that govern these areas.

C. Academic Freedom – Resolution of Disputes

Because disputes can arise over specific applications of the term Academic Freedom that can lead to serious conflict that is harmful to the parties involved and disruptive to the academic mission of the University, we suggest the creation of a process for resolving such disputes in a timely, fair and collegial manner.

a. Criteria:
   1. Full participation and an opportunity to be heard by all interested parties.
   2. Discussion and mediation by skilled facilitators who will assist the parties in resolving the dispute.
   3. A final decision by an administrator at the level of Vice President or the President, who is not involved in the underlying dispute.

b. Process

Step One: Any individual or group claiming a violation of academic freedom should report the claim to an appropriate person, who shall be:
   a. For faculty, a chair, academic dean or other person designated by the Academic Vice President
   b. For students, an academic chair, a club advisor, FUSA advisor, department head or other person designated by the Dean of Students.

Step Two. If the claim is unresolved, the interested parties shall participate in mediation, facilitated by a person skilled in mediation and conflict resolution, to be agreed upon by the parties.

Step Three: If mediation does not resolve the dispute, it shall be decided by the Academic Vice President or the Vice President of Student Services or their designee, after hearing the concerns of all interested parties. Decisions shall be made in conformance with University rules and policies regarding Academic Freedom. The decision should be by an administrator not involved in the underlying dispute. The person invoking this process may indicate that a timely decision is necessary. In that case Step One shall take place within three days, Step Two within seven days, and Step Three within ten days of the initial reporting of the claim.

Waiver of any step or any time limit requires the agreement of all parties.

We also recommend that the University provide mediation training to a selected group of interested students, faculty and staff.
PROPOSED NEW WORDING FOR THE FACULTY HANDBOOK’S FACULTY POLICIES

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

Current wording:

b) *four* years experience in the rank of assistant professor

Proposed wording:

b) *five* years experience in the rank of assistant professor

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

(3) *That the candidate for tenure shall have served a probationary period of not less than five years in the academic profession, not less than two years of which shall have been served at Fairfield University*
Faculty/Trustees Interaction
A Proposal for Restructuring
Draft
Revised 10/28/05

Preamble:
In the Fall of 2004 President von Arx indicated his wish for closer involvement between Trustees and members of the faculty. Since then the Conference Committee meets with Academic Affairs Committee of the Trustees for the entirety of their two-hour meeting four times a year whereas before that time the faculty committee was only admitted for the second half of the meeting, to bring its own agenda items to the Trustees. The faculty are expected to participate fully in discussion of the published agenda, on which both Trustees and Faculty can place items for consideration. In Fall 2004 the president also expressed his wish to incorporate faculty on other sub-committees of the Trustees (they are Finance, Technology, Development, Student Affairs). To date, this has not happened.

While it seems likely that faculty in general would consider that increased contact between us and the Trustees is beneficial to the institution, the reorganization has perhaps inadvertently revealed the complexity of the two roles faculty on the Conference Committee are expected to play. The Trustees look to the faculty for their experience and wisdom in a general discussion of issues of university academic policy that come before them. For example, the first meeting every year looks at the statistics of the incoming class and often gets into questions of financial aid and so on. The faculty, while they are presumably not averse to engaging in these general discussions, see themselves as there primarily to act at the behest of the Academic Council to bring matters of general concern to the faculty to the attention of the Trustees.

In the light of the need to clarify these two faculty roles and on the assumption that wider involvement in Trustees sub-committees is desirable, the following proposal for re-structuring the Conference Committee is offered for discussion. It would require a Handbook Amendment.

Proposal:
1. The Conference Committee shall be composed of six individuals elected by the faculty to serve as faculty representatives on the sub-committees of the Board of Trustees. The faculty shall elect two to serve on the Academic Affairs Subcommittee, and one each to serve on the subcommittees on Finance, Development, Student Affairs and Technology. The Conference Committee shall meet as a faculty committee in the normal way, under the guidance of the Academic Council, and the different members will meet with the subcommittees of the Board of Trustees on which they have respectively been elected to serve.
2. The tasks of the Conference Committee members shall be:
   a. To meet together periodically to keep one another abreast of developments on the different Trustees subcommittees.
   b. To serve as the voice of the General Faculty on the respective subcommittees, acting under the guidance of the Academic Council, and placing items on the subcommittee agendas as directed by the Council;
   c. To participate in the meetings of the Trustees’ subcommittees, bringing their individual experience and wisdom to bear upon the entire agenda.
3. When a matter of particular serious moment, as determined by the Academic Council and/or the General Faculty, needs to be brought to the Trustees, the Academic Council Executive Officers should collectively appear before the relevant subcommittee, together with the elected faculty representative(s).

Why the proposed changes?
1. Wider faculty representation is a desirable goal.
2. At present there is a faculty voice only on the academic affairs subcommittee of the Board.
3. The Conference Committee as currently constituted has divided and sometimes confusing responsibilities, and its relationship to the Council is not always managed effectively.
4. On matters of real seriousness, the Executive Officers of the Academic Council are usually better-informed about the issues than is the membership of the Conference Committee.