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 November 7, 2005 (attached)
   b. Correspondence
   c. Oral Reports

4. Council Committee Reports.

5. Petitions for immediate hearing.

6. Old Business.
   a. Proposal for a new track in the Graduate Nursing Program: Nurse Anesthesia (materials sent under separate cover)
   b. Follow-up to Petition for Immediate Hearing (AC May 2005) re items in the Journal of Record that may not have been sent to the administration (attachments)

7. New business
   a. Motion from EPC re course offerings listed for the 2 upcoming semesters (attachment)
   b. Reviewing text of a new edition of the Faculty Handbook
   c. Evacuation Procedures for Individuals with Disabilities (attachment)

8. Adjournment

Attachments
- For item 3.a: Draft minutes of AC meeting 11/7/2005 (pages 1-5)
- For item 6.b: Memo from GFS to AVP of 11/3/2005; Memo from AVP to GFS of 11/12/2005; Memo from GFS to AVP of 11/15/2005; Email from AVP to GFS of 11/15/2005 (pages 6-21).
- For item 7.a: Memo from EPC with motion (page 22)
- For item 7.c: Email from D. Ryan-Soderlund of 9/16/2005 (page 23-24); see also http://www.brandonu.ca/Administration/HumanResources/Safety/safety3d.htm

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.

Academic Council Minutes of 7 November 2005 (3:32-5:07 p.m. in CNS 209)

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

Administrators Attending (4): AVP Grossman, Deans Novotny, Snyder, Solomon

Absent (4): Deans Hadjimichael, Simões, Wilson; Professor Haug

Regrets: (1): Yarrington

Guests (1): Dennin

The meeting was called to order at 3:32 p.m.

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

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty: Mulvey reported that, as mandated by the Academic Council in May 2005 with regard to the Petition for Immediate Hearing brought to the Council by the AVP, a list of items in the Journal of Record that may not have been submitted to the administration for approval or rejection has been sent to AVP Grossman and it is expected that he will respond to the Executive Committee within the 15 day time limit specified in the Journal of Record

3. Report from the Executive Secretary: DeWitt requested an approval of minutes.

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of 3 October 2005. Motion: O’Neill; Seconded: Ligas. Minor Correction: Professor Lakeland pointed out that Professor van Hise’s name was misspelled on page 1, section 3d, line 2. Vote: 14-0-0. Passed

4. Council Committee Reports:

   a) Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Academic Freedom and Free Expression.

Lakeland provided an overview of the report sent simultaneously to the AC and President von Arx regarding issues of academic freedom and free expression. The report contains modified language drafted to provide guarantees of academic freedom for all sectors of the University and to ensure consistency between the Faculty Handbook and the Student Handbook. While academic freedom has not been a concern among most faculty, Lakeland suggested that steps should be taken to ensure the protection of students. Lakeland reviewed several inconsistencies in the two documents and explained the process in which the corrections were proposed. Discussion followed.

Referring to the student event that prompted this report, Steffen asked how circumstances surrounding the event might have turned out differently given the proposed changes. Lakeland replied that student affairs policies are often written quickly to address specific problems; whereas, faculty tend to contemplate its policies for years. He stressed the need to shift the burden of proof away from students and place it on the student-affairs administration that may oppose student actions or events. To Steffen’s question, Grossman added that “we learned from the experience” and agreed that students need broadly-defined free expression and academic freedom. He also said that it was necessary to understand connections and differences between academic freedom and free expression.

Steffen expressed concern that, according to current policies, students are required to supply club membership lists and said that this existing policy was “chilling.” He explained that such a policy would not matter to 90% of the student clubs, but for the remaining 10%, it could impact free expression. Lakeland said that Steffen’s concern was...
shared but that funding issues necessitated the policy. While the policy may need review, funding is assigned to clubs based on student membership. Snyder confirmed the process, pointing out the importance of being able to confirm “real” membership numbers so that monies can be distributed fairly.

Motion by DeWitt: “The Council directs the Executive Committee to work with the Chair of the Subcommittee on Academic Freedom and Free Expression to draft appropriate motions to facilitate implementation of the Subcommittee’s recommendations.” Seconded by Rakowitz. Vote: 15-0-0. Passed.

5. Petitions for Immediate Hearing: none

6. Old Business: none

7. New Business: The Chair and Executive Secretary suggested that the sequence of agenda items be slightly reordered to accommodate Dennin’s schedule. There were no objections. The sequence of items that follows is presented chronologically; however, the letters that precede each item (i.e., a, b, c) indicate the sequence as listed on the agenda.

b) Proposal for Restructuring the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees.

Lakeland summarized the proposal and asked the AC to give permission to the Conference Committee so that it can begin discussions with the Board of Trustees about restructuring the Conference Committee. Lakeland expressed his wishes to improve faculty-trustee interactions and explained that the Conference Committee wants guidance from the AC regarding this matter.

Lakeland summarized the one-year history of the proposal, beginning with President von Arx’s expressed interest in broader faculty representation on five subcommittees involving the Board of Trustees (e.g., student affairs, technology). Currently, there is faculty representation on only one of the five subcommittees. Thus, the Conference Committee seeks feedback from the AC on the proposal to add faculty to the Conference Committee. This proposal is in response to increased access in the past year on the part of the faculty to members of the Board of Trustees. With the permission of the AC, Lakeland will ask for this topic to be placed on the agenda for an upcoming meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. Discussion followed.

Lang pointed out that a new structure would help faculty have a voice on important issues and gain access to settings “where serious decisions are made.” Lakeland added that it would also provide the AC with more advanced notice when decisions were made by the Board of Trustees. Snyder pointed out that this change would also allow the Board of Trustees to get a better idea of issues important to faculty, but that having a single faculty member on each subcommittee may provide the trustees with a limited perspective on faculty interests. That is, the University is a complex organization with many perspectives; having just one faculty on each subcommittee would be limiting in terms of representation and expertise. He suggested that faculty representatives for each subcommittee be sent, not from the Conference Committee itself, but from a Faculty Handbook committee most closely related to the subcommittee (e.g., technology).

Lang pointed out that the proposal does not go into that level of detail, but that Snyder’s suggestions are worth considering in the future. Lakeland reiterated the advantages of the trustees having increased access to faculty. He expressed his belief that this is a move in the right direction. Grossman added that it is not only good for the trustees to have increased access to faculty but for faculty to have increased opportunities to understand the decisions of the trustees. Grossman thinks that it would be helpful for faculty to witness the trustee’s decision-making process and share with the General Faculty issues that seem most important to the Board of Trustees.

Motion by DeWitt: “The Council authorizes the Conference Committee to explore informally, with the Board of Trustees, the possibility of restructuring the Conference Committee.” Seconded by Keenan. Vote: 15-0-0. Passed.
a) **Handbook Change from Rank and Tenure Committee** (reordered).

Dennin provided an overview of the Rank and Tenure Committee’s recommended changes to *Faculty Handbook* language. He explained that the language seems inconsistent and illogical. Discussion followed.

DeWitt agreed with the motivation for the proposed change but had concerns about how the new language would affect our traditional policy of allowing faculty to apply for tenure in their fifth or sixth years. DeWitt explained his position, that criterion 1 for tenure (page 24 of the *Faculty Handbook*) requires that a candidate satisfy the criteria for academic rank, hence changing the criteria for rank changes the criteria for tenure. Dennin repeated that members of the Rank and Tenure Committee want candidates to apply for promotion and tenure in the same year, something the current language complicates.

Lakeland voiced his support for the change, saying that DeWitt’s concern seemed to be about whether or not an applicant can count the current year in which the application is submitted towards the minimum years necessary for eligibility. Lakeland said that the current year has always counted towards eligibility. DeWitt suggested that the change be delayed until the General Faculty decides whether or not to pursue a sixth-year “up or out” review. Rakowitz answered that the change is limited to the issue of promotion and does not influence tenure; she concluded that waiting was not necessary. Mulvey asked whether or not the AC should send the proposal back to the Rank and Tenure Committee for clarification.

Lang asked that the possibility of a sixth-year review not be considered in the process of determining if this change to the *Faculty Handbook* should be made. He expressed his belief that “we are not ready” to discuss major changes to the rank and tenure process. **Lang made a motion (see below).** Discussion of the motion followed.

Grossman stated that the current language is “awkward” and “inappropriate.” He expressed his displeasure at the possibility of a candidate applying for tenure and promotion under different standards of criteria (i.e., for promotion under normal criteria in the fourth year, and under extraordinary criteria for tenure in the same year). DeWitt insisted that the language, as it currently exists, is being misinterpreted by the AC. Lakeland said that he was in favor of the motion because “it can’t make things worse.” Steffen spoke against the motion, asking for the proposed change to be sent back to the Rank and Tenure Committee for clarification.

**Motion by Keenan: “Call to Question.” Seconded by Rakowitz. Vote: 12-1-0. Passed.**

**Motion by Lang: “The Council accepts the change to the *Faculty Handbook* as recommended by the Rank and Tenure Committee and forwards the changes to the General Faculty for its consideration.” Seconded by Rakowitz. Vote: 10-2-2. Passed.**

c) **Proposal for a Masters of Science in Nursing: Nurse Anesthesia.**

Lange provided an overview of the proposal and summarized its history. She explained that the partnering organization was seeking alliances, and when the opportunity was presented to the University, the SON was deeply honored. Lange explained that the degree program would begin in January 2007 and that each cohort of 12 students would complete 50 credits for the degree in about 2.5 years, including summers. Discussion followed.

Lang expressed frustration about the proposal itself, pointing out that the lack of page numbers and table of contents made the document difficult to navigate. He also noted that the title used to describe the program’s director was inconsistent, sometimes referred to as a “coordinator” and sometimes as a “director,” making it unclear whether one or two administrators would run the program. Lang also expressed concern that academic rank would be assigned to the administrator. He explained that the Rank and Tenure Committee must give its recommendation for academic rank to the President for the program director, even if this position is not tenure-track.
Novotny insisted that the director’s position was unpaid and that the title is being assigned as a courtesy so that the University can assign office space, ensure the director’s access to curriculum meetings, and so that a requirement can be met for the accrediting agency. Lang pointed out that it is violation of the *Faculty Handbook*. He asked how courses were approved for the program, another topic that seemed to be missing in the proposal. Lange said that the SON has its own curriculum committee, and that courses for the program are subject to approval from both the SON Curriculum Committee and the curriculum committee at the off-campus site. She added that there is cross-membership on these committees.

Novotny said that courses have already been approved and that accreditation dictates exactly which courses must be offered because graduates from the program will be putting hospital patients asleep. She repeated that it is an honor for the University to have been asked to join this partnership. She assured attendees that the curriculum was rigorous and that the application process would be highly competitive. She also asserted that this partnership will help enrollments in the Chemistry and Physics departments in the CAS. She also informed the AC that the program would be reviewed in three years, at which point point decisions could be made regarding its future.

Referring back to a previous concern, Grossman said that the director would be “like an adjunct,” not an administrator with faculty rank. It is merely a courtesy title. Lange added that if the director was not considered faculty, there was a risk of communication breakdown. Lakeland asserted that the director should be called *adjunct assistant professor*.

Mulvey said that courses should have been approved by the SON Curriculum Committee, then the faculty of the SON. She continued to wonder if the courses had undergone appropriate review as outlined in the routing procedure in the Journal of Record. Rakowitz pointed out that, if so, a set of minutes seemed to be missing from the proposal. Mulvey added that minutes from the EPC, which were included, were weak and lacked detail regarding their discussion. Several agreed, saying that they could not tell whether or not the review of courses was discussed adequately to justify the Committee’s recommendation.

Rakowitz and Lang continued to communicate concern about the course approval process, pointing out that the proposal lacked details. It was unclear to Lang which courses would be offered at the University and which ones would be offered off-campus. He pointed out that even if courses are offered off-campus, students would be earning University credit for them, so that made them our courses, subject to approval like any other course on campus.

Rakowitz asked about projected enrollments. Novotny explained that the first cohort would include 12 students. The students will earn 30 credits at the off-campus site and 20 credits on campus, totaling 50 credits for the degree program. On campus, the students would enroll in established graduate courses. Nurse Anesthesia would be considered a new track under the existing umbrella of the Masters of Science in Nursing. Grossman clarified that what the AC is being asked to approve is a partnership with an established organization. “The partnership is the heart of the proposal,” said Grossman, who believes it will positively affect the University’s reputation.

Keenan raised the possibility of going into recess and asked Novotny if waiting until December to make this decision would be satisfactory. Greenberg asked Novotny the latest date at which the University can inform the organization that the proposal has been approved. Novotny replied that the admission process will begin soon and that applications will begin to arrive in January 2006 so that the program can begin in January 2007. She then expressed concern that the University might lose this opportunity to another university. She also mentioned that she “might need to go to the State for approval,” and needed enough time to do so. *Keenan made a motion (see below)*. Discussion of the motion followed.

Lang expressed his displeasure of the limited amount of time the AC was given to review documents related to this proposal, noting, for example, that the SON minutes included with the proposal are dated 4 February 2005. He repeated several of his concerns and stated that he felt “pressured” to make a decision, concluding with “I don’t think this is right.” Novotny repeated the upcoming deadlines that she faces regarding this proposal.
Motion by Keenan: “The Council will recess until the Monday before Thanksgiving, at which point discussion will continue on the Proposal for a Masters of Science in Nursing: Nurse Anesthesia.” Seconded by O’Neill. Vote: 4-8-1. Failed.

8. Motion to Adjourn, 5:07 p.m. Motion: Rakowitz; Seconded: Ligas. Passed.

Immediately after the meeting was adjourned, the Executive Secretary and Chair asked that members of the AC send comments to the Executive Committee regarding the proposed Masters of Science in Nursing: Nurse Anesthesia. Any comments received will be forwarded to Professor Lange to assist her in preparing for continued discussion of this topic at the next meeting of the AC in December 2005. The “Proposal for a Masters of Science in Nursing: Nurse Anesthesia” will be listed as Old Business on the next agenda.

Respectfully submitted,

David Alan Sapp
MEMORANDUM
Fairfield University
Secretary of the General Faculty

TO: Orin Grossman, Academic Vice President

FROM: Irene Mulvey, Secretary of the General Faculty

DATE: November 3, 2005

RE: Items in the Journal of Record for approval

In accordance with this motion passed by the Academic Council on May 2, 2005:

**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.

The Executive Committee of the Academic Council has determined that the following items that were entered in the Journal of Record since September 2001 may not have been submitted to the administration for approval or rejection. We ask that you respond to the Executive Committee within fifteen calendar days with your approval or rejection of each of these 16 items. Following these items for your approval are four items that the Executive Committee has decided should be removed from the Journal of Record. If you would like more detail on any one of these items, please contact me.

1) *Center for Instructional Development:*
That the Academic Council approve the creation of a Center for Instructional Development.  
AC: 5/5/81  
AC: 9/10/01

2) *Release time for athletes during exam period.*
The Academic Council reaffirms the current policy on release time for athletes: “No required practices of games are permitted during the official University exam periods including reading days”.  
AC: 12/09/2002

3) *Exceptions to Athletic Department policy on athletic events and final exams.*
Given the Athletic Department’s policies of not scheduling athletic events to conflict with final exams, the Academic Vice President should, each semester, inform the Academic Council of any approved exceptions to that policy during the previous semester.  
AC: 5/5/2003

4) *Routing of Undergraduate Course/Program Revisions:*
Guidelines

The Routing and Approval of Proposed Course/Program Revisions in the Undergraduate Divisions
The general principles for the following guidelines are the following:

The person making a proposal (or one person from among those making a proposal) shall act as a “manager” for the proposal, who will:

a. see that the proposal moves forward from committee to committee;
b. provide each committee chair in a timely fashion with copies of the proposal and appropriate documentation (including relevant excerpts of minutes of committees that have already approved the proposal);
c. be present at committee meetings as needed to answer questions.

Faculty review (at more than one level of responsibility) is required for all course/program revisions.

EPC review is required if new resources are required.

Moreover, UCC review is required for

1. all new programs, or changes in programs involving interdisciplinary or inter-school relationships; and

2. all changes having impact upon the present Core Curriculum.

Note: Academic Council review is required of all EPC and UCC recommendations on curriculum policy.

1. New Courses - Within the Same School

Included here are any course or program changes internal to a department or school, including new interdisciplinary courses.

Curriculum Faculty Dean or School Area Chair.......... of School.........Curriculum Committee

2. New Inter-School Courses

Curriculum Faculty of School(s) Area Chair(s).......or School Curriculum.......Dean(s).......UCC Committee(s)

3. Formation or Dissolution of Degree Programs, Majors, Concentrations, and Minors

Curriculum Faculty of School(s) Area Chair(s)..........or School ...........Dean(s)..........UCC..EPC.....Ac Co [where appro- Curriculum Committee(s) priate]

4. Formation or Dissolution of Schools
UCC ... EPC....Academic Council...General Faculty

5. **Courses/Programs seeking Grant Support, or Involving Other Universities, of Having Impact Outside F.U.**

The routing to be followed is the same as for "New InterSchool Courses," except that the **Academic Vice-President must also review** the proposal.

6. **Changes in Core Requirements**

   Included here also are those situations where groups of students are to be excused from some part of the Core requirements, and those situations where courses are offered by one curriculum area but receive Core credit in another curriculum area.

   [Note: Individual student exceptions to the Core requirements would continue to be made upon the advice of the Faculty Advisor to the Dean of the appropriate School.]

   **Curriculum Area Chair(s)....UCC**

7. **Changes in Degree Requirements:***

   Curriculum Faculty of School(s)
   Area Chair(s)......or School Curri-.....Dean(s)..........UCC
   curum Committee(s)

   CR: 9/14/87
   corrected AC: 2/1/88
   amended AC: 12/4/01

5) **Course and Credit Requirement for Graduation:**
   The course and credit requirement for graduation is a minimum of 120 credits and at least 38 three or four credit courses.
   [This new graduation requirement is in effect with the class of 2006.]

   **AC: 12/03/2001**

6) **Policy for Advanced Placement:**
Departmental, Advanced Placement, and CLEP exams may be used to exempt a student from certain required courses in the core or in the student's major. The use of particular exams and the matching of exams with courses shall be at the discretion of the appropriate department. Justification must be provided to the Curriculum Committee by any department declining to use exemption exams. For each course exempted through advanced placement or departmental testing, a student's requirements for graduation will be reduced by one course.

   The acceptable mark for CLEP exams is at least the 50th percentile. The acceptable mark for Advanced Placement Tests is 4 or 5. Students who score at least a grade of 4 on an Advanced Placement Test will be awarded graduation credit by the University.

   Fairfield undergraduates are limited to no more than a combined 15 credit hours toward graduation for CLEP exams (College Level Examination Program), the Excelsior program in Nursing, high school Advanced Placement exams and any other programs in which the students take an exam in lieu of an entire semester’s coursework.
7) Faculty Salary Committee
The General Faculty reaffirms its position that the Faculty Salary Committee is the only body authorized to negotiate salary and benefits for the faculty. All other faculty and faculty bodies are called on to defer to the Salary Committee in matters of salary and benefits.

GF: 02/08/2002

8) Faculty Salary Committee and cost-of-living figure
In collegial discussions between the Faculty Salary Committee and the Administration during an academic year, the cost-of-living increase to be considered in the discussions is the national cost-of-living figure for the 12-month period ending in December of that academic year.

GF: 03/15/2002

9) Memo of Understanding
The General Faculty reaffirms the position that the Memo of Understanding determines how compensation will be distributed.

GF 2/20/2004

10) Fair Labor Association
The Academic Council recommends to the administration that Fairfield University join the Fair Labor Association.

AC 9/8/2003

11) Full-time Undergraduate Engineering Program
The full-time undergraduate engineering program was approved as a four-year program.

GF: 4/30/99
Amended AC: 02/04/2002

12) Major in Neuroscience
The B.S. Program in Neuroscience is approved
The Program in Neuroscience is closed.

AC: 3/6/95
AC: 04/08/2002

13) Assignment of Course Credit in FU Study Abroad Programs:
All Study Abroad programs that award Fairfield University grades for courses must assign credit for those courses according to the following policy.

a. The University College (working with the program director, if a Fairfield academic program is closely linked to the study abroad site) will sift through the catalog and compile an initial list of courses that correspond to offerings in our current departments and schools.

b. University College will send the corresponding courses to the relevant dean, department chair or program director. The dean/chair/director, in consultation with the department/advisory board, will decide whether a study abroad course 1) should qualify for Fairfield credit; 2) meets
departmental/program requirements for the major or minor; and 3) meets core requirements in the
department’s or school’s area.

c. Fairfield students also would have the opportunity to seek Fairfield credit for study abroad courses that
do not correspond to Fairfield departments and schools. Students would seek approval from the Dean of
University College to use such courses as electives. Students also could try to have such elective courses
count toward core requirements; such petitions would be heard by the AVP’s office since core issues go
beyond the jurisdiction of a single department or dean.

d. The process set forth in a., b., and c. shall be initiated by University College and repeated every three
years.

AC: 03/03/2003

14) Committee on Continuing Education / University College Committee
The name of the Committee on Continuing Education is changed to University College Committee.

AC: 12/9/2002

15) Affirmative Hiring of Jesuits
The Council recommends that each individual school incorporate a process for the affirmative hiring of
Jesuits into their governance documents.

AC: 11/05/2001

16) Masters of Science Degree in Electrical and Computer Engineering
The Masters of Science Degree in Electrical and Computer Engineering is approved.

AC: 04/07/2003
In addition, the following five items will be removed from the Journal of Record since they are not statements of policy. If you disagree with the removal of any of these items, the Executive Committee is willing to keep them in the Journal, pending administration approval.

1) Performance Based Financial Rewards
In order to address our community’s interest in continuing to attract and retain excellent faculty, the General Faculty is open to considering a system of performance-based financial rewards that is outside the compensation package described in the Memo of Understanding. Such a system will include a set of incentive bonuses tied to particular faculty activities that the Academic Council and Administration agree upon. Such activities might include making contributions to a new program, publishing a book or article, teaching a new course, and/or contributing to the student-advising program. Long-Range Planning Committee VIII on Faculty Creativity, composed of faculty and administrators, has already drawn up a series of proposals for incentive bonuses, including things such as 3/2 teaching loads, awards for teaching projects, and extra financial support for research projects. (This report was endorsed by the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences in May 2001.)

The General Faculty requires that any new pool of financial rewards that is outside the compensation package be determined by the Administration in the context of discussions with the Faculty Salary Committee. If the Administration is interested in devising such a scheme, they should inform the Faculty Salary Committee.

GF 2/22/2002

2) Board of Trustees
The General Faculty insists that the Board follow governance procedures outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* until such time that the Board and the Faculty determine together that those procedures by changed.

The General Faculty strongly objects to the unilateral executive decision taken by the Board of Trustees on December 6, 2001, that imposes the Board’s vision of education for Fairfield University’s future over the near unanimous objections of this body. This decision was communicated to individual faculty members rather than through the channels described in the *Faculty Handbook* and used on most every other occasion of communication between the Board and the Faculty. The Faculty objects to the fact that the Faculty Committee on Conference with the Board, which met with the Academic Affairs subcommittee of the Board the morning before the resolution was passed, was not informed of the action that the Board was to take that afternoon.

GF: 02/08/2002

3) Sustained merit, Additional merit and CPI
The General Faculty’s position is that in any year additional merit cannot be funded unless sustained merit is over CPI. Further that sustained merit should be over CPI not only for an individual year but also over any period of years.

GF 2/20/2004

4) Distribution of Additional Merit
The General Faculty’s position is that any additional merit be distributed according to the Faculty Salary Committee formula: each eligible faculty member receive an amount equal to the size of the additional pool divided by the number of eligible faculty.

GF 2/20/04
TO: Irene Mulvey, Faith-Ann Dohm, Rick DeWitt  
FROM: Orin Grossman  
DATE: November 12, 2005  
RE: Items in the Journal of Record for approval

I have enclosed a detailed response to the items you have sent me. Here is a brief summary of all items:

1) Accepted  
2) Accepted  
3) Accepted  
4) Acceptance not necessary—already accepted  
5) Accepted  
6) Accepted  
7) Rejected  
8) Rejected  
9) Rejected  
10) Accepted  
11) Accepted  
12) Accepted  
13) Accepted  
14) Accepted  
15) Accepted  
16) Accepted

Regarding the items removed from the Journal by the executive committee of the Council, the administration agrees with that decision. However, only four items appear in my copy, so if there is a fifth item, as you state, please send it over. Thanks for your attention to this matter.

I) *Center for Instructional Development: That the Academic Council approves the creation of a Center for Instructional Development.  

AC: 5/5/81
The Academic Long-Range plan called for such a center, and we now have a Center for Academic Excellence doing significant instructional development. The original call for the center occurred in 1981. The 2001 update reinforces the idea that the Academic Council supports the creation of a center. The administration is grateful for the support of the Academic Council and has no objection to the reaffirmation, assuming that the Center for Instructional Development called for in the Journal is, in fact, the Center for Academic Excellence.

This item is accepted.

2) Release time for athletes during exam period.

The Academic Council reaffirms the current policy on release time for athletes: “No required practices of games are permitted during the official University exam periods including reading days”.

AC: 12/09/2002

This item does not create or change policy. It simply reaffirms existing policy. Of course, the occasional exception must be made, and my office communicates these exceptions each semester to the Academic Council (see #3). In general, I am leery about reaffirmations. However, as with #1, it seems to reinforce existing policy about which there is no disagreement. Therefore, the administration, while suggesting the item is redundant, has no objection to this reaffirmation.

This item is accepted.

3) Exceptions to Athletic Department policy on athletic events and final exams.

Given the Athletic Department’s policies of not scheduling athletic events to conflict with final exams, the Academic Vice President should, each semester, inform the Academic Council of any approved exceptions to that policy during the previous semester.

AC: 5/5/2003

This item is accepted.

4) Routing of Undergraduate Course/Program Revisions:

Guidelines

The Routing and Approval of Proposed Course/Program Revisions in the Undergraduate Divisions

The general principles for the following guidelines are the following:

The person making a proposal (or one person from among those making a proposal) shall act as a “manager” for the proposal, who will:

d. see that the proposal moves forward from committee to committee;
e. provide each committee chair in a timely fashion with copies of the proposal and appropriate documentation (including relevant excerpts of minutes of committees that have already approved the proposal);
f. be present at committee meetings as needed to answer questions.

Faculty review (at more than one level of responsibility) is required for all course/program revisions.

EPC review is required if new resources are required.

Moreover, UCC review is required for

1. all new programs, or changes in programs involving interdisciplinary or inter-school relationships; and

3. all changes having impact upon the present Core Curriculum.

Note: Academic Council review is required of all EPC and UCC recommendations on curriculum policy.

1. New Courses - Within the Same School

Included here are any course or program changes internal to a department or school, including new interdisciplinary courses.

Curriculum Faculty Dean or School
Area Chair........ of School........Curriculum Committee

2. New Inter-School Courses

Curriculum Faculty of School(s)
Area Chair(s)......or School Curriculum.......Dean(s)......UCC Committee(s)

3. Formation or Dissolution of Degree Programs, Majors, Concentrations, and Minors

Curriculum Faculty of School(s)
Area Chair(s),or School ..........Dean(s)...UCC...EPC.....Ac Co [where appro- Curriculum Committee(s) priate]

4. Formation or Dissolution of Schools

UCC ... EPC....Academic Council...General Faculty

5. Courses/Programs seeking Grant Support, or Involving Other Universities, of Having Impact Outside F.U.

The routing to be followed is the same as for "New InterSchool Courses," except that the Academic Vice-President must also review the proposal.
6. **Changes in Core Requirements**

Included here also are those situations where groups of students are to be excused from some part of the Core requirements, and those situations where courses are offered by one curriculum area but receive Core credit in another curriculum area.

[Note: Individual student exceptions to the Core requirements would continue to be made upon the advice of the Faculty Advisor to the Dean of the appropriate School.]

*Curriculum Area Chair(s)….UCC*

7. **Changes in Degree Requirements:**

*Curriculum Faculty of School(s)*

*Area Chair(s)……or School Curri-----Dean(s).........UCC*

*Curriculum Committee(s)*

CR: 9/14/87

Corrected AC: 2/1/88

Amended AC: 12/4/01

This was presented to the office and was not objected to at the time. Although the administration has some issues with the routing/governance structure, it acknowledges that the routing procedures described here were approved in 2001, and they stand as the present system. No further approval is necessary.

5) **Course and Credit Requirement for Graduation:**

The course and credit requirement for graduation is a minimum of 120 credits and at least 38 three or four credit courses.

[This new graduation requirement is in effect with the class of 2006.]

*AC: 12/03/2001*

This item is accepted.

6) **Policy for Advanced Placement:**

Departmental, Advanced Placement, and CLEP exams may be used to exempt a student from certain required courses in the core or in the student's major. The use of particular exams and the matching of exams with courses shall be at the discretion of the appropriate department. Justification must be provided to the Curriculum Committee by any department declining to use exemption exams. For each course exempted through advanced placement or departmental testing, a student's requirements for graduation will be reduced by one course.

The acceptable mark for CLEP exams is at least the 50th percentile. The acceptable mark for Advanced Placement Tests is 4 or 5. Students who score at least a grade of 4 on an Advanced Placement Test will be awarded graduation credit by the University.

*Fairfield undergraduates are limited to no more than a combined 15 credit hours toward graduation for CLEP exams (College Level Examination Program), the Excelsior program in Nursing, high school Advanced Placement exams and any other programs in which the students take an exam in lieu of an entire semester’s coursework.*
7) Faculty Salary Committee
The General Faculty reaffirms its position that the Faculty Salary Committee is the only body authorized to negotiate salary and benefits for the faculty. All other faculty and faculty bodies are called on to defer to the Salary Committee in matters of salary and benefits.

GF: 02/08/2002

The role of the salary committee is clearly delineated by the Faculty Handbook. That role does not include negotiation. The Handbook states (p.17):

**General Purpose:** To receive and make specific recommendations each year to the appropriate administrative officers regarding faculty salaries and other wage benefits.

There is no reference to negotiations.

This item is not approved.

8) Faculty Salary Committee and cost-of-living figure
In collegial discussions between the Faculty Salary Committee and the Administration during an academic year, the cost-of-living increase to be considered in the discussions is the national cost-of-living figure for the 12-month period ending in December of that academic year.

GF: 03/15/2002

The general faculty may certainly offer guidance to the salary committee, but it is not appropriate to place this statement of the general faculty into the Journal of Record.

This item is not approved.

9) Memo of Understanding
The General Faculty reaffirms the position that the Memo of Understanding determines how compensation will be distributed.

GF 2/20/2004

This item is not approved.

10) Fair Labor Association
The Academic Council recommends to the administration that Fairfield University join the Fair Labor Association.

AC 9/8/2003

This item is approved.
11) Full-time Undergraduate Engineering Program
The full-time undergraduate engineering program was approved as a four-year program.  
GF: 4/30/99
Amended AC: 02/04/2002
This item is approved.

12) Major in Neuroscience
The B.S. Program in Neuroscience is approved  
AC: 3/6/95
The Program in Neuroscience is closed.  
AC: 04/08/2002
This item is approved.

13) Assignment of Course Credit in FU Study Abroad Programs:
All Study Abroad programs that award Fairfield University grades for courses must assign credit for those courses according to the following policy.

a. The University College (working with the program director, if a Fairfield academic program is closely linked to the study abroad site) will sift through the catalog and compile an initial list of courses that correspond to offerings in our current departments and schools.

b. University College will send the corresponding courses to the relevant dean, department chair or program director. The dean/chair/director, in consultation with the department/advisory board, will decide whether a study abroad course 1) should qualify for Fairfield credit; 2) meets departmental/program requirements for the major or minor; and 3) meets core requirements in the department’s or school’s area.

c. Fairfield students also would have the opportunity to seek Fairfield credit for study abroad courses that do not correspond to Fairfield departments and schools. Students would seek approval from the Dean of University College to use such courses as electives. Students also could try to have such elective courses count toward core requirements; such petitions would be heard by the AVP’s office since core issues go beyond the jurisdiction of a single department or dean.

d. The process set forth in a., b., and c. shall be initiated by University College and repeated every three years.  
AC: 03/03/2003
This item is approved.

14) Committee on Continuing Education / University College Committee
The name of the Committee on Continuing Education is changed to University College Committee.  
AC: 12/9/2002
This item is approved.

15) Affirmative Hiring of Jesuits
The Council recommends that each individual school incorporate a process for the affirmative hiring of Jesuits into their governance documents.  

AC: 11/05/2001
This item is approved.

16) Masters of Science Degree in Electrical and Computer Engineering
The Masters of Science Degree in Electrical and Computer Engineering is approved.  

AC: 04/07/2003
This item is approved.

In addition, the following five items will be removed from the Journal of Record since they are not statements of policy. If you disagree with the removal of any of these items, the Executive Committee is willing to keep them in the Journal, pending administration approval.

1) Performance Based Financial Rewards
In order to address our community’s interest in continuing to attract and retain excellent faculty, the General Faculty is open to considering a system of performance-based financial rewards that is outside the compensation package described in the Memo of Understanding. Such a system will include a set of incentive bonuses tied to particular faculty activities that the Academic Council and Administration agree upon. Such activities might include making contributions to a new program, publishing a book or article, teaching a new course, and/or contributing to the student-advising program. Long-Range Planning Committee VIII on Faculty Creativity, composed of faculty and administrators, has already drawn up a series of proposals for incentive bonuses, including things such as 3/2 teaching loads, awards for teaching projects, and extra financial support for research projects. (This report was endorsed by the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences in May 2001.)

The General Faculty requires that any new pool of financial rewards that is outside the compensation package be determined by the Administration in the context of discussions with the Faculty Salary Committee. If the Administration is interested in devising such a scheme, they should inform the Faculty Salary Committee.

GF 2/22/2002

2) Board of Trustees
The General Faculty insists that the Board follow governance procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook until such time that the Board and the Faculty determine together that those procedures by changed.

The General Faculty strongly objects to the unilateral executive decision taken by the Board of Trustees on December 6, 2001, that imposes the Board’s vision of education for Fairfield University’s future over the near unanimous objections of this body. This decision was communicated to individual faculty members rather than through the channels described in the Faculty Handbook and used on most every
other occasion of communication between the Board and the Faculty. The Faculty objects to the fact that the Faculty Committee on Conference with the Board, which met with the Academic Affairs subcommittee of the Board the morning before the resolution was passed, was not informed of the action that the Board was to take that afternoon.

GF: 02/08/2002

3) Sustained merit, Additional merit and CPI
The General Faculty’s position is that in any year additional merit cannot be funded unless sustained merit is over CPI. Further that sustained merit should be over CPI not only for an individual year but also over any period of years.

GF 2/20/2004

4) Distribution of Additional Merit
The General Faculty’s position is that any additional merit be distributed according to the Faculty Salary Committee formula: each eligible faculty member receives an amount equal to the size of the additional pool divided by the number of eligible faculty.

GF 2/20/04

The administration has no objection to these items being removed from the Journal of Record. They are not appropriate for the Journal of Record. However, I count only four such items. If there is a fifth item, please let me know.
TO: Orin Grossman, AVP
FROM: Irene Mulvey, Secretary of the General Faculty
DATE: November 15, 2002
RE: Follow-up to your Journal of Record response of 11/12/2005

As I mentioned in an email, seven items have been removed from the official version of the Journal of Record (the four items – there were only four - that the Executive Committee decided to remove since they are not policy statements and the three items in the list below that the administration rejects.)

Two items of follow-up:

After looking in the records of Academic Council minutes, this item

1) *Center for Instructional Development:
That the Academic Council approves the creation of a Center for Instructional Development.  

was only mentioned briefly in a discussion of pending items at the 9/10/2001 AC meeting. There was no formal vote or action. I propose that the date 9/10/01 be removed from this item in the Journal of Record since the Journal should only contain items formally voted on by the Council or the General Faculty.

Item 4 (below) is incorrectly dated in the Journal of Record. The discussion and vote on this item took place on 12/4/2000 and not 12/4/2001. This item was probably sent to you for approval or rejection by Prof. Nantz who was Faculty Secretary through summer of 2001. I propose correcting the date of this entry in the Journal of Record from 12/4/2001 to the correct date of 12/4/2000.

Please let me know if you object to either of these corrections.

CC: Rick DeWitt, Faith-Anne Dohm
Email from Orin
Memo from EPC
Email from Ryan-Soderlund