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 December 5, 2005 (attached)
   b. Correspondence
      i. Email of 1/17/2006 from T. Pellegrino (attached)
   c. Oral Reports

4. Council Committee Reports.
   a. Suggested motions to implement the recommendations in the Report from the
      Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Academic Freedom and Free Expression (attachment)
   b. Report from Executive Committee re new edition of the Faculty Handbook (attachment)

5. Petitions for immediate hearing.

6. Old Business.
   a. Three faculty-approved items for the Journal of Record rejected by the administration. (attachments)

7. New business
   a. Motion from EPC re course offerings listed for the 2 upcoming semesters (attachment)
   b. Interdisciplinary Minor in Catholic Studies (separately stapled)
   c. Two Handbook changes from Research Committee (attachments)
   d. Proposed new wording for Faculty Handbook on Athletics Committee (attachment)
   e. New wording from Rank and Tenure Committee for Timetable and Guidelines for Tenure and
      Promotion (attachment)

8. Adjournment

**Attachments:**

For item 3.a.: Draft minutes of the 12/5/2005 Academic Council meeting (pages 1-5);
For item 3.b.i.: Email from Thomas Pellegrino dated 1/17/2006 (page 6) See AC minutes 12/5/05;
For item 4.a.: Report from the Executive Committee/Academic Freedom Committee Chair
   (pages 7-9) See AC minutes 11/7/05 for report and discussion;
For item 4.b: Report on proofreading new edition of Faculty Handbook (page 10) See AC minutes 12/5/05;
For item 6.a.: Email correspondence of AVP and Faculty Secretary (pages 11-16) See AC minutes 11/1/04;
For item 7.a.: Memo from EPC with motion (page 17)
For item 7.b.: Proposal for an Interdisciplinary Minor in Catholic Studies (separately stapled)
For item 7.c.: Two memos from Chair of Research Committee dated 12/15/2005 (pages 18-19)
For item 7.d.: Proposed new wording for Faculty Handbook with rationale, 11/15/2004 Faculty
   Athletics Committee minutes, excerpt of the Faculty Handbook (pages 20-24)
For item 7.e.: Proposed new wording for Guidelines from Rank and Tenure Committee (page 25)

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

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

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

Absent (1): Dean Wilson

Regrets (2): Professors Gibson, Haug, Lakeland

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

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

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

3. Report from the Executive Secretary:

   a) DeWitt called for a motion to approve the Nov. 7th, 2005 minutes.

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

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

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

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

   b) DeWitt had no further correspondence or oral reports

4. Council Committee Reports: None

5. Petitions for Immediate Hearing: None

6. Old Business
a) Proposal for a new track in the Graduate Nursing Program: Nurse Anesthesia

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

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

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

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

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

Gen. Fac. Sec. Mulvey: The correspondence included in your packets shows the process by which Orin and I worked out what to add and/or cut from the JOR. We reviewed items from the last four and half years, starting from the end of Kathy Nantz’s term as Secretary of the General Faculty. Twenty items were reviewed. Four items, detailed on p11 of the Academic Council packet for this meeting, were determined by the Academic Council Executive Committee to not be policy statements and therefore should be removed. The AVP had no objection to removing these four items from the Journal or Record. Twenty other items, detailed on pp 6-10 of the Academic Council packet for this meeting, were sent to the AVP for approval and/or rejection by the Administration. Thirteen of these items were approved by the AVP for inclusion in the JOR. The Administration rejected three items, numbers 7, 8, and 9, from the list sent to them. Regarding the rejection of item 7, the executive committee does not suggest challenging this decision since there is a more or less identical item from 1982 already in the Journal of Record. Item 8 is a statement of faculty position and the Academic Council Executive Committee does not feel it is worth challenging this rejection. Item 9 is already in the current Memorandum of Understanding and so at this time is jointly agreed policy.
I am continuing the review of the Journal of Record. At this time, we are in agreement that every item in the Journal has been approved by both the faculty and the administration, so important progress has been made providing closure to the Petition for Immediate Hearing brought to the Council by the AVP last May. I am continuing the review of the JOR; there are some items still to be added after being sent to the administration for approval or rejection and I expect to have the Journal of Record completely up-to-date by our next meeting in February.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. New Business

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Abbott: Can you describe some examples of greater specificity?

Lang: Wheelchair patients – no mobility and a heavy chair? Carry them in the chair with two people, one in front and one in back, very specific information on specific problem. The website listed on the agenda with this agenda item is remarkably comprehensive.
Keenan: Are we just creating another bureaucratic layer? So few anyway – could we just have each faculty member consult with their students on an as-needed basis?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Meeting was adjourned at 4:45pm

Respectfully submitted:

L. Kraig Steffen
Recording secretary
Subject: Evacuation policy and planning
Date sent: Tue, 17 Jan 2006 08:09:35 -0500
From: "Pellegrino, Thomas C." <tpellegrino@mail.fairfield.edu>
To: "Dewitt, Richard" <RDewitt@mail.fairfield.edu>
Copies to: "Ryan-Soderlund, David" <DRSoderlund@mail.fairfield.edu>

Dear Richard,

David Ryan-Soderlund shared with me the work he has been doing in response to a request from you to get a disclosure on students and policies involving evacuation for students with disabilities. I was pleased to hear of the request. David knows that I have a similar interest in investigating the feasibility of a comprehensive policy for evacuation of all students in the classrooms and labs of our buildings. In this respect, I took your lead and have expanded some of the research that David has done. My goal would be to have the work David is doing on evacuation procedures for students with disabilities become part of a more comprehensive policy covering all students. I wanted to let you know that this was in the works from my end of things.

I know from speaking with David that one of the requests on the table is to have a list of students with disabilities identified for the benefit of faculty members. I know the list that David currently has is very small, and should not be viewed as comprehensive (as students are under no obligation to disclose this information to the university). In that respect, I think we want to craft a policy that calls for a general notice to go out to all students in their classes at the beginning of the semester about general evacuation procedures, followed by an invitation to those with specific needs to speak individually with the professor and/or David. As David reminded me, many students are not aware that they need special assistance in case of an evacuation. Conversely, there are a number of students who know they need assistance, but do not wish to have their name included on a list. These are all factors to be considered when researching the feasibility of a workable and comprehensive plan.

I just wanted to alert you to the investigative work I have begun doing. My thanks for raising this important issue.

Sincerely,

Thomas C. Pellegrino, Ph.D.
Dean of Students
Fairfield University
Fairfield, Connecticut 06824-5195
PH:203-254-4000ext. 3425
FAX: 203-254-4014
MEMORANDUM
Academic Council
Fairfield University

TO: Academic Council
FROM: Executive Committee of the Academic Council
DATE: January 31, 2006
RE: Suggested motions to implement the recommendations in the Report of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Academic Freedom and Free Expression

The Academic Council, at the November 7 meeting, passed the following motion.

**Motion.** 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.

The Executive Committee of the Council had two meetings with Professor Paul Lakeland, Chair of the Subcommittee. We invited Professor Lucy Katz, another member of the Ad Hoc Subcommittee, to the second meeting and we worked collegially to draft motions as requested by the Academic Council.

We propose five motions to the Academic Council. The first three are straightforward adaptations of the committee’s recommendations. Motions 4 and 5 stem from the section on Resolution of Disputes in the committee’s report, in which there was one procedure to cover both faculty and students. In order to remain compliant with the Procedure for Due Process in the *Faculty Handbook*, we felt that separate procedures were necessary.

**Motion 1.** The Academic Council recommends that the General Faculty approve the following language for Section II of the *Faculty Handbook* (ninth edition, II.; page 20). New language is indicated by underline; deletions are indicated by strikeout:

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. No limitations are implied other than those required by generally accepted standards of responsible scholarship and by respect for the Catholic commitment of Fairfield University. This commitment delimits any professor only to the extent of restraining him or her from attempting to undermine the basis of that commitment, just as university professors anywhere are expected to respect the principles upon which the university at which they teach is founded. 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 it values the diversity which their membership brings to the university community."
Motion 2. The Academic Council recommends that the following language be incorporated into faculty contracts and directs the Faculty Salary Committee to address this in the collegial discussions with the administration:

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. 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. 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.”

Motion 3. While recognizing that the Academic Council has no authority over Student Services, the Academic Council (1) endorses Section B from the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Freedom and Free Expression and encourages the President to see that the recommendations made in Section B are implemented, and (2) endorses the recommendation to adopt the language from Section A into the Student Handbook and wherever in the University a statement on academic freedom is needed or thought desirable.

Motion 4. While recognizing that the Academic Council has no authority over Student Services, the Academic Council endorses the creation of a process for resolution of disputes concerning violations of academic freedom of students, as amended below from the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Freedom and Free Expression to remove references to faculty, and encourages the President to see that such a process is implemented.

Academic Freedom: Resolution of Disputes for Students

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 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, 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.

---

**Motion 5.** The Academic Council endorses the process for mediation of disputes concerning violations of academic freedom of faculty as adapted below from the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Freedom and Free Expression.

**Process for mediation of disputes concerning violations of academic freedom of faculty:**

Step One: Any individual or group claiming a violation of academic freedom should report the claim to an appropriate person, who shall be a chair, academic dean or other person designated by the Academic Vice President.

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, then the faculty member may proceed according to the Procedures for Due Process in the *Faculty Handbook*.

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.
MEMORANDUM
Academic Council
Fairfield University

TO: Academic Council
FROM: Executive Committee of the Academic Council
DATE: January 30, 2006
RE: New edition (tenth) of the Faculty Handbook

The Academic Council passed the following motion at the December 5, 2005 meeting:

**MOTION.** The Academic Council authorizes the Executive Committee of the Academic Council to review the galley proofs for a new edition of the Faculty Handbook.

The Executive Committee received the galley proofs from the Academic Vice President’s office and proofread them painstakingly. We verified that all duly ratified amendments to the Faculty Handbook have been correctly incorporated into the new edition.

In addition, we found some minor, non-substantive errors and some matters of practical information that should be corrected in a new edition. In particular,

- School of Continuing Education should be changed to University College throughout.
- The Table of Contents has not kept up with the various Handbook changes and needs correction.
- Development and Public Relations Committee should be University Advancement.
- “Areas” in DSB are now “Departments”
- “Programs” in GSEAP are now “Departments”
- Various formatting errors need to be corrected
- Various punctuation errors and a spelling error or two were caught.

A complete and completely detailed list of all these minute, non-substantive corrections is available from the Executive Committee.

According to the Handbook (I.A.8), “Matters of practical information may be amended by the Academic Council as circumstances change.” We recommend that the Academic Council pass a motion to amend the Faculty Handbook with all the corrections detailed by the Executive Committee in its 1/26/2006 Faculty Handbook Review Report to the Academic Vice President.
Subject: Items from AC for Journal of Record 2004-2005
Date: Monday, December 5, 2005 11:06 AM
From: Mulvey, Irene <Mulvey@mail.fairfield.edu>
To: "Grossman, Orin" <OLGrossman@mail.fairfield.edu>
Cc: "Dewitt, Richard" <RDewitt@mail.fairfield.edu>, "Dohm, Faith-Anne" <FDohm@mail.fairfield.edu>

Orin,
Attached to this email is a document listing all the remaining items passed by the Academic Council in 2004-2005 to be entered in the Journal of Record. As you know the administration has 15 calendar days in which to respond with either acceptance or rejection of each item.

Thanks,
Irene
Five items to be entered in the Journal of Record:


2. The Master of Science in Accounting is approved subject to the provision that adjuncts will be paid in accordance with the Memo of Understanding. AC 11/1/2004.

3. The Master of Science in Taxation is approved subject to the provision that adjuncts will be paid in accordance with the Memo of Understanding. AC 11/1/2004.

4. The Master Degree Program in Mechanical Engineering is approved. AC 2/7/2005.

5. 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.

   AC 4/4/2005

Irene Mulvey
Secretary of the General Faculty
December 4, 2005
Date: December 14, 2005  
To: Irene Mulvey  
From: Orin Grossman  
Re: Journal of Record

Thank you for submitting these five items to the administration for consideration.


This item is approved

2. *The Master of Science in Accounting is approved subject to the provision that adjuncts will be paid in accordance with the Memo of Understanding.* AC 11/1/2004.  

The Academic Council does not have the authority to limit the pay scale for adjuncts. There are situations where the amounts in the MOU must be increased. The amounts in the MOU are properly considered floors below which deans cannot go. They protect those adjuncts teaching in fields where it would be possible to hire at a lower rate. But the pay-scale for adjuncts in the MOU should not be considered ceilings which make it impossible to hire adjuncts in areas where market forces require adjustment. The MS in Accounting has been properly approved but the administration cannot allow the language of the resolution to appear in the Journal of Record, since it might indicate approval of the provision. I should add that the state and the Board of Trustees approved the program without the inclusion of the provision from the Academic Council.

This item is rejected as it stands. The administration would approve the resolution if it ended after the word “approved”.

3. *The Master of Science in Taxation is approved subject to the provision that adjuncts will be paid in accordance with the Memo of Understanding.* AC 11/1/2004.  

This item is rejected for the reason given in #2.


This item is approved.

5. *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.

AC 4/4/2005

The various positions on this matter have been sufficiently stated in other documents. This item is rejected.
MEMORANDUM
Secretary of the General Faculty
Fairfield University

TO: Orin Grossman, Academic Vice President
FROM: Irene Mulvey, Secretary of the General Faculty
DATE: January 6, 2006
RE: Your memo of December 14 on Journal of Record Items.

I want to respond to your memo of December 14, 2005 Re: Journal of Record to let you know that your memo has been received and that the Executive Committee of the Academic Council will discuss your response and decide how to proceed at our next Executive Committee meeting on January 30.

With regard to your rejection of the two items concerning masters programs in the Dolan School of Business, I would like to clarify that the motions passed by the Academic Council do not limit the pay scale for adjuncts in any way. The motions only state that adjuncts will be paid in accordance with the Memo of Understanding. Since the Memo of Understanding is a jointly-approved and jointly-signed document, it is hard to see the administration’s objection to the Academic Council motion. Moreover, the current MOU includes the following paragraph:

G. The salary paid for part-time instruction to full-time faculty members (beyond normal load) and the salary for credit courses for adjunct faculty who are not full-time faculty members will be as follows. The amounts have been increased by 3.0%. Higher payments are occasionally made as market conditions dictate.

The last sentence (in bold) is new language in the current 2005-2006 MOU that did not appear in the 2004-2005 MOU.

I suspect that when these two motions, which have been rejected by the administration, wind up back at the Academic Council, the Council will ask for clarification on the administration’s rejection in light of this current MOU language, and that there will be a discussion of the status of these programs if the Council motion is not accepted by the administration. But for now, this memo is just to inform you that the Executive Committee is in receipt of your memo of December 12 and that we will respond formally after our next Executive Committee meeting on January 30. Let us know if you would like to change your mind about rejecting, or clarify the administration’s objections to these two items concerning masters programs in the Dolan School of Business.
Subject: RE: Journal of Record items
Date: Friday, January 6, 2006 11:40 AM
From: Grossman, Orin <OLGrossman@mail.fairfield.edu>
To: "Mulvey, Irene" <Mulvey@mail.fairfield.edu>, "Dewitt, Richard" <RDewitt@mail.fairfield.edu>, "Dohm, Faith-Anne" <FDohm@mail.fairfield.edu>

Irene,

Thanks for your memo of January 6. The administration does not see any reason to have language referring to the payment of faculty attached to a statement approving the program. The objection to inclusion in the Journal of Record stands.

Orin
Memorandum

To: Faith-Anne Dohm  
Chair, Academic Council

From: Meredith Wallace, Chair Faculty Research Committee

Date: 12/15/05

Re: Handbook change in Senior Summer Fellowship

The purpose of this memo is to propose a change in the *Guidelines for Senior Summer Fellowships*. The proposed change is intended to ensure consistency between the *Guidelines for Senior Summer Fellowships* and *Guidelines for Senior Summer Research Stipends*. Currently, the guidelines for *Summer Research stipends* prevent faculty members from receiving the stipends for either summer contiguous to sabbatical leaves. This clause is currently not present in the *Guidelines for Senior Summer Fellowships*, which is a substantially more competitive award. This change will allow consistency between the two guidelines. The statement to be added to the *Guidelines for Senior Summer Fellowships* is as follows:

Faculty members approved for sabbatical leave will not be eligible for either summer contiguous to the academic year of the sabbatical leave.
Memorandum

To: Faith-Anne Dohm  
   Chair, Academic Council

From: Meredith Wallace, Chair Faculty Research Committee

Date: 12/15/05

Re: Handbook change in Sabbatical Leave Policy

The purpose of this memo is to propose a change in Handbook language on Sabbatical Leaves. The proposed change reduces the time of eligibility for the first sabbatical leave at Fairfield from 12 semesters of active service to ten semesters. This change will support new faculty in their scholarship, position them for promotion, and serve as a recruiting incentive to attract candidates of high quality for faculty positions. Dr. Orin Grossman, the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, has agreed to this change.

Section II FACULTY POLICIES
II. B. FISCAL POLICIES
2. Leaves of Absence and Sabbaticals
a. Sabbatical Leaves (p. 29)

Current Handbook Language
Sabbatical leaves are reserved for tenured faculty members who have served actively on the faculty of the University for at least twelve semesters since their last financially supported leave.

Proposed Revision of Handbook Language
Sabbatical leaves are reserved for tenured faculty members. Tenured faculty who have not been awarded a pre-tenure research leave are eligible for their first sabbatical after 10 semesters of active service AT FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY. Tenured faculty who have been awarded a pre-tenure leave are eligible for their first sabbatical after 10 semesters of active service AT FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY following their pre-tenure leave. Tenured faculty are eligible for any subsequent sabbatical after serving twelve semesters since their last sabbatical leave.
Five pages on Athletic Committee Handbook changes (not available electronically)
Rank and Tenure Proposed New Wording (not available electronically)