ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, May 1, 2006
Canisius 209 at 3:30 PM

1. Presidential courtesy.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary.
   a. i. Approval of minutes of meeting of April 3, 2006 (attached)
      ii. Approval of minutes of meeting of April 10, 2006 (attached)
   b. Correspondence
   c. Oral Reports
      i. Academic Council summer meeting dates

4. Council Committee Reports.
   a. Subcommittee on description of non-tenured positions in the Faculty Handbook (attachment)

5. Petitions for immediate hearing.

6. Old Business.
   a. Rejection of Journal of Record entry on privacy of teaching evaluation data (attachment)

   a. Slate for the Committee on Committees (attachment)
   b. Slate for the Secretary of the General Faculty (attachment)
   c. Faculty Salary Committee request for subcommittee on benefits (attachment)
   d. Academic Calendar issues from the Academic Vice President (attachment)
   e. Research Committee Guidelines in the Journal of Record (will be sent separately)
   f. Faculty Handbook change from the Library Committee (attachment)
   g. CAS chairs on the availability of grade data

8. Adjournment

Attachments
For item 3.a.i: Draft minutes of the 4/3/2006 Academic Council meeting (pages 3-8)
For item 3.a.ii: Draft minutes of the 4/3 AC meeting reconvened on 4/10/2006 (p. 9-13)
For item 4.a: Report from Subcommittee on description of non-tenured positions in HB (p. 14-15)
For item 6.a: Memo from AVP dated 3/28/2006 (p. 16-17)
For item 7.a.: Proposed slate for the Committee on Committees (p. 18)
For item 7.b.: Proposed slate for the Secretary of the General Faculty (p.19)
For item 7.c: Memo from chair of Faculty Salary Committee dated 4/24/2006 (p. 20)
For item 7.d: Memo from AVP of 4/17/2006 (p. 21-22)
For item 7.e: Material will be sent separately.
For item 7.f: Proposal from Library Committee (p. 23-24)
Minutes of Library Committee Meetings – relevant excerpts (p. 25)

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

Items Pending 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 MEETING
APRIL 3, 2006
CNS 209


Regrets: AVP O. Grossman, I. Haug, R. DeWitt (Executive Secretary)

Guests: R. Crabtree; J. Garvey.

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m.

1. **Presidential Courtesy**

   No items.

2. **Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty**

   No items.

3. **Report from the Executive Secretary**

   a. **Approval of minutes of meeting of March 6, 2006.**

      Changes (page numbers refer to the numbering in packet) as follows:
      Page 8 line 10 from bottom: K. Nasser should be C. Naser.
      Page 8 line 15: faculty should be faculty
      Page 7 line 4: rational should be rationale
      Page 6 Motion (at top) should read Faculty members approved for sabbatical leave will not be eligible for a Senior Summer Fellowship for either summer contiguous to the academic year of the sabbatical.

      A vote to approve the minutes was called. Vote on the

      **MOTION: to approve the minutes.** **MOTION PASSED 14-0-0**

   b. **Correspondence.** Secretary Irene Mulvey discussed the March 28, 2006 memo from AVP approving some and not approving one AC motion. She said that this memo is under correspondence, but not on the AC agenda today because it came in too late. She explained that the motion was re-affirming current policy, but the AVP stated that the motion’s language would not be helpful in the Journal of Record. I. Mulvey asked for input from the Council on this matter. B. Abbott
asked if the Council can refer this to the General Faculty; I. Mulvey responded that anything can be referred to the General Faculty. P. Lakeland asked if there was any reference to teaching evaluations and privacy in the Journal of Record; I. Mulvey responded that there is nothing about privacy in the JR. There is certainly historical precedent, but nothing that she can find in the general faculty meeting archives yet. G. Lang asked if there was anything referring to the idea that teaching evaluations had to be turned over to administrative parties? I. Mulvey said not that she was aware of. D. Keenan asked if the Executive Committee should meet with Orin to discuss the issue; I. Mulvey stated that she thought that was a good idea.

4. Council Committee Reports.

There were none to be presented.

5. Petitions for immediate hearing.

There were none to be presented.

6. Old Business.

   a. Follow-up Report from the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees

   P. Lakeland distributed a summary report (attached) of the Conference Committee Meeting with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, Thursday, March 23. P. Lakeland noted that P. Huston, Chair of the Board of Trustees read a prepared statement in which he argued key points of view by the Trustees. P. Lakeland noted that it became apparent in the ensuing discussion that the BOT and the faculty are somewhat at cross-purposes; the Board’s stated goal is to “lower the overall cost of providing medical coverage” so that a greater proportion of compensation can be devoted to salary. The faculty referred to the “Guiding Principles” which state that “in a year when overall funds cannot meet cost of living, attention should be given to satisfying sustained merit.” P. Lakeland noted that progress had been made in terms of clarifying the faculty’s views but that problems remained in the sense that the Board did not agree to the statement in the Guiding Principles that funds be directed to cost of living first, since they divided the funds into 2.5% sustained merit and 0.5% additional merit. The Trustees also continue to insist that total compensation (including health care costs) be compared to any cost of living increase.

   P. Lakeland asked if G. Lang, who was also at the meeting, had anything to add. G. Lang added that President Von Arx was at the meeting. He congratulated P. Lakeland on the last two sentences of the report, pointing out the cultural gap between the Trustees and faculty, especially the notion that “The Trustees failed to see the argument on principle that ‘some should not receive more if all do not receive enough.’” The faculty have a difference in philosophy; some voices on the Board assert, “if you’re healthy, you should take out more money.” They don’t
understand that the faculty view is that we are willing to sacrifice some of our own pay for someone else.

D. Keenan asked what the Board’s rationale is for splitting the compensation as they did. P. Lakeland responded that the Board believes that if we go to cost sharing, we would reduce the overall level of health care costs to the University. Experience shows that institutions in which faculty take a portion of health care costs on themselves actually spend less overall. We’re not in a good place when 49% of our increase goes to health care; that affects the University’s competitiveness.

G. Lang commented that the faculty will have to address the health care issue, just as all corporations are dealing with it. D. Greenberg asked if the survey the Board referred to found that the quality of health got better among faculty at these institutions. P. Lakeland responded that these were assertions, not a statistical survey. D. Greenberg asked if it was certain if the money saved from health care would go to the salary portion of compensation. P. Lakeland stated that the Board did not use the term “automatically,” but that their philosophy is that salary will increase if the Board is actually committed to the 95th percentile. D. Greenberg asked if it is possible that some faculty would get the bulk of the extra money, and P. Lakeland responded affirmatively.

S. Rakowitz asked what had happened last year, with they money from increased co-pays. G. Lang responded that half of the money went to salary, the other half to endowment. W. Abbott argued that health benefit costs might decrease with no corresponding increase in salary. P. Lakeland reiterated that that shouldn’t happen, if the Trustees and AVP are committed to the 95th percentile. J. Lange asked if the Board did not agree with the Guiding Principles. P. Lakeland responded that it was good that we had the Principles, but that only one Board member indicated agreement with it. G. Lang argued that since in three of the last four years the CPI had not been met, in the short run that means the death of the merit program. T. Snyder asked if there was clarity around which figure should be used to measure “cost of living.” He suggested that economists address this issue. G. Lang stated that an attempt was made to explain CPI-U, which typically does not include benefits. T. Snyder suggested that a position paper be presented to the Board as a basis for further discussion. P. Lakeland argued that economists were present at the meeting (W. Hlawitschka, M. LeClair), but that it wasn’t really the correct forum, that it should go to the salary committee. E. Hadjimichael asked what would happen if the Guiding Principles were actually used? P. Lakeland responded that it would help determine the relative portion of salary versus health care benefit increases.

7. New Business

a. Three proposals from the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

i. Guidelines for UCC advisory committees reviewing courses
J. Garvey, Chair of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee presented a document, “Guidelines for UCC Advisory Committees” that would provide direction to the Core Science Review Committee and the two advisory subcommittees on diversity in proposing new courses. J. Garvey asked that the AC approve the proposed Guidelines.

E. O’Neill asked if all the items (1-5) were guidelines, since points 1 and 2 appeared to be contextual. J. Garvey suggested that the motion should be to approve the complete draft, and then points 3-5 could be put into the Journal of Record. S. Rakowitz asked why point 3d was necessary. J. Garvey explained that J. Simon drafted these guidelines, and that the committee wanted to make it clear that proposes include “rules and specifications.” W. Abbott argued that 3d was trying to make criteria specific. J. Lang suggested that more transparency was needed in the course approval process, but she wondered if it was necessary to have the course descriptions included in the minutes. J. Garvey said that the committee does want the course description, because it is helpful for review. T. Snyder argued that more specific descriptions ensure that the committee focuses on the guidelines and prevents discriminatory behavior. K. Steffen affirmed that it was good to have course descriptions. P. Lang asked if there were specific criteria for the committee used in making their determination. J. Garvey responded that the Guidelines under consideration were an umbrella document, then more specific criteria would be presented. K. Steffen suggested that in the sciences, there has been interest in having the process of course approval be more orderly. J. He said that when he had been Chair of the UCC, there were no written documents on courses that the UCC approved. The World diversity subcommittee would approve courses, but they would not seek approval of UCC. UCC asked the subcommittee to at least provide a summary of what they approved.

I. Mulvey suggested that before making a motion, the Council should remove points 1 and 2 and re-number 3, 4 and 5 as 1, 2 and 3, but use the paragraphs 1 and 2 as introductory paragraphs.

**MOTION.** [Lang/Steffen] To approve the Guidelines for UCC Advisory Committees for inclusion in the Journal of Record with the proposed modifications (remove points 1 and 2 and re-number 3, 4 and 5 as 1, 2 and 3, but use the paragraphs 1 and 2 as introductory paragraphs).

S. Rakowitz proposed an amendment.

**AMENDMENT.** [Rakowitz/Abbott] To remove the last sentence from the Guidelines in point 3d.

T. Snyder argued against the amendment; W. Abbott argued for, along with I. Mulvey.

**AMENDMENT PASSES:** 8-2-4
Discussion continued on the motion as amended. D. Keenan asked why the Guidelines didn’t tie into language in the Course Catalog, that this might leave open the potential for interpretation by the subcommittees. J. Garvey suggested that these Guidelines applied across subcommittees and thus had to be general.

P. Lakeland proposed an amendment.

**AMENDMENT.** [Lakeland/Keenan] [new wording for Guidelines, point 3d (to be re-labeled 1d), last sentence] “Please frame such a discussion around the criteria approved for your committee.”

J. Garvey argued that this was covered by point 3c. P. Lakeland asked if it was always the case that subcommittees will be asking about core credit? J. Garvey said that the Guidelines referred specifically to core review classes (Core Science Review, and US and World Diversity). I. Mulvey suggested combining points 3c and 3d. J. He argued that some of the US and World Diversity classes are not core classes.

**AMENDMENT PASSES: 11-0-3**

J. Garvey asserted that US and World Diversity classes are core requirements. S. Rakowitz proposed an amendment.

**AMENDMENT.** [Rakowitz/Buss] [new wording for Guidelines, point 3c (to be re-labeled 1c), last sentence] “The committee’s recommendation on whether the course meets the specifications for core credit in the area under the committee’s purview.”

D. Keenan spoke in favor. D. Greenberg argued that this document should be sent back to the UCC to tighten the language. K. Steffen spoke in favor. J. Buss called the question.

**MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION [Buss/Steffen]: 14-0-0**

**AMENDMENT PASSES: 12-2-0**

D. Greenberg moved to table the motion and send back to the UCC.

**MOTION.** [Greenberg/Sapp] Table the motion.

**MOTION FAILS: 4-7-3**

**MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION [Ligas/Buss]: 13-1-0**

Vote on the main motion.

**MOTION PASSES: 11-2-1**
ii. **Request form and template for US Diversity and World Diversity course submissions**

J. Garvey asked the Council to approve the request form and template for each of the Diversity subcommittees and to have these materials included in the Journal of Record. The templates came to UCC in their December meeting, including the Request Form, Criteria and Guidelines, Chart, and flow chart.

F. Dohm suggested that the Council focus on the US Diversity Designation forms.

**MOTION [Buss/He]: To approve the “Request to Consider Course for US Diversity Designation” form and include in the Journal of Record.**

S. Rakowitz stated that the template asks for more than is often provided on a course syllabus. She suggested that this presents a higher hurdle for a faculty member to offer a Diversity course, even though offering these courses is something the University wants to encourage. T. Snyder stated that, on the other hand, these are guidelines, and they might be helpful to people who haven’t offered these courses before. W. Abbott argued that statements on the template such as “will [students] be moved to advocacy?” is an example of areas where the templates might create uncertainty. G. Lang had questions about emphasizing student learning outcomes. He argued that the role of the University is to provide an environment where learning can take place, but learning outcomes are the responsibility of our adult students. We should focus on content and methods of delivery rather than learning outcomes.

P. Lakeland argued that the courses themselves have already been approved, we don’t need the Diversity Committee to second guess the department’s decision. The committee needs to find out if there is diversity in the substance or content of the course, not the process (how the course is taught). J. Lange explained that, from the UCC’s perspective, the committee needs more information. The syllabi that faculty present represent a wide range, from too much to too little information. G. Lang re-emphasized that the focus should be on content.

Due to the late hour, the Council agreed to recess the meeting at this time and reconvene on Monday, April 10 at 3:30 in CNS 209 to complete the remaining items on today’s agenda.

**MOTION. [Greenberg/Sapp]: To recess.**

**MOTION PASSES: 12-0-0**

Respectfully submitted,

Don Gibson

Secretary pro tem
Academic Council
April 10, 2006
CNS 209 at 3:30 PM

The Academic Council meeting of April 3, 2006 was reconvened on April 10th at 3:30.

Attending:
Professors Abbott, Buss, DeWitt (Executive Secretary), Dohm (Chair), Greenberg, Gibson, Haug, He, Keenan, Lakeland, Lang, Lange, Ligas, Mulvey (Secretary of the General Faculty), O'Neill, Rakowitz, Sapp, Steffen.
Guests: Professors Garvey, Crabtree, Bradford.

7.a.ii.
The meeting reconvened with the motion moved on April 3, 2006 still on the floor:

**MOTION.** The Academic Council approves the Template for approval of U.S. Diversity courses approved by the UCC at its March 2006 meeting.

Sapp: Spoke against the motion because he does not believe the setting of guidelines for how the UCC or diversity committee decides on courses is an appropriate topic for the Academic Council.

Rakowitz: Spoke against the motion. These do not seem to be guidelines but requirements and may discourage rather than encourage people to submit diversity course proposals.

Abbot: Spoke against the motion. The template is very vague and does not do what a template should do. This template may be suitable as a set of guidelines.

He: Can changes be made to this document?

Garvey: The document you have before you is the one voted on by the UCC.

He: Yes, but can it be taken back to the committee for the purpose of revision?

Lang: Spoke against the motion. A document that was intended to be helpful seems to be more a set of strict standards.

Garvey: Explained that the reason for creating a standard template was to avoid having the UCC having to constantly reinvent the wheel. People are constantly going off and coming on the committee and the hope was to create a standard that would guide the UCC over time.

Steffen: Spoke against the motion. Is this document sufficient? What level of detail will be necessary? How do you using this document create a sufficient standard?
Mulvey: Asked if the paragraph that appears in the catalogue gives sufficient guidance to know the criteria for what meets a US diversity course?

Garvey: The paragraph that is in the template is a quote from the catalogue.

The question was called, and the motion was voted down. In favor of the motion 2, Opposed 9, Abstain 3. **MOTION FAILED.**

The Council then began a discussion of the template for approving World Diversity Courses. No motion was placed on the floor.

Steffen: There may be no need for a template but the particulars for criteria for approval could be left to the Diversity committee with UCC guidance within the framework established by the catalogue.

Abbot: I see mistakes in the template for World Diversity courses.

Grossman: It is necessary to find a mechanism that allows for a sufficient number of World Diversity courses that have adequate rigor to exist. Possibly some general statement to guide the UCC could be drafted but it must be done with the understanding that there must be sufficient courses to meet this University requirement.

Garvey: Expressed agreement with the remarks of AVP Grossman. The UCC has formed a subcommittee to examine the delivery of diversity courses.

**7.a.iii.**

Next item on the agenda was a request from the UCC to change the Social Science Core requirement as it appears on page 30 of the current catalogue.

Garvey: This item was referred to the UCC by the Deans of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Dolan School of Business. The Social Science departments are in agreement that the present requirement should be changed. The Psychology Department had several dissenting voices to this view.

Keenan: As the Core currently exists a Biology major, for example, need not take another science to meet the Science Core requirement.

**MOTION**. [Rakowitz/Lang] that the AC approve the recommendation of the UCC: to eliminate the restriction that majors in the Social Sciences may not use courses in the department in which they are majoring to fulfill the social science requirement in the core.

Sapp: Spoke against the motion. Why does this proposal not just apply to double majors?

Garvey: This Core requirement no longer serves a useful purpose.
Lang: Spoke for the motion. The breadth of our Core is insured and a second social science course is not needed.

The question was called. The motion carried. In favor 14, Opposed 1, Abstain 0. **MOTION PASSED.**

7.b.
At this point Professor Crabtree joined the Council to discuss item 7.b. under New Business, the approval of the program proposal for a Corporate Cohort Program in Organizational Communication. This program will lead to a Master of Arts in Communication.

**MOTION.** [Greenberg/Lang] to approve the Cohort Program in Organizational Communication.

Mulvey: Faculty Secretary Mulvey explained that this program had been prevented from coming to the Academic Council in 2005 because it had not gone through the proper routing procedures. The program in academic year 2005-2006 has now gone through the proper routing procedures and approvals. She expressed appreciation for the work of Prof. Crabtree and Dean Wilson to insure proper procedures were followed and approvals obtained.

Lang: Asked if in this program new courses would go through the college curriculum committee for approval?

Crabtree: Yes, that is correct. New courses would go through the department and then the college curriculum committee.

Buss: Asked how learning assessment would be measured?

Crabtree: Since this proposal was written we have come to understand much more about the need for more direct assessment outcomes.

Rakowitz: Expressed serious concern that degrees in this program have been granted before the program had been through faculty committees and been approved.

The question was called. In favor 14, Opposed 0, Abstain 0. **MOTION PASSED.**

7.c.
At this point, Professor Bradford joined the meeting to discuss Item 7.c. Proposal for a minor in Accounting Information Systems.

Bradford: This minor merges accounting and information systems. These are overlapping areas of the curriculum that are now not covered.
Rakowitz: Would this minor be limited to students majoring in either accounting or information systems?

Bradford: Technically no, but given the requirements it would be very difficult for anyone else to fulfill the minor.

**MOTION. [He/Ligas] To approve the minor in Accounting Information Systems.**

He: Spoke for the motion. Any one can take this minor but it really only makes sense for students majoring in either accounting or information systems.

The question was called. In favor 14, Opposed 1, Abstain 0. **MOTION PASSED.**

7.d.
The next item on the agenda was 7.d., Five year review of the engineering program.

Hadjamichael: Gave a summary of the written report already given to Council members

Mulvey: Usually a faculty member would present a report of this type to the Council.

Hadjamichael: Did not believe a faculty member present was necessary but if the Council so wished that could happen at the next meeting.

Rakowitz: Asked what the size was of individual classes?

Hadjamichael: There are about 25 students admitted each year to the program. Currently program has 96 majors. Each class runs from 8 to about 17. There are never 20 in a class.

**MOTION. [O’Neill/Lang] to accept the 5 year review.**

Rakowitz. This is a very expensive program given the class size and the need to have more full time faculty. What does it mean to accept this review in light of the cost of the program?

Hadjamichael: Program is heavily staffed with adjunct and existing faculty. It is not that expensive a program.

Lang: What is the purview of the Council with regard to reviewing a program?

Sapp: Page 30 of the report indicates 5 full time faculty. Are these the same people who serve as Directors of the MA

Hadjamichael: No

Mulvey: Are there projections for new full time faculty?
Hadjamichael: As faculty are needed we will request them.

Steffen: What are the resource needs for the program over the next 5 years.

Hadjamichael: The resources must be consistent with the needs of the program, especially in order to deal with outside industries.

The question was called. In favor 13, Opposed 0, Abstain 2. **MOTION PASSED.**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:32.

Submitted by
Donald Greenberg
To: Academic Council  
From: Subcommittee on Non-Tenured Positions  
Date: 4/21/06  
RE: Subcommittee Report and Recommendations

Background and Recommendations

The subcommittee consisted of Rick DeWitt, George Lang, and Dean Tim Snyder, and was formed by the Academic Council to look into, and make recommendations about, non tenured faculty positions. Part of the motivation for forming the subcommittee came from concern about faculty being appointed to positions (for example, Special Visiting Instructor) not recognized by the Faculty Handbook.

After discussions with the Academic Vice President, the subcommittee is recommending the following:

(i) Add “Visiting Instructor” to the Faculty Handbook descriptions of non-tenured positions. This will bring the descriptions for visiting positions into line with the faculty positions described on page 21 of the handbook, and allow for the possibility of hiring someone, to a temporary but full-time position, who is in the process of completing his or her PhD (or other terminal degree).

(ii) Compensation figures for Visiting Instructors will be determined by the figures in the Memo of Understanding (as is currently done for Visiting Assistant Professors, Visiting Associate Professors, and Visiting Professors).

(iii) Apply the “Qualifications for Appointment to Rank” on page 21 of the Handbook to non-tenured positions as well as to full-time permanent positions.

Since (ii) and (iii) are applications of existing policies, (i) is the only item that requires change. In particular, we recommend the Academic Council approve the following Motion.

**Motion.** The Academic Council recommends the changes below to section II.A.7 (page 26) of the Faculty Handbook be approved by the General Faculty. New language is indicated by **bold**, deleted language is indicated by *strikeout*. (For context, all of Section II.A.7 is included, although the changes affect only paragraph 4.)

7. Non-Tenured Positions
A Lecturer shall be a teacher carrying less than the normal teaching load and is appointed for a single semester or academic year.

A Graduate Assistant shall be a student of the University appointed to a curriculum area for one academic year and assigned duties as determined by the appropriate Dean and the faculty responsible for the curriculum area.

An Adjunct Professor, who may have any of the three grades—Assistant, Associate, or Professor—shall be an expert in a particular field whose main post is outside this or any
other university and who shall be appointed to give part-time or discontinuous service. The title in any grade shall not imply tenure.

A Visiting Professor, who may have any of the three grades, A Visiting Instructor, or a Visiting Professor (who may have any of the three grades), shall come to give full-time service for one or two semesters. This may be renewed on an annual basis but not ordinarily for more than a total of three years. The title in any grade does not imply tenure.

The President of the University shall be granted *ex officio* the rank of Professor in a curriculum area appropriate to his doctoral degree and/or prior teaching experience. The granting of this rank does not of itself imply tenure.

Academic administrators who have held faculty rank at other institutions may be granted the same rank in an appropriate curriculum area upon the request of the President and approval of the faculty in the curriculum area. Such rank does not imply tenure nor does time spent in rank as an administrator count as part of a probationary period toward tenure. An appointment at a higher rank may be granted upon the request of the President, approval of the faculty in the curriculum area and the Committee on Rank and Tenure. Academic administrators granted the rank of Instructor or above are voting members of the General Faculty.
Date: March 28, 2006
To: Rick DeWitt, Faith-Anne Dohm, Irene Mulvey
From: Orin L. Grossman
Re: Academic Council motions

Thank you for forwarding on March 26th the motions passed by the Academic Council on March 6, 2006. In keeping with policy in the Journal of Record, I am responding on behalf of the administration.

Motion:
Issues surrounding the provision that adjuncts be paid in accordance with the Memo of Understanding have been resolved.

This motion is approved for inclusion in the Journal of Record

Motion:
Amend the 4/25/1988 Journal of Record entry regarding the listing of new programs to say that “the approval of all new programs should be entered into the Journal of Record.”

This motion is approved for inclusion in the Journal of Record

Motion:
To accept the program for an Interdisciplinary Minor in Catholic Studies.

This motion is approved for inclusion in the Journal of Record

Motion:
Faculty members approved for sabbatical leave will not be eligible for (summer stipends) either summer contiguous to the academic year of the sabbatical leave.

This motion is approved for inclusion in the Journal of Record

Motion:
Amend the language in the Rank and Tenure Guidelines timetable section 11 as follows: (new language is underlined).

11. By April 1

The Committee recommendation for or against the appeal will be forwarded to the applicant. The Committee recommendations for all applicants will be presented to the President. The Academic Vice President will make his/her recommendation to the President and provide the Committee with a copy.

This motion is approved for inclusion in the Journal of Record

Motion:
That the statistical and qualitative results of the student evaluations of individual faculty members’ teaching be sent directly to the individual faculty member without being viewed by anyone else, unless and until the individual faculty member chooses to make those results known.

This motion is not approved for inclusion in the Journal of Record. In an era of increased public and internal scrutiny of assessment tools for a wide variety of purposes, including accreditation, Rank and Tenure, and merit reviews, it is increasingly important that the university is able to state to various internal and external stakeholders that we do
in fact review and assess appropriate information. This is not the time to add language to the Journal of Record that would seem to isolate the faculty from appropriate collegial and decanal review.

Much has been made of the inadequacy of the present evaluative tool. I agree with that assessment and as long ago as January, 2001, I recommended that, as merit was coming, it would be wise to review the tools used in making judgments. The way to deal with an inadequate tool is to change it and I encourage the faculty to review the number of commercially available tools. In the meantime, we must use what we have as wisely as possible and this language would not be a helpful addition to the Journal of Record.
## COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td>Behavioral &amp; Social Sciences/DSB</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Grossman</td>
<td>GSEAP/Nursing</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Zera</td>
<td>At large</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Schwab</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura McSweeney</td>
<td>Natural Sciences/Math/Engineering</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Restrictions.** Must have completed at least 2 years service at Fairfield

**Note.** Candidates submitted by the Academic Council and by nominations from the floor.

### Humanities: VOTE FOR ONE

________ Betsy Bowen (CAS/English)

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

### Behavioral and Social Sciences/Dolan School of Business: VOTE FOR ONE

________ Cheryl Tromley (DSB/Management)

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________
SECRETARY OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

1 opening for a three-year term ending in spring 2009

VOTE FOR ONE:

___________Irene Mulvey (CAS/Mathematics and Computer Science)

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________
Date: April 24, 2006
To: Executive Committee of the Academic Council
From: Beth Boquet, Chair, Faculty Salary Committee
Re: Subcommittee on Benefits

Benefits, and in particular health benefits, are an important part of faculty’s compensation package and are detailed in the Faculty Handbook. Given the Board of Trustees' interest in reviewing and requesting changes to health benefits, the Faculty Salary Committee makes the following motion:

The Faculty Salary Committee requests that the Academic Council form a Subcommittee on Health Benefits to investigate the current benefits arrangements with benefits plan providers (Anthem Blue Cross/Blue Shield, for example) as well as to offer updates and make recommendations to appropriate university bodies (including the Budget Committee, the Faculty Salary Committee, the Academic Council, and the General Faculty).

Background Information and Rationale:

1. Such an arrangement has precedent with this body. The last time major changes to health benefits described in the Faculty Handbook were made, a group such as the one we are requesting was convened as a subcommittee of the Academic Council.

2. Changes to benefits, as we all know, have wide-ranging implications for all members of the university community. We seek, then, a group whose explicit focus will be health benefits (in contrast to several of our committees, for whom benefits is one of a number of concerns) and whose members can work the intersections of various interest groups (budget and salary, for example).

3. The subcommittee should be large enough to offer reasonable representation but small enough for members to meet with relative frequency. We would suggest that the subcommittee include one faculty representative each from the Faculty Salary Committee and the Budget Committee (to be appointed by the respective committees), one administrative representative, and two members of the Academic Council. The committee should meet frequently with representatives from Human Resources and their advisors and access consultant resources available through both the administration and through the FWC/AAUP.
Date: April 17, 2006  
To: Executive Committee of the Academic Council  
From: Orin Grossman  
Re: Academic Calendar

Over the fall semester, the Academic Support Group, under the direction of Mary Francis Malone, has been examining a number of issues related to the academic calendar. I want to share their views with you.

The Academic Calendar is complete for 2006/2007 and we have a draft of 2007/2008. The primary issue of 2006/2007 is to request a change in the Journal of Record to eliminate the statement that there should be a minimum of three reading days. This is an essential change based on five important reasons.

- We need additional class days, and by eliminating one of the reading days we can consolidate the exam period and add at least one more class day to both the fall and spring semesters. We are always particularly constrained in the fall semester by our late start (after Labor Day) and the necessity to finish by Christmas. We have fewer class days at present per semester than Notre Dame, Villanova, Loyola Maryland, and UConn. Most of the schools we surveyed indicated two reading days was the norm.

- Quantitative evidence from the DiMenna Nyselius Library indicates that the library hosted the least number of student patrons in 2003, 2004 and 2005 on reading days.

- Student Affairs over the last few years has reported increased disciplinary action and social activity on the evening prior to and on the reading days themselves.

- Over the last two years, many of the faculty, for sound pedagogical reasons, have chosen not to require final exams in the traditional format of a written exam scheduled during exam week.

- Depending on the specific timing of the holidays, with the three reading days, we find ourselves as we did this last December, ending exams as late as December 23rd. This caused a fair amount of discussion among faculty, as well as students and parents. All of the evidence of the past two years seems to indicate that the students do not need and do not use three reading days. Thus I am requesting a change in the Journal of Record.

The second issue, which is contained in the same section of the Journal of Record, has to do with the academic calendar itself. Fairfield University is in the unique situation of beginning after Labor Day. Historically, this has been the case because of the students residing at Fairfield Beach. We now have full assurances from the Student Affairs Division that it is possible to start the week before Labor Day and that students who plan to reside at the beach, with enough notice, can adjust their leases. Thus, we are no longer
tied to the need to begin after Labor Day. This change will not be in effect 2006-2007, but will begin in the 2007-2008 academic year.

In addition, in examining the calendar for the last two years, Academic Support determined that we do need, at least, one more class day in the fall semester. The state does require 14 weeks and in some of the professional schools, the requirement is up to 15 weeks. Thus, the opportunity to start the week before Labor Day would provide another full week of classes.

I am therefore requesting that the Council amend the Journal of Record statement, “that the first semester begin the first week of September (e.g. September 3rd) and end before Christmas (e.g. September 19)…. [from March, 1970]. I believe a statement that the fall semester ends by Christmas should be sufficient. If the Council wishes to target a beginning, perhaps a statement referring to the last week in August would be appropriate.

Of course, it will be important to amend faculty contracts to be consistent with a nine-month contract, beginning slightly before labor day and therefore ending before May 31. The faculty contracts will certainly remain nine-month contracts.

In addition, the University Registrar has compressed the examination schedule for next fall into 5 ½ days to insure that we have sufficient class days. This is made possible because many faculty members no longer offer the traditional examination of a 3 hour in-class experience. Because the registrar is not aware of each of these situations, he has been required to provide a slot for every single class. The effect of that is that many students have an extended exam period with only one or two exams over a period of 8 or 9 days. Thus, the consolidation and compression of the exam schedule into 5 ½ days also assists in providing more class days and more time for faculty to submit their grades.

Thank you for your attention to these matters
Proposal for Adding Faculty Members from each Professional School to the Library Committee

Submitted to the Academic Council
April 21, 2006

Jocelyn M. Boryczka, Chair, Library Committee

Introduction
This proposal arises from a discussion in Fall 2004 by S. Grossman of the Library Committee regarding the need for representation on the committee from all of the professional schools. At the time all members were from the College of Arts & Sciences but S. Grossman and all were in favor of the recommendation. No further action was taken by the 2004-2005 Chair. The idea was discussed again at the 12/2/05 Library Committee Meeting and supported by all members. The Library Committee revisited the matter at its February 3, 2006 meeting at which the committee agreed to investigate how the professional schools viewed the need for expanding the committee’s membership to reflect their growing role at Fairfield University. The Library Committee unanimously voted to support the proposal at its April 5, 2006 meeting. See attachments of pertinent meeting minutes regarding this proposal.

Rationale for Proposal
The professional schools have grown exponentially and should each be represented in order for all schools and departments to be involved in accomplishing the purpose of the Library Committee which is to study and make recommendations concerning library policies and utilization of funds.

Proposed Change to the Handbook (10th edition) page 15 under Membership of the Library Committee:

Current Handbook language:
Six members elected from the faculty for three-year overlapping terms; one member to be elected from each of the following electoral divisions: Behavioral and Social Sciences and School of Business; Natural Sciences and Mathematics; the Graduate School and Nursing; two members from two different departments in the Humanities; and one member at large without restriction as to curriculum area or school. The Director of the Library or his or her delegate shall be a voting member.

Current language with proposed changes shown:
Six Seven members elected from the faculty for three-year overlapping terms; one member to be elected from each of the following electoral divisions: Behavioral and Social Sciences and School of Business; Natural Sciences and Mathematics; the Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions; the School of Nursing; and two members from two different departments in the Humanities; and one member at large without restriction as to curriculum area or school. The University Librarian and the Director of the Library or his or her delegate shall be a non-voting ex officio members.
Proposed new language:
Seven members elected from the faculty for three-year overlapping terms; one member to be elected from each of the following electoral divisions: Behavioral and Social Sciences; School of Business; Natural Sciences and Mathematics; the Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions; the School of Nursing; and two members from two different departments in the Humanities. The University Librarian and the Director of the Library shall be non-voting ex officio members.

Summary of Changes to Current Language in the Faculty Handbook
1. Faculty membership increases by one member: from six to seven.
2. The School of Business will hold membership separate from the College of Arts & Sciences Behavioral & Social Sciences division.
3. The School of Nursing will hold membership separate from the Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions.
4. The phrase “and one member at large without restriction as to curriculum area or school” is deleted.
5. The “University Librarian” and “the Director of the Library” now both serve as non-voting ex officio members of the committee. Both members are necessary to the providing the information regarding the library, its budget, and services necessary for the committee to perform its work.
Library Committee Meeting
December 2, 2005
Excerpt of minutes

III. Addition of New Members from All Professional Schools to Library Committee - S. Grossman recommended that the Library Committee consider enlarging its constituency to include members from each professional school. Discussion ensued regarding the increasing numbers of students in these programs and all agreed it would be important to obtain representation from each School in order that their library needs are met. J. Boryczka asked S. Grossman to develop a proposal for the committee to send to Academic Council regarding this recommended change and send to her.

Library Committee Meeting
February 3, 2006
Excerpt of minutes

III. Addition of New Members from All Professional Schools to Library Committee. Following our previous conversations regarding representation of all the professional schools on the LC, we discussed the possibility of broadening membership on the LC. The chair asked an open question to members of the committee as to how the distribution of representation among the various departments and schools was originally decided. SG suggested pursuing the question with those with more institutional history than was represented by the committee. She offered to follow up on the question and the issue was tabled pending her findings.

Library Committee Meeting
April 5, 2006
Excerpt of minutes

Proposal for a Handbook Change to Add Faculty Member from professional schools. Discussion of proposal ensued.

Sheila brought the committee up to date on previous discussions relating to this idea. She then read the current Faculty Handbook language and compared it to the proposed changes (see attached proposal). In addition to the additional representation of the professional schools, the University Librarian and the Director of the Library shall be added as non-voting ex-officio members.

Tod felt the proposed change reflected an appropriate mix and representation of the University community.

Danke expressed support of the proposed changes.

Gisela brought up the change in voting of the committee members from the Library.

Jocelyn felt that the committee needed the important input from both the Director and the University Librarian. She said that the proposed changes, which includes the representation of both members from the Library, best supports the actual working of the Library Committee.

Motion was made to accept the new changes and seconded. Vote was unanimous (8 in favor; 0 opposed). The proposed changes will be submitted for discussion at the next meeting of the ACC in May.