

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, October 5, 2009
CNS 200
3:30 – 5:00 PM

1. Presidential courtesy.
2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty
3. Report from the Executive Secretary.
 - a. Approval of minutes of meeting of September 14, 2009 (attached)
 - b. Correspondence
 - i. Response from AC Subcommittee on Governance to AC questions (attached)
 - ii. Additional correspondence from Committee on Conference re Q&As (attached)
 - iii. Athletic conflicts with final exams (attached)
 - c. Oral Reports
4. Council Committee Reports
 - a. IDEA subcommittee
5. Petitions for immediate hearing.
6. Old Business
 - a. Consideration of AC Subcommittee on Governance proposals (attachment)
7. New business
 - a. School of Nursing proposal for Doctor of Nursing Practice (included separately); EPC 9/17/09 minutes (attached)
 - b. Elect faculty representatives to the Honorary Degree Committee
 - c. Election of 3 person panel judging faculty achievements for recognition receptions
 - d. Form subcommittee to clarify policy on grade changing (attachment)
 - e. Form subcommittee to work on academic calendar and final exam schedule
8. Adjournment

Attachments

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| For 3.a. | Draft minutes of 9/14/09 AC meeting (pages 3-9) |
| For 3.b.i | Memo from AC Subcommittee on Governance dated 9/21/09 (pages 10-13) |
| For 3.b.ii | Summary of 6/4/09 meeting with the Academic Affairs Subcommittee of the Board (pages 14-16) |
| For 3.b.iii. | Memo to SVP Fitzgerald dated 8/26/09 (page 17) |
| For 6.a | Final report of ACSG dated 9/1/09 (pages 18-25) |
| For 7.a | SON proposal included as separate booklet; EPC minutes of 9/17/09 re SON proposal (pages 26-29) |
| For 7.d | Excerpt of 3/9/09 AC minutes with relevant motion (page 30) |

PENDING ITEMS ON BACK

Pending Items

- A. Recommendations in report in Spring 2002 from Faculty Athletics 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 University's 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. Distance learning issues. (*See item 7 of AC minutes of 5/5/03.*)
- D. Report from the Educational Technologies Committee on security, long-term feasibility, potential for integration, ownership, accessibility, etc. of servers containing faculty data. (*See AC minutes of 2/5/2007; AC 4/2/07 3b; AC 12/3/2007 7b.*)
- E. Faculty Data Committee (*AC 12/3/07*).
- F. Subcommittee (Nantz, Mulvey) to consider ways of ensuring that faculty policy is correctly stated in official documents. (*See AC minutes 10/1/2007*).
- G. Issues related to parking on campus; faculty on University parking study (*AC 2/5/07 7c; AC 3/5/07 6a; AC 4/2/07 6a; AC 9/10/07 3bi; AC 10/1/07 6c; AC 2/4/08 3bi*).
- H. Subcommittee on sunseting of courses (*AC 4/28/08*)
- I. MFA in Creative Writing, Five-Year-Review due in 12/2012 (*AC 12/3/07*).

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. Report from the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees after each meeting with board members. At the end of each academic year, discuss items for the Conference Committee to put on the agenda for their meetings with members of the board the following year.

DRAFT MINUTES
Academic Council Meeting
September 14, 2009
3:30- 5:07 p.m.
CNS 200

Present: Professors Bowen, Lyon, Bayne, Preli, Mulvey (Faculty Secretary), Tucker, DeWitt, Bernhardt, Xu, Garvey, Boryczka, Robert, Shea, Strauss, Rakowitz, Bayers, Massey,
Deans: Solomon, Crabtree, Wilson, Hadjimichael, Franzosa
Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs (SVPAA): Fitzgerald, S.J.
Guests: Professors Nantz, Greenberg, Thiel, Hlawitschka, Kelly; Alison MacNeill (student)
Regrets: Joseph Dennin
Absent:

The recording secretary for this meeting was chosen by lot by SVP Fitzgerald from an envelope provided by the Faculty Secretary, Prof. Mulvey. Tracey Robert was the lucky winner. Prof. Mulvey then conducted elections for Chair and Executive Secretary of the Academic Council. Rona Preli was nominated and elected chair unanimously. Rick DeWitt was elected unanimously as executive secretary.

1. Presidential Courtesy

SVPAA Fitzgerald addressed the Council stating he is happy to be at Fairfield. He comes to the university with great respect for the university and has felt a desire for shared governance among the faculty and administration. His ideas of shared governance include being candid about ideas, being transparent, sharing data. He feels the proposal from the AC subcommittee on governance being presented today is an advantage to creating shared governance for an outsider new to the Fairfield community. He felt the general faculty committee meeting on Friday, 9/11, included an articulate, well-reasoned presentation by Prof. Joy Gordon. He stated that the Trustees also have legal counsel to consider. He stated that he would prefer not to have a year of confrontation. He feels universities work best from having very clear transparent rules, protocols and structures and also loyalty, respect and dignity are important. He stated that the university is weathering the financial situation well. He hopes that the Faculty Salary Committee (FSC) has done the best job in offering a proposal to the faculty and that we can move forward and get back to the business of teaching, scholarship and research. He offered to take questions. There were none.

2. Report from Secretary of the General Faculty

Prof. Mulvey welcomed all new members of the council, SVPAA Fitzgerald, Alison MacNeill, the student observer from FUSA and returning members. She reminded members that there is a roster on page 3 of the packet. She referenced the memo on taking minutes which is on page 4 of the packet. She stressed that the minutes are vitally important to the work of the council and the faculty. They are the official record of the meeting and the only way the General Faculty learns of our work.

Prof. Mulvey stated that Item 6.b. proposal for more fully integrating graduate education into Handbook committees is tabled by request of the proposers.

Prof. Mulvey requested that Item 6 a. be moved to the next meeting. There is nothing new to discuss. Prof. Mulvey stated this is an unusually full agenda for a first meeting of the council.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary

a.i. Approval of minutes

Prof. Preli (Chair) asked for corrections or changes for the draft minutes of April 27, 2009.

Prof. Massey asked that her comment be changed as follows on page 11 of the packet.

Prof. Massey stated that if improving working relations was for the rationale for administrators to have voting privileges, then giving administrators voting privileges could, in situations in which the votes of the faculty members and the administrative members of the Academic Council diverge, send a message that we lack collegiality and could send a negative message. Prof. Massey spoke against the motion due to the potential unintended consequences of giving voting privileges to administrators.

MOTION. To accept minutes as amended. [Massey/Garvey]

MOTION PASSED. 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 7 abstentions

a.ii. Prof. Preli asked for corrections or changes for the draft minutes of June 23, 2009. There were none.

MOTION. To accept minutes. [Bowen/Boryczka].

MOTION PASSED. 7 in favor, 0 opposed, 8 abstentions.

a.iii. Prof. Preli asked for corrections or changes for the draft minutes of July 29, 2009.

Prof. DeWitt called attention to two areas, p. 22-23 where it was unclear who was speaking. It appeared that it was the recording secretary's comments and he asked that they be removed.

On page 24, Prof. DeWitt wanted his statement to be changed as follows:

DeWitt: the attorney did draft a statement before the administration offered the extension, it accomplished the same thing as the attorney's letter.

Prof. Mulvey clarified the strikethroughs and corrections made to Prof. Massey's remarks on page 24. She had received these before the meeting and made the corrections.

Prof. Bowen recommended that the emoticons that appear on p. 35 & 26 be removed.

Prof. Robert stated that her name was misspelled in the faculty listing.

Prof. Bernhardt clarified his remarks on pg. 26. He stated that he was referring to all nontenure track faculty. He agreed that the minutes should be amended to the following: "will all untenured tenure track faculty be renewed?"

MOTION. To accept minutes as amended. [Bowen/Tucker].

MOTION PASSED. 12 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstentions.

3.b. Correspondence

Prof. DeWitt asked Prof. Mulvey to make comments on the correspondence.

b.i. Memo from President to faculty dated 6/12/09

Prof. Mulvey stated that this memo went directly out through faculty announce. No message was sent to the Academic Council or to the Faculty Secretary.

b.ii. Statement from Board of Trustees dated 6/12/2009

Prof. Mulvey again stated this was not sent to the Academic Council but directly to the faculty through faculty announce as an attachment to the President's message..

b.iii. Memo from Faculty Secretary to President dated 6/16/09

Prof. Mulvey wrote of serious concerns about some the factual errors contained in the above two pieces of correspondence. She asked if she could receive the minutes of the Board's meeting and specifically exactly what motions the Board of Trustees had voted on

b.iv. Letter from the President to the Faculty Secretary dated 6/29/09

The President responded with a list of the votes. Prof. Mulvey stated this information is essential. It shows the Board actions.

Prof. DeWitt stated he had concerns about misunderstandings about the charge of the AC subcommittee on governance and other items. He stated there were some unusual statements about the language in the Handbook.

MOTION. [Dewitt/Massey]. That the Academic Council direct the Executive Committee to write a cordial letter to the members of the BOT and cc'ing the GF, pointing out the misunderstandings related to the charges given to the ACSG, and the misunderstandings related to the provisions for amendment to the Handbook.

Discussion. Bowen asked if there is a precedent to communicate with the BOT in this way. Prof. Mulvey said she believed there was. Prof. Massey spoke in favor of the motion. She referenced her memo of June to the AC where she pointed out misinformation. Prof. Tucker was curious if a letter written to the BOT before their Oct. 1 meeting and before we vote on the proposals before us, would be in conflict?

Prof. DeWitt said this is a simple letter and believed it would not cause a conflict. Prof. Tucker asked Prof. Rakowitz as a member of the FSC, if she felt it would cause a conflict. Prof. Rakowitz spoke against the motion. She stated that since the Conference Committee is charged to speak to the Board already, she is not sure what the point would be.

Prof. DeWitt said that there have been repeated mistakes, inaccurate information in letters from both the President and BOT. Prof. DeWitt feels it is in our best interest to make sure the communication is correct. Prof. Mulvey stated her understanding is that we do have a communication problem which causes serious problems going forward. Dean Hadjimichael asked a procedural question. He stated that Prof. DeWitt's motion did not include the President. He asked that the letter be sent to him. Prof. DeWitt stated that the President would get it since he is a member of both the BOT and GF.

MOTION. [Tucker/Bayers]. Table the motion until after the report from the Committee on Committees.

MOTION PASSED. 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.

3.c. No oral reports.

4. Council Committee Reports.

a. Prof. Nantz presented the final report from the AC subcommittee on governance comprised of Profs. Greenberg, Thiel, Yarrington and Rakowitz and herself. She thanked all of them for their service. Prof. Nantz stated that since the GF did not approve motions as part of the package in May, the subcommittee work was done. However, a request from the President and

EVP for another meeting and meetings over the summer resulted in subsequent meetings. The committee hoped to work in a positive communication environment and to come up with a compromise between the BOT position approved in June and the faculty's alternative motions. The final report includes 7 recommendations to the council for changes to the Handbook.

The first two Handbook amendments (pgs. 34 & 35) are compromises. The committee recommends that the Academic Council approve adding the SVPAA and the secretary of the GF as voting members of the AC. (Amendment #1). The subcommittee eliminated two Deans and added the secretary of the GF.

The subcommittee recommends in Amendment #2 that the SVPAA be the person added to the executive committee as opposed to just any academic administrator.

The other five proposed changes have not been discussed with the administration. The subcommittee felt that these suggested changes would help to improve governance which is the stated intention of the Board and administration. These have not been discussed in the AC before. In the spirit of moving forward on issues of governance, the five Handbook amendments are recommended. Amendment #3 is adding the SVP of marketing and communications to the Public Lectures and Events Committee. Amendment #4 is intended to keep issues of governance in the schools between the faculty and the President not giving it up to the BOT. Handbook #5 formalizes the relationship between the standing committees and Board committees and puts it in the Handbook.

Amendment #6 responds to the NEASC recommendation for a global council to discuss broader representation of the university. Amendment #7 asks to include FSC and EPC members on the budget committee. They do work that directly impacts the budget.

Prof. Greenberg re-iterated that the administration hasn't agreed to any of these amendments. Prof. Thiel did say the committee did discuss the first two amendments at length with the administration. He stated the administration would not budge on these decisions. Prof. Mulvey thanked the committee for their hard work.

Chair Preli asked if there were questions for the committee. Prof. Bernhardt echoed the thanks for their work. He asked if they thought that adding the new amendments will cause a problem. Prof. Nantz said that their take was that they wanted to show the administration that the faculty is anxious to participate in shared governance. The committee hoped it will be seen as a show of goodwill and will create strong procedures as we move forward. Prof. Tucker asked if the subcommittee wanted the faculty to vote on this report. Prof. Nantz said it is up to the AC to decide what to do.

Prof. Thiel stated that since the faculty already said no to the proposed package, that the subcommittee wanted to create something that the AC could respond to. He stated that this is a compromise that has integrity. Prof. Massey stated that she really appreciated their hard work and had a question about the details ("the devil is in the details").

Prof. Massey asked how Amendment #1 would impact on her previously stated concern about the potential of an administrator voting against the faculty and how that would look in terms of faculty and administrators working together. Prof. Nantz stated that this proposal reduces the number of administrators with votes and that could reduce the possibility of that situation. Prof. Thiel stated that this amendment allows for participation and there are 7 Handbook committees where administrators already have voting privileges. Prof. Nantz stated that some of these new proposals increase transparency and feels that the administration will respond to that.

Dean Solomon added that before the BRC, the President did move to include faculty on committees that had been strictly administrative. Prof. Mulvey agreed that there was more inclusion of faculty, for example at Deans and Directors Meetings and meetings of the Senior Management Team, but they have never been given voting rights, as in the ACSG proposal. Prof. DeWitt stated that the senior management team deals only with topical issues, and is not a decision-making body. On the BOT subcommittees, it was hopeful that faculty would be included. But as the chair of the BOT stated in his letter inviting faculty participation on board committees, "To be clear, this is an invitation to have a participative voice, not vote," and that "shared governance does not necessarily mean shared decision making." Prof. DeWitt cited the standard and widely accepted model for shared governance, jointly formulated by the three bodies: AAUP, AGB, Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (trustees), ACE, American Council on Education (University presidents)

Prof. Nantz stated that everyone on the subcommittee was aware of the AAUP statement and they sought to find a compromise between what the administration proposed and provide an administrative role on the AC that they wanted to see. Prof. Thiel asked for clarification of the statement of the three bodies that Prof. DeWitt cited. Prof. DeWitt stated that the proposals from the AC subcommittee aren't in line with the jointly formulated statement on shared governance. Prof. Thiel asked for a definition of the contradiction. Chair Preli asked Prof. DeWitt to state a specific question for the subcommittee. Prof. DeWitt said that the AC is a decision-making, deliberative body. Prof. DeWitt questioned the committee on seeming divergence between this model of shared governance and what the subcommittee is proposing. Chair Preli asked that discussion be limited to questions specifically about the proposed Handbook amendments rather than a debate of the merit of the proposals. Dean Franzosa asked if the subcommittee had specifically considered the issue of due process with the SVPAA having a vote. She explained that the proposal would give the SVPAA essentially two votes which would be against due process. Prof. Nantz replied that they definitely did consider this issue. She stated that the current proposal only eliminated the Deans from having voting privileges and that the issue of inclusion of the SVPAA was also a problem with the initial proposal.

Prof. DeWitt stated that the second proposal creates a potential practical problem. . He stated that when he was previously on the executive committee, that it was his experience that faculty would ask for input on matters like ageism, and legal issues. They would be asking for input from the executive committee but not asking the items to go to the full AC. IF the SVPAA is a member of the EC, then such sensitive items, ones a faculty member does not want shared with administration, would have to be shared with the SVPAA, who would be obliged to share it with those he reports to. He likes the idea of inclusion but would like to suggest a different proposal to have the SVPAA meet once a month with the EC. Prof. Thiel stated if this (#2) is passed, that faculty would need to bring sensitive issues to other venues to deal with their concerns. There are other venues already available for faculty. Chair Preli invited the subcommittee to stay if they wished to observe the remainder of the meeting and thanked them for their work. The faculty applauded and the subcommittee members left the meeting.

Before taking any action on the subcommittee's proposals, a motion was made to re-order the agenda.

MOTION. [Rakowitz/Bowen]. To re-order the agenda to move immediately to item 7.a and, after that, return to item 4.a.

Discussion

Prof. Mulvey reminded the AC of the time constraint of the meeting. There is a tentative GF meeting scheduled for 9/25/09. However the agenda for that meeting has to go out tomorrow 9/15. If this motion passes, the AC will not get back to the subcommittee on governance Handbook amendments for a vote today. Her goal is for faculty to make informed decisions.

MOTION. [Tucker/ Rakowitz]. To call the question on re-ordering the agenda
MOTION PASSED. 13 in favor, 2 opposed, 0 abstentions

MOTION to re-order the agenda PASSED.
10 in favor, 5 opposed, 0 abstentions.

Prof. Rakowitz presented the FSC report and roadmap. This is in response to the Board wanting to remove fiscal policies from the Handbook.

On page 44 the three primary changes are listed:

Moving details of the life insurance, and the university contribution to the retirement plan to the BPO and removing “at no cost” from the description of the faculty health care plan in the Handbook.

What remains in the Handbook are tuition benefits, TIAA/CREF and Fidelity as retirement providers and the high quality medical plan as stated in the Handbook. Prof. Rakowitz stated that if the faculty does not act before Oct. 1, there may be negative consequences. If there are, they will affect all faculty and they may be big consequences.

MOTION.[Rakowitz/Tucker]. The Handbook is amended by replacing the section II.B. Fiscal Policies with the attached text.

Prof. DeWitt stated that he was surprised to see this motion. The motion doesn't include any of the contingencies that have been discussed. Prof. Rakowitz stated that they have every intention of having this contingent on the faculty and administration voting on the merit plan and the MOU. Prof. Massey asked what happen if the administration wants to make changes in the BPO without faculty review. She has a very grave concern – with this proposal, faculty have no control over changes.

Chair Preli asked faculty to speak in favor or against the motion. Prof. Rakowitz stated that on p. 61 of the packet the process is laid out. Dean Franzosa asked for clarification of what was being replaced with specific language. Prof. Mulvey referred faculty to pages 47 and 48 of the packet and said the highlighted and track changes are there. Prof. Mulvey remarked that she had initially asked the FSC to send each change as a separate item for a vote. There are three changes:

(1) To health benefits, (2) retirement and (3) life insurance. She asked that we focus on p. 47 & 48 where the substantive changes are shown.

Dean Franzosa asked how the MOU articulates with p.47 & 48. Prof. Mulvey stated that p.47 & 48 are on the floor now and whatever is in the MOU is not under discussion or up for a vote at this time. Prof. DeWitt stated that the contingencies should be included in the motion, because without them, the Council is being asked to give up key benefit protections for nothing in return.

Prof. Tucker spoke in favor of the motion. He stated that faculty voted against the package. However, this plan is not unreasonable. He felt most of it was agreed on in the GF last year. Prof. Mulvey asked to make a point of information which was that removing fiscal policies from the Handbook was voted down last year overwhelmingly. Prof. Tucker called the question. No second. Continued discussion.

Prof. Bernhardt wanted clarification on the BPO. Asked if the BPO can be changed by the administration and BOT without faculty input except for the three year cap. Is that in the agreement? Prof. Rakowitz explained that the BPO states that it is amended through discussions between the faculty and the administration. Bernhardt: What is the faculty and administration do not agree?

Prof. Bowen made a motion that the AC direct the General Faculty Secretary to include on the agenda for the GF meeting the governance document and the FSC report and MOU. Prof. Mulvey stated this was out of order as Handbook amendments must go to the AC for review and recommendation before they go before the GF.

Chari Preli (who teaches a class at 5:00) suggested that the council recess and re-convene on Monday, September 21. By recessing, we will pick up right where we left off with the same agenda and materials.

Prof. Rakowitz had a concern about the timing of the next Academic Council meeting which would be too late to have these items included on the general faculty agenda.

MOTION.[Massey/Bowen] to recess.

Prof. Tucker voiced concerns that the faculty will not vote on these items before the BOT meeting if they are not on the agenda. The BOT can then act unilaterally.

MOTION PASSED. 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

Chair Preli apologized to Prof. Hlawitschka and Prof. Kelly, guests to report for the Committee on the Conference with the Board of Trustees that we did not get to that item on the agenda.

Meeting adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Tracey Robert
Associate Professor
Recording Secretary

DATE: September 21, 2009
TO: Academic Council Executive Committee
FROM: AC Subcommittee on Governance
RE: Questions from AC

Please find the responses to your questions below in blue.

[NOTE: page numbers refer to the page numbers of the packet for the AC meeting of 9/14/09.]

p. 36, ff., Recommendation #2 regarding adding the SVPAA & GFS to the AC Executive Committee – This gives the Executive Committee an even membership (i.e., 4 members). What would be the procedure to deal with situations in which the Executive Committee was evenly divided about a matter (e.g., 2 members wanted to include a matter an AC agenda while 2 members thought the matter could be resolved outside of the AC)?

This may be a problem now, with the two-member executive committee currently described by the Handbook on p. 6. As we stated in our document, the GFS has no role to play in this executive committee as it is defined in the handbook, though it has become common practice for the GFS to participate in the shaping of the AC agenda.

As the GFS pointed out in her 2008 response to the BRC Report, the business of preparing the agenda of the AC is purely perfunctory. Our first report to the AC supported this judgment. Voting doesn't happen at the Executive Committee about the agenda. If there were disagreement, common sense would have the item added to the AC agenda, with the Council deciding whether or not to proceed with it.

p. 37, ff., Recommendation #3 regarding adding SVP-Marketing & Communication to PL&E as an ex-officio nonvoting member – Since the Quick Center director is a member of the PL&E Committee, does it make sense for him to remain with the addition of the SVP-M&C? In other words, is there incremental value to having both the QC director and the SVP-M&C on the PL&E? (Perhaps the Quick Center director should be removed while “the SVP-M&C or his/her designee” should be added, instead.) (Part of the concern here is that as committees grow in size, they become more unwieldy to schedule...so I’m just trying to get at whether the benefit of the add exceeds the cost.)

The Director of the QC and the VP for Marketing have very different roles to play on our campus. The director of the QC deals with the minutia of running a large playhouse; this might include decisions regarding the kinds of events hosted there, but it is also about the ability of the building itself to support various types of events. The VP for marketing is responsible for helping to shape the face of Fairfield to a wide variety of communities, and as such brings a much larger institutional perspective to conversations and decisions made by the PLE faculty committee. It seems clear that both of these individuals bring expertise to the PLE committee that could be very valuable to the committee on a regular basis. The committee is not so large that we were concerned about it being unwieldy.

p. 38, ff., Recommendation #4 regarding giving authority over governance documents to the President (v. the BOT) – What are the pros/cons to the faculty of doing this? To the president?

To the trustees? What do other schools do?

Please see our report on this. Our recommendation is based primarily on the value of making this a more local decision, which we believe helps to empower faculty and administrators. We did not research what other colleges and universities do. We believe that this is a very institution-specific practice, and that for Fairfield the more local decisions regarding school administration and governance should rest with the President and faculty and not with the Board.

Not included in the ACSG recommendations, but included in the BRC Report of May 2008 was the following recommendation: “on all appropriate occasions, information concerning the deliberations of campus decision-making be made available to everyone via the University website” – Is the Administration contemplating making reports, agenda & minutes of meetings of the senior management team and the BOT available on the University intranet?

This question is more appropriately posed to the administration. We can report that our subcommittee did not establish this as a priority as we engaged in our conversations. We do know that the administration is considering this.

Not included in the ACSG recommendations, but included in the BRC Report of May 2008 was the following recommendation: “In addition to faculty participation in Trustee committees...faculty representatives should be invited to attend appropriate administrative committee meetings.” – Is the Administration contemplating making any such changes? If so, please describe/discuss. ANSWERED (N. Solomon)...Faculty participate in the Senior Management Team meetings.

This question is more appropriately posed to the administration. We can report that our subcommittee did not establish this as a priority as we engaged in our conversations.

Not included in the ACSG recommendations, but included in the BRC Report of May 2008 was the following recommendation: “The Commission recommends that assessments of policies, procedures and programs as well as performance evaluations of principal committees and senior administrators (and their offices), should become routine. In addition to superiors, these evaluations should represent the views of faculty, peers and other affected groups, in the spirit of the 360-degree evaluations now common in organizations.” – As faculty we are evaluated by a number of constituencies (students, self, departmental & school colleagues, research & professional colleagues, etc.), including annual merit reviews that are overseen by the University Administration via the deans. Is faculty input being included in the review of other campus groups (e.g., staff, senior administrators, etc.)?

This question is more appropriately posed to the administration. We can report that our subcommittee did not establish this as a priority as we engaged in our conversations.

Regarding the second recommendation from the ACSG, of having the SVPAA be a member of the AC Executive Committee: At last Monday’s meeting, it was pointed out that this has the drawback that the Chair or Executive Secretary of the AC would be obliged to share all communication they receive regarding the AC with the SVPAA, including sensitive communications that a faculty member would not want shared with members of the

administration. The response to that question seemed to be that it would be possible for faculty to avoid this problem, by being diligent about not sending sensitive inquiries to the Chair or Executive Secretary. While it is true that it would be *possible* for faculty to avoid this problem, as a practical matter, the problem is almost certain to arise (how many faculty will be aware of the composition of the AC Executive Committee?). At last Monday's meeting, it was suggested that a different would seemingly achieve the goals of the original motion, but without the drawback noted above. The motion described was along the following lines: **Motion: That the Academic Council Chair and Executive Secretary, together with the General Faculty Secretary, meet with the SVPAA at least once a month. The meetings should take place before the agenda is prepared for upcoming Academic Council meetings. Topics for discussion should include but not be limited to possible Academic Council agenda items, as well as how best to address issues that arise within the governance structure of the university.** Does the ACSG see any drawback to this motion?

We prefer our motion as it stands. Though the scenario described above is possible, it is improbable. That is, it is unlikely that a faculty member would make the mistake of sending personal information to a committee that contains members of the administration if that information is sensitive. In our experience, it is rare for such sensitive information to come to the Academic Council without earlier consultation with other faculty leaders like the General Faculty Secretary or the President of the FWC.

Establishing the SVPAA as a member of the Executive Committee, and asking him or her to work with the Chair of the Academic Council and the Executive Secretary of the Academic Council to establish an agenda for the Council, provides greater opportunities for efficient problem solving. Agendas will be jointly constructed by administrators and faculty leadership, providing opportunities for productive dialogue and exchange.

[NOTE: the questions below are questions indicated as having been asked and answered at 9/14/09 AC meeting, but were included in the correspondence. They probably do not need additional responses unless the ACSG wishes to.]

p. 34, ff., Recommendation #1 regarding adding the SVPAA & GFS as ex-officio voting members of the Academic Council (& related changes) – what does this do to address the potential unintended negative consequences of highlighting divergence between administration and faculty positions that might arise if the SVPAA votes contrary to the faculty? ANSWERED (S. Rakowitz & J. Thiel)...Reduces the degree, not existence of potential unintended negative consequences.)

Once again, we refer you to our report, and note that the AVP has always had voice and so, by voice or vote, the Council knows where he or she stands on the viability of policy for administrative acceptance into the JoR. In fact, at times, the AVP has made public his decision to oppose a policy at the time it is passed by the AC.

Not included in the ACSG recommendations, but included in the BRC Report of May 2008 was the following recommendation: "In addition to faculty participation in Trustee committees...faculty representatives should be invited to attend appropriate administrative

committee meetings.” – Is the Administration contemplating making any such changes? If so, please describe/discuss. ANSWERED (N. Solomon)...Faculty participate in the Senior Management Team meetings.

Summary of the 6/4/09 Meeting with the Academic Affairs Sub-Committee of the Board of Trustees

Walt Hlawitschka, Don Gibson and I attended the 6/4/09 meeting of the Academic Affairs sub-committee of the Board of Trustees as members of the Committee on Conference. In addition, Sue Racowitz, Irene Mulvey, and Joe Dennin attended as guests in order to address specific aspects of the events that led to the faculty votes at the 5/14/09 general faculty meeting.

We were with the Faculty Affairs sub-committee of the BOT for approximately one hour. Initially, the tone of the meeting was tense, as members of the BOT subcommittee conveyed their disappointment at the fact that the faculty had not voted in the entire package presented at the 5/14 general faculty meeting. They conveyed a sentiment similar to that stated in the letter from Fr. von Arx that was sent to the faculty after that general faculty meeting; confusion over the fact that a subcommittee of the Academic Council (selected by the faculty to represent the faculty) had met with Fr. von Arx and Billy Weitzer to negotiate the package that was then voted down (at least in part). Sue Racowitz spoke as a member of that Academic Council subcommittee and informed the board that, while her subcommittee did work well with the administration throughout these negotiations, there were several points that remained fairly non-negotiable throughout the process. She stated that the AC subcommittee did alert the administration to the fact that there were aspects of the package that the faculty was likely to vote down. Finally, she conveyed to this sub-committee of the BOT that the faculty was composed of 200+ individuals who were independent thinkers, not likely to ever vote as one entity.

Irene also spoke to the fact that the faculty had actually lost quite a bit in the votes on 5/14. She stated that by voting to cost share on benefits the faculty had actually lost ground, and truly demonstrated their willingness to negotiate. In response to the vote regarding administrative representation on the Academic Council, Irene informed the BOT sub-committee that this vote was in fact very close, and might pass when some of the language was clarified and details were ironed out.

Regarding removal of items from the Faculty Handbook, we were unable to clarify where this content would then reside and thus, tried to help this sub-committee understand that this left the faculty unsure of what might be in their best interests. This issue seemed to remain unresolved, with both groups having difficulty negotiating further.

As the meeting progressed the tone in the room did shift and various individuals on the BOT sub-committee seemed to hear what we had to present. We (the involved faculty members) remained extremely positive throughout the meeting and urged the sub-committee to convey to the entire BOT that the faculty regarded this year as representative of positive movement toward trust-building and negotiating difficult issues. We worked very hard to convince these individuals to accept the votes of the 5/14 general faculty meeting and to continue to work with the faculty to resolve the issues that remained unresolved.

The Committee on Conference has not met since that date and we were informed of the BOT's decisions as was the rest of the faculty; via the letter from the BOT. We will meet as a committee for the first time this fall on 9/24/09 and plan to attend the BOT meeting on 10/1/09.

From: Gibson, Donald
Sent: Sun 9/20/2009 7:57 PM
To: Dennin, Joseph; Kelly, Virginia; Hlawitschka, Walter; Rakowitz, Susan
Subject: RE: summary of the 6/4 BOT meeting

Hi Ginny,

Thank you for writing up the summary support. I guess this is moot now that the report has been distributed, but I have to agree with Joe. While the tone became slightly more positive toward the end of the meeting, I thought there was little to no indication that the members of the subcommittee would agree with our position. I and others were also surprised that members who previously had seemed somewhat sympathetic to our views seemed much less sympathetic in this meeting. It was obvious that the subcommittee had made up its mind before the meeting started and nothing we said was going to change the recommendation they were going to make to the Board.

My views,

Don

From: Dennin, Joseph
Sent: Sunday, September 20, 2009 7:21 PM
To: Kelly, Virginia; Gibson, Donald; Hlawitschka, Walter; Dennin, Joseph; Rakowitz, Susan
Subject: Re: summary of the 6/4 BOT meeting

Ginny et al,

My memory:

Some of the trustees became slightly more sympathetic to our position as the meeting progressed but: (1) it did not translate into support for our position; (2) the one who seemed most sympathetic is no longer on the Board (or at least the committee); (3) the chairman Paul was hostile throughout taking positions such as the faculty has a duty to support the President which we were not doing by rejecting the package. At no time did I feel that our position would be accepted.

Joe

P.S. Note that 3+ months later we still have not resolved the issues which I think will not please the Board.

On 9/20/09 2:32 PM, "Kelly, Virginia" <VKelly@fairfield.edu> wrote:

Hi All -

Rick DeWitt asked me to respond to several questions related to the tone and substance of the 6/4 meeting that we all attended with the Academic Affairs sub-committee of the BOT. I sent him a summary of the meeting that I had shared with my GSEAP colleagues this summer. He has asked to distribute this document to the AC. He and I both agreed that this should really be a document that comes from all of the faculty that attended the 6/4 meeting - not just my personal account of that meeting. I have therefore attached that document here. I am wondering if you can look this over and perhaps we can edit it over email to come up with a document that we are all comfortable sharing with the AC.

Let me know what your thoughts are. I think that Rick is hoping to have something to share with the AC tomorrow.

Thanks.

Ginny

To: Paul J. Fitzgerald, S.J., Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

From: Mary Ann Palazzi, Coordinator of Programs for Student-Athletes

Date: Wednesday, August 26, 2009

Re: Conflicts with Final Exams and Scheduled Athletic Contests

Men's Soccer No Conflicts

Women's Soccer MAAC Tournament Championship @ Orlando FL,
Disney World, October, 29, 2009-November, 2, 2009

Field Hockey No Conflicts

Men's Golf No Conflicts

Women's Golf No Conflicts

Women's Tennis No Conflicts

Men's Tennis No Conflicts

Volleyball No Conflicts

Swimming No Conflicts

Men's Cross Country No Conflicts

Women's Cross Country No Conflicts

M/W Crew No Conflicts

Men's Basketball Home contest vs Sacred Heart Sunday, December, 13, 2009
Reading Day

Women's Basketball Home contest vs Sacred Heart, Sunday, December, 13,
Reading Day

Report of the Academic Council Subcommittee on Governance

September 1, 2009

Subcommittee Membership: Professors Donald Greenberg, Kathryn Nantz (Chair), Susan Rakowitz, John Thiel, and Jo Yarrington

At its June 23, 2009 meeting, the Academic Council authorized its Subcommittee on Governance to continue talks with senior administrators during the summer. Our subcommittee has done so in several meetings. Our report and recommendations to the Academic Council follow.

BACKGROUND

In his June 12, 2009 e-mail to the General Faculty, President von Arx reported that the Board of Trustees acknowledged the progress that faculty and administrators had made in resolving some of the contested issues under discussion during the past academic year. Yet, he stated, the Trustees were disappointed that the faculty, at its May 14, 2009 meeting, did not pass the entire “package” of items negotiated by senior administrators and the Subcommittee on Governance. At their June 4, 2009 meeting, the Trustees voted to approve the entire package of items and requested that the General Faculty reconsider its last position.

In his June 12 e-mail, President von Arx repeated a statement he had made in an earlier e-mail on June 2, 2009: “my goal continues to be to find a resolution to these issues that we all can live with. This will necessitate continued conversations between the faculty, the administration and the Board to see if there is a resolution between the positions voted on by the Faculty on May 14 and the actions of the Board on June 4.” Our subcommittee has worked with the senior administrators during the summer to find such a resolution.

Last semester, our subcommittee’s work proceeded in tandem with the work of the Salary Committee. During the summer discussions, the Salary Committee reached agreement with the administration on a modified proposal regarding salary and fiscal policy matters that it will report to the faculty under separate cover. Therefore, our subcommittee’s task is to focus on the governance issues unrelated to fiscal policies in the original package.

At our final meeting with the senior administrators on August 25, President von Arx and Executive Vice-President Weitzer were clear in stating that they were fully committed to the principle of shared governance. They believed this principle was best conveyed by the *Handbook* changes proposed in the original package that called for an extended participation of academic administrators at the Academic Council.

In this meeting, our subcommittee responded that we, and the entire Fairfield faculty, are committed to the principle of shared governance, and that we believe shared governance has been practiced well at Fairfield throughout nearly all of our history. We stated too that we were open to constructive changes in our governance structures that reflected our commitment to shared governance. We were concerned, however, that the same flexibility that led to a modified proposal on fiscal policy issues was needed on governance issues, so that, again in the President's words, we could try to reach "a resolution between the positions voted on by the Faculty on May 14 and the actions of the Board on June 4."

RECOMMENDATIONS

To that end, our subcommittee has crafted a proposal that we believe is faithful to the spirit of the original package and yet settles in that space between the positions voted by the faculty on May 14 and by the Trustees on June 4. The first two items below propose revised *Handbook* amendments regarding Academic Council voting privileges that we believe offer a good compromise on these issues. Items 3-7 expand occasions for shared governance in our current structures by adding additional items that were not presented to or voted on by the faculty at its May 14 meeting. These new items represent what we believe are important opportunities to formalize structures and processes in ways that will increase collaboration among faculty, administrators, and the Board of Trustees. We recommend that the Academic Council approve these proposals and forward its approval to the General Faculty for its consideration.

1. HANDBOOK AMENDMENT ON ACADEMIC COUNCIL VOTING PRIVILEGES

The subcommittee recommends that the Handbook be amended to extend voting privileges at the Academic Council to the Secretary of the General Faculty and the Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs.

Rationale: The extension of voting rights to administrators on faculty *Handbook* committees is hardly unprecedented. In fact, it is typical. Academic administrators currently have *ex officio* voting rights on 7 *Handbook* committees: Research, Undergraduate Curriculum, Library, University Advancement, Educational Planning, Faculty Development and Evaluation, University College. At the Academic Council, the Academic Vice-President and the Deans of Schools currently are *ex officio* nonvoting members. They have been ardent participants in policy discussions and their collaborative contributions have been, and will continue to be, valued highly by the faculty. As a structural sign of our commitment to this collaboration in service to the university, it would be productive to amend the *Handbook* to extend *ex officio* voting privileges on the Council to the highest academic administrator and to the highest faculty officer.

We recommend that the Academic Council approve the following motion to amend the Faculty Handbook:

At I.B.2, second paragraph, added language proposed for amendment in bold; excised languages in ~~strikeout~~:

Ex officio members of the Academic Council are the **Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs** ~~Academic Vice-President~~, the Deans of the Schools and the Secretary of the General Faculty. **The Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs and the Secretary of the General Faculty are *ex officio* voting members.**

This amendment requires the following correction at I.B.2, sixth paragraph, added language proposed for amendment in bold; excised language in ~~strikeout~~:

The right to vote and/or to make and second motions is limited to faculty members elected to the Council and those *ex officio* members designated above as voting members. Other *ex officio* members do not have these rights. ~~Only the elected faculty members on the Council have the right to vote and/or to make and second motions. *Ex officio* members do not have these rights.~~ All Council members have the right and privilege of discussion. Additionally, the opportunity for direct communication from the President of the University to the members of the Council is afforded at all meetings in the Order of Business.

In the interests of sharing authority among faculty officers, we recommend that the Secretary of the General Faculty not be entitled to serve as Chairperson of the Academic Council. This requires the following correction at I.B.6, first paragraph, added language proposed for amendment in bold:

The Academic Council shall, at its first meeting of the year, elect from its current **elected** membership a Chairperson for the ensuing year.

2. HANDBOOK AMENDMENT ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL

The subcommittee recommends that the Handbook be amended to authorize an Executive Committee of the Academic Council composed of the Council's Chairperson, the Council's Executive Secretary, the Secretary of the General Faculty, and the Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs. The task of the Executive Committee is to plan the agenda for meetings of the Council. The dialogue that ensues in meetings of the Executive Committee also will

provide an opportunity for faculty leadership and the SVPAA to identify and solve problems that can be adjudicated informally.

Rationale: The meeting of the “Executive Committee” of the Academic Council is a practice that has transpired for some time, even though such a committee, as such and in its practiced form, has no standing in the *Handbook*. The *Handbook* stipulates that the Chairperson and Executive Secretary of the Council establish the agenda for Council meetings. Under long-established practice, the Secretary of the General Faculty also participates, even though the *Handbook* does not authorize such participation. Of course, the current practice makes good sense, since the Secretary of the General Faculty should be most fully informed of faculty issues, is an important resource person for such work, and provides continuity (and wisdom!) from year to year. For these very same reasons, the Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs should also serve as a member of the Executive Committee. Moreover, the Executive Committee’s monthly meetings during the academic year will provide a formal, scheduled opportunity for three faculty leaders to meet together with the senior academic administrator. In addition to the typically perfunctory work of preparing the Council’s agenda, such meetings can provide opportunity for productive dialogue that can identify and avert problems in the academic division before they grow and fester.

We recommend that the Academic Council approve the following motion to amend the Faculty Handbook:

At I.B.10, added language proposed for amendment in bold; excised language in ~~strikeout~~:

10. Agenda

Any member of the University community may suggest topics for the Council’s consideration. However, the Council, subject to specific instructions by the General Faculty, shall determine which items to accept for placement on the agenda. **The Executive Committee of the Academic Council establishes the agenda of Council meetings. The members of the Executive Committee are the Chairperson and Executive Secretary of the Council, the Secretary of the General Faculty, and the Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs. The Chairperson of the Council serves as Chairperson of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee is also available to consult with faculty and administrators on the best way to address issues within the governance structure.**

This description of the work of the Executive Committee in I.B.10 requires the deletion of I.B.6c,

I.B.6. Position of Chairperson of the Council

The Academic Council shall, at its first meeting of the year, elect from its current membership a Chairperson for the ensuing year. The term of office is fixed for one year. The functions of the Chairperson are:

- a. To serve as presiding officer during the course of Council meetings and to enforce the operating procedure adopted by the Council. In the absence of the Chairperson the Council shall designate a substitute from its membership, ex officio or elected.
- b. Serve as its official representative to outside groups.
- c. ~~With the Executive Secretary establish the agenda for the meetings.~~

This description of the work of the Executive Committee in I.B.10 requires a change in the description of the position of the Executive Secretary in I.B.7, added language proposed for amendment in bold; excised language in ~~strikeout~~:

7. Position of Executive Secretary

The Executive Secretary is elected from the **elected** membership of the Council. The Executive Secretary is responsible for the following: (a) implementation of the actions of the Council: (b) arranging meetings **of the Council and of the Council's Executive Committee** , and, ~~in conjunction with the Chairperson, establishing the agenda;~~ (c) communicating the work of the Council to the President and the General Faculty; ...

3. HANDBOOK AMENDMENT ON THE PUBLIC LECTURES AND EVENTS COMMITTEE

The subcommittee recommends that the Handbook be amended to add the Vice-President for Marketing and Communications as an ex officio nonvoting member of the Public Lectures and Events Committee.

Rationale: Under recent administrative reorganization, the Quick Center for the Arts now stands under the authority of the Vice-President for Marketing and Communications. Moreover, the Vice-President's expertise in marketing public lectures and events makes the addition of the holder of this position to this *Handbook* committee essential to its mission.

We recommend that the Academic Council approve the following motion to amend the Faculty Handbook:

At I.C.b.9, first paragraph, added language proposed for amendment in bold; excised language in ~~strikeout~~:

Four members elected from the faculty with three-year overlapping terms, and two students elected by the Student Legislature. **The Vice-President for Marketing and Communications and** the Director of the Quick Center **for the Arts** shall be a members *ex officio*.

4. HANDBOOK AMENDMENT ON THE APPROVAL OF SCHOOL GOVERNANCE DOCUMENTS

The subcommittee recommends that the Handbook be amended to give the authority for the approval of the governance documents of schools to the President of the University.

Rationale: While it is crucially important that the Board approve *Handbook* changes, the circumscribed and comparatively local character of School governance documents suggests that the approval of changes in such documents be placed under the purview of the University President.

We recommend that the Academic Council approve the following motion to amend the Faculty Handbook:

At I.D.3, added language proposed for amendment in bold; excised language in ~~strikeout~~:

Each School's faculty shall determine its own structure of governance, subject to the approval of the **University President** ~~Board of Trustees~~. The faculty of a School or the **University President** ~~Board of Trustees~~ may propose amendments to a School's initial governance document. All amendments must be accepted by both the **University President** ~~Board of Trustees~~ and the faculty of the School in question.

5. FORMALIZING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HANDBOOK COMMITTEE CHAIRS AND BOARD COMMITTEES

The subcommittee recommends that the Academic Council establish a subcommittee to formulate a Handbook amendment that formalizes the current practice of Handbook committee chairpersons sitting as nonvoting members on comparable committees of the Board of Trustees, considers the relationship of these chairs with the Committee on

Conference with the Board of Trustees, and notes their responsibility to report, when appropriate, to the Academic Council and the General Faculty.

Rationale: Last year the Board began inviting relevant committee chairs to attend the meetings of related Board committees. This proposal formalizes the role of Faculty Handbook committee chairpersons extended by the Board of Trustees. This process needs to be included in the *Faculty Handbook* as part of the charges to the appropriate committees, and the relationship between these chairs and the Committee on Conference needs to be considered.

6. UNIVERSITY COUNCIL AND STUDENT LIFE

The subcommittee recommends that the Academic Council establish a subcommittee to consider the value of folding the work of the University Council into the Student Life Committee.

Rationale: This recommendation will bring resolution to long-standing issues regarding the relationship between the University Council and the Student Life Committee. Since the work of these committees often seems to overlap, and since the University Council's description in the *Handbook* is so nebulous, we believe that a discussion among students, faculty, and administration on this matter is long overdue.

7. EXPANDING FACULTY REPRESENTATION ON THE BUDGET COMMITTEE

The subcommittee recommends that the Academic Council pass a motion that requests the University President to add the chairpersons of the Salary Committee and the Educational Planning Committee to the membership of the University Budget Committee.

Rationale: Over ten years ago, the university administration agreed to allow elected faculty representatives to sit in on the university's Budget Committee. (This committee was then called the "Finance Committee", but the name was changed to avoid confusion with the Board's Finance Committee, which has a very different role.) Faculty have since been electing such representatives, and three faculty have been participating in the work alongside the vice presidents, the executive vice president, and representatives from the student body and staff.

This recommendation would improve shared governance by 1) increasing faculty participation in conversations regarding the allocation of key campus resources, and 2) placing elected chairpersons of standing faculty committees that conduct business often related to the allocation of resources in conversation with the broader context of resource

needs on campus. This broadening of faculty participation in substantive conversations regarding fiscal resources would contribute significantly to the budgetary process.

CONCLUSION

We believe that our work as a subcommittee is now complete, though we would be pleased to present these proposals to a wider faculty audience. We urge the faculty representatives at the Academic Council to approve these proposals. Our conversations with President von Arx and Executive Vice-President Weitzer were not conducted under propitious circumstances. These conversations were always frank and at times testy. But they were always respectful, collegial, and full of commitment for doing the best for Fairfield's many constituencies. We believe that these discussions have been a good model for what an even more collaborative future for faculty and administration might be.

Educational Planning Committee September 17, 2009

Draft Minutes

(taken by Wendy Kohli)

EPC Members Present: Steve Bachelor, Peter Bayers (Chair), Robbin Crabtree (ex officio), Paul Fitzgerald, (ex-officio), Cathy Giapponi, Wendy Kohli, Michael Pagano, Shelley Phelan, Joyce Shea, Norm Solomon (ex officio), Barbara Welles-Nystrom.

EPC member regrets: Jo Yarrington

1. The meeting was called to order at 3:35pm by outgoing Chair, Professor Carl Scheraga. Carl welcomed the new AVP Paul Fitzgerald, S.J. and two new deans, CAS Dean Robbin Crabtree and SOB Dean Norm Solomon. The following new faculty committee members were introduced: Steve Bachelor (At-Large), Barbara Welles-Nystrom (GSEAP), and Michael Pagano (Behavioral and Social Sciences).
2. The election for the new Chair of EPC was conducted. Peter Bayers was elected unanimously, by acclamation! With the passing of the gavel, Peter and the entire committee gave a big thanks to outgoing Chair, Carl Scheraga, for his excellent work over a two-year period leading this committee.
3. The next order of business was a discussion of the Proposal for a New Degree Program: Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) submitted by the School of Nursing.

The School of Nursing was represented at the meeting by Dean Jeanne Novotny, Professor Jean Lange, and Professor Sheila Grossman.

Jean Lange provided background information on the proposal, noting that this will be the first doctoral degree offered by Fairfield University, and reminding us that representatives from the SON met with the EPC for an informational session in November 2008, receiving helpful feedback on the development of the proposal.

Assuming that EPC members had read the complete proposal, Professor Lange proceeded with an overview of the rationale for the new degree and the process leading to the final proposal. The move to a DNP is necessitated by changes in the national standards of the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN), which wants Schools of Nursing to move training for advanced nursing practice to the doctoral level by 2015.

The School of Nursing voted unanimously to move toward a doctoral program and set up a Task Force in the fall of 2008 to get the DNP underway. The process included the formation of an Advisory Board as well as extensive consultations with experts in the field—leading to a proposal for a “cutting edge program.”

Simultaneously, the SON faculty committee worked closely with Judy Dobai in Enrollment Management, who conducted a feasibility study and a comparative analysis with other programs. The comparative analysis disclosed that the SON program was unique and would offer a particular niche for face-to-face learning and collaboration with faculty and fellow students. Evidently, the competitor programs were either exclusively or primarily on-line degree programs. The SON model also offered the potential for a stronger cohort experience, which is an attractive component for nursing education.

The proposed program addresses both full and part-time students, with curriculum plans appropriate to both constituencies. They expect mostly part-time students for the new DNP program.

Five (5) new courses were developed and five (5) existing courses were revised for the DNP. The new program is based on eight (8) essential principles endorsed by the AACN, as well as the accreditation guidelines and standards of AACN.

Peter Bayers opened the floor for questions and comments.

Barbara Welles-Nystrom inquired about the reason they are not offering a research degree?

Dean Novotny responded, indicating that this was a clinical doctorate, comparable to an MD, and that the DNP prepared students to teach and do clinical research. This practice-based doctorate fits with our status as a Masters I institution, and with the mission and goals of the university.

Sheila Grossman pointed to the Capstone Project that is required in the final semester and must integrate theory, research and practice.

Barbara Welles-Nystrom followed up with a query about the dissemination of the Capstone results. Were students required to publish?

Dean Novotny responded by saying that students **must submit** their practitioner research, but it is not a requirement that it be published.

Michael Pagano offered praise for a “terrific proposal.” He then wanted clarification on the role of “clinical faculty” in the Capstone Project.

Sheila Grossman responded by saying the students would have 400 clinical immersion hours and work extensively with a wide-range of preceptors in the SON network.

Michael Pagano then followed up by asking if it’s the case that most of these clinical associates are not DNP trained?

Sheila Grossman responded in the affirmative.

Wendy Kohli praised the “conservative” design of the proposal, validating the careful growth model inherent in it, as well as the realistic match between the outcomes of the new doctoral degree and the capacity of the university as we are now configured.

Jean Lange indicated that they will begin admitting two groups of students in the Fall 2010 and that based on the enrollment analysis of Judy Dobai, there will be enough support to justify a faculty member by the second year of implementation.

Norm Solomon said it was a very good proposal and that he was very supportive of it. His question had to do with how the DNP would articulate with the existing B.S program in the SON. Would recent undergraduates from Fairfield, or elsewhere, be encouraged to move through the path to the DNP? Once the current pool of Masters level students gets the DNP, will there be a need to articulate at the B.S. level?

Peter Bayers asked if he was addressing a sustainability issue?

Norm Solomon responded, “sort of.”

Dean Novotny proceeded to explain that most BA/BS graduates would be advised to get experience in nursing practice before pursuing an advanced degree such as the DNP. Part of their job is to educate people about the possible roles they can attain, including the three (3) Advanced Practice tracks at Fairfield.

Jeanne Lange indicated that there are different routes to becoming an RN. Students need a path to advancement if they want to stay in nursing. Anyone who wants advanced practice roles will need the DNP. Many of the SON graduates are returning for advanced work here.

Dean Novotny reminded the committee that Fairfield will continue to offer nursing leadership roles at the Masters level, in addition to the new DNP.

Sheila Grossman chimed in to say that there is also 2nd career feeder track for people switching careers.

Robin Crabtree queried AVP Paul Fitzgerald about how much doctoral level education we can provide at Fairfield and still keep the Masters I category?

Paul Fitzgerald responded that it could be up to 3% of the offerings at the university. The doctorate of practice is qualitatively different from a doctorate at a Research I institution.

Barbara Welles-Nystrom made the motion for EPC to accept The Proposal for a New Degree Program: Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP). Cathy Giapponi seconded. The DNP was approved unanimously by the EPC members.

4. Peter Bayers tabled the discussion of the Assessment Coordination Team. He will speak with Billy Weitzer about coming to our next meeting.

Peter also reminded us about our prior interest in discussing the charge of the EPC and how we can/should be a sounding board for departments to vet things earlier.

He will see what is on our schedule for the October meeting and plan the agenda accordingly.

Wendy Kohli also reminded the committee that we have yet to have our substantive conversation with Billy Weitzer about the intersections between the EPC and the Strategic Plan, particularly in relation to governance policy and practice.

Robbin Crabtree agreed that this was a good and timely idea.

5. Joyce Shea thanked the EPC on behalf of the SON for supporting the doctoral proposal and for the help given last year. She also reminded members that the DNP program will involve collaboration across schools and departments at Fairfield, and that ongoing feedback from colleagues across campus is expected and welcome.

Paul Fitzgerald views the EPC as a very helpful group and wants to use the groups as a sounding board for his work. For example, with the retirement of Dean Hadjimichael, he has an obligation and an opportunity to review the School of Engineering. The EPC is a helpful constituency to vet his ideas.

Secondly, part of the Strategic Plan is to grow graduate programs. Is it time for us to be ambitious with new Masters program? Is it time to prune some? He would like to see more cross-school collaboration on new degree development. And also more non-degree adult enrichments. All this while playing to our strengths.

6. Wendy Kohli made a motion to adjourn the meeting; Joyce Shea seconded it. The motion was approved unanimously and the meeting was adjourned with applause for Peter Bayers, our new chair.

**Motion passed by the Academic Council
March 9, 2009**

MOTION [Strauss/Robert]. The Academic Council will form a subcommittee, with faculty and administrative representation, to clarify policy on grade changes. Items for this subcommittee to consider would presumably include, but not necessarily be limited to, issues such as time frames when grade changes can be made, by whom, and under what circumstances. This subcommittee will be formed at the first Council meeting of fall 2009.

MOTION PASSED: 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions