

General Faculty Meeting

Friday October 14, 2016

Gonzaga Auditorium, 3:30-5 pm

Agenda

1. Announcements
2. Approval of the minutes of 9/16/16 (attachment, pages 2-11)
3. Presentation of CT State Conference-AAUP George E. Lang, Jr. Award
4. Presentation of Faculty Welfare Committee Awards
5. Distribution of 2016-17 Salary Increase (attachment, page 12)
6. Consideration of proposal for Post-Tenure Review (attachments)
Note: some of the comments in the attached minutes refer to aspects of the proposal that have since been changed. The actual text to be voted on is shown with changes tracked on pages 15-21 and changes incorporated on pages 22-26.
 - a. Subcommittee report to the Academic Council, 5/2/16 (pages 13-14)
 - b. Proposal with changes shown (pages 15-21)
 - c. Proposal with changes incorporated (pages 22-26)
 - d. 2015-2016 Memo of Understanding- Excerpt (page 27)
 - e. General Faculty Minutes from 9/2/15- Excerpt (page 27)
 - f. Academic Council Minutes: Excerpts from 9/21/15, 10/5/15, 2/1/16, 4/4/16, 5/2/16, 9/12/16 (pages 27-37)
7. Adjournment

**The meeting will be followed by a gala reception
hosted by the Faculty Welfare Committee/AAUP**

**Fairfield University
General Faculty Meeting
September 16, 2016
Draft Minutes of Meeting**

These minutes have not yet been approved by the General Faculty.

1. Announcements

General Faculty Secretary Susan Rakowitz called the meeting to order at 3:33 and introduced Professor Tracey Robert, the President's appointee for Faculty Chair for 2016-2017.

Prof. Robert invited Prof. Walt Hlawitschka to offer a remembrance of Professor Emeritus, Michael Tucker:

We lost Michael Tucker this summer, after he lost a brief battle with cancer. He retired from Fairfield just a few months ago, after 28 years of service. He retired while in good health and with high hopes of moving to Seattle and exploring the Pacific-West. He started feeling ill in February. When told that he had terminal cancer, Mike asked me to tell his colleagues: "Don't wait too long to retire!" I know what he really meant: "Life is uncertain. Life is what happens to you while you are planning for it. Get to the doing, and don't worry so much about the planning."

For Mike, teaching here at Fairfield was not just a means to an end. Mike loved his time at Fairfield, and he was engaged in so many aspects of the University. He taught in my department, the Finance Department, in the Dolan School of Business. Mike and I started the same year as Assistant professors in 1988.

Mike was engaged with our undergrads. Let me share one story: Many years ago, Mike helped a group of students petition the Board of Trustees to set aside endowment funds to be managed by students. When the Board granted this request, it came with disappointing restrictions that would exclude some of the students who worked so hard on the proposal. Mike jumped into action with an alternative plan. He helped find an "outside investor" that allowed the students to independently manage a small portfolio. This small group of students grew over the years to a very large group of students. Ten years later, the Fairfield Investment Group has involved hundreds of students is still going strong today.

Mike was engaged with his faculty colleagues.

1. He was a dependable member of the Faculty book club.
2. He was one of handful of faculty leading the charge for a more sustainable University campus.
3. He published over 60 articles with over a dozen different faculty members.
4. He traveled with Faculty on University sponsored trips to Russia and Haiti.
5. In Haiti, he worked with Winston Tellis to bring solar ovens to a "startup bakery." He later published a case about it.

Many of you know Mike through his work on our University Healthcare Plan. Mike has been involved in every initiative, review, change, or evaluation of our healthcare plan over the past 2 decades. I think he felt that his experience in receiving a liver transplant gave him valuable insight into how the system works. Last Fall, during his final semester on campus before retiring, Mike was an active member of the Health Care Committee. Even though the proposals before the committee would have an effect on him, he worked tirelessly to serve the University community and leave behind a better healthcare plan. I found this inspiring.

I personally found Michael to be a great colleague and a great friend. My discipline, Finance, by its nature, goes to the heart of capitalism: competition and competitive markets. Mike taught and believed that the competitive nature of free markets lead to the best economic outcomes. But Mike also believed in social justice and in providing a safety net for the more vulnerable members of our society. He believed in "community" and thought that all members of the Fairfield University community, faculty, students, and administrators, should all work together to make Fairfield a great place to work and study.

And he believed that while competition is great for markets, cooperation is what is needed at a university like Fairfield. We need to work together, support one another, and always be aware and care for the more vulnerable among us.

Mike Tucker will be missed.

Dean Don Gibson added that a memorial was scheduled for November 2, 4-5 in the Chapel. Faculty then observed a moment of silence.

2. Approval of minutes

**Motion [Caster/Salafia]: to approve the minutes of 4/15/16.
The motion passed unanimously.**

**Motion [Patton/Weiss]: to approve the minutes of 5/4/16.
The motion passed unanimously.**

**Motion [McFadden/Steffen] to approve the minutes of 5/31/16.
The motion passed unanimously.**

3. Introduction of New Faculty

Provost and SVPAA Lynn Babington began the introductions:

Good afternoon and welcome to Fall semester 2016. As is tradition, we will start off our general faculty meeting with an introduction of new faculty and key members of the academic community.

We are welcoming 24 new faculty this year! That brings our total to 272 full time faculty (plus 22 administrators with faculty status – some of whom teach regularly). Before I introduce deans from each academic unit, I want to introduce you to a few key members of our academic community.

I am pleased to introduce to you Dr. **Linda Wolk-Simon**, Although Linda joined us last year, she was not formally introduced.

Linda Wolk-Simon came to Fairfield last year after serving as Charles W. Engelhard Curator and Department Head, Drawing and Prints at the Morgan Library and prior to that position was Curator, Master Drawings and Prints at the Metropolitan Museum of Arts. Dr. Wolk-Simon earned her bachelors degree from the Honors College, University of Michigan and her PhD with distinction in Art History from University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. She is also a member of Phi Beta Kappa.

Her publications are extensive and one of her specialties is the Raphael Madonnas. In her first year at Fairfield Dr. Wolk-Simon rebranded the Bellarmine Museum to become the Fairfield University Museum and started the University on the path to museum accreditation. This year she has established a faculty liaison program for each exhibit, has secured loans from the Penn Museum of Archaeology and has planned important shows including Leonardo Cremonini 1925-2010, and Adolf Dehn exhibit to coincide with the release of Dr. Eliasoph's book, and contemporary Japanese ceramics complete with a traditional Japanese tea ceremony. Join me in welcoming Linda to the University.

Next I would like to introduce Dr. **Brent Alan Mai** (who could not be here today) as the new University Librarian and Dean of Libraries for Fairfield University. Dr. Mai comes to us from Concordia University in Oregon where he was the Dean, University Libraries, Professor of Library and Information Management and Director of the Center for Volga German Studies. Dr. Mai earned his baccalaureate degree from Bethany College. He holds a Master of Library and Information Science from the University of Texas, a Master of Arts degree in International Finance, Economic Development, International Law and National Security from the Elliott School of International Affairs at George Washington University and an Ed.D. in Higher Education-Leadership, Policy and Organizations from Vanderbilt University. Dr.

Mai has a strong publishing record in prestigious journals both in library and information sciences and history journals for his work on German Colonies on the Volga. Please join me in welcoming Brent.

We are privileged this year to have Dr. **Patrick Kelley** join us as a Distinguished Fellow in Nursing and Health Studies. Dr. Kelley comes to us from the Institute of Medicine (IOM) of the US National Academies where he was the Director of the Board on Global Health. He also served from 2004 to 2015 as Director of the Board on African Science Academy Development. Prior to joining the National Academies, Dr. Kelley served in the US Army for more than 23 years as a physician, residency director, epidemiologist, and program manager. Dr. Kelley is a sought after speaker, having lectured in English and Spanish in over 20 countries. He has authored or co-authored over 75 scholarly papers, book chapters, and monographs and has supervised the completion of over 25 book length IOM consensus reports and workshop summaries. While at the IOM he obtained grants and contracts for work conducted by his unit from over 60 governmental and non-governmental sources.

Dr. Kelley earned his Bachelors of Science from Fairfield University, his MD from the University of Virginia and his DrPH in epidemiology from the Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health.

He has also been awarded two honorary doctoral degrees and is board certified in Preventive Medicine and Public Health. Dr. Kelley will be teaching and mentoring students in the nursing and health studies programs and building community partnerships. Please join me in welcoming Dr. Kelley to Fairfield University!

At this point, Dean Meredith Kazer introduced the new faculty in the Egan School of Nursing.

Cynthia Bautista has been in the nursing profession for over 30 years. She received her PhD at the College of Nursing at the University of Rhode Island. She is the Neuroscience Clinical Nurse Specialist at Yale-New Haven Hospital. Cindy is also a nurse entrepreneur – owner of Nursing Brains, LLC which provides neuroscience nursing seminars all over the world. She is very involved with several nursing and interdisciplinary healthcare provider organizations.

Christa Esposito earned her BSN at Western CT and CNM and Masters at SUNY Downstate Medical Center at Brooklyn and Stony Brook University. She's thrilled to further her education in the DNP program here at Fairfield this year. She's practiced full scope midwifery for 20 years in all practice settings from the MIC clinics in Brooklyn to private practice here in CT. She resides in Fairfield with her husband, Felix, who is a police sergeant in town, and her girls Charlotte, 11, and Keira, 9.

Anka Roberto is a psychiatric mental health nurse practitioner with a research interest in the area of trauma in children and the impact that brain based treatment has on resiliency and executive functioning. Anka received her DNP and her BSN from Fairfield University and her masters in nursing and public health from Hunter College in NYC. She has worked as a pediatric and neonatal intensive care nurse for over 15 years and came to Fairfield 4 years ago to grow the simulation program. She is a National League for Nursing Simulation Leadership Fellow and completed the International Nursing and Clinical Simulation in Learning Fellowship this past year. She resides in Sandy Hook, CT with her husband and two girls Maya and Serena ages 9 and 7.

Danielle Hall completed her BSN from the University of Scranton, a Master's from Yale and her DNP degree from Case Western Reserve University. She has been in nursing for 20 years with experience in Medical -Surgical, Critical Care and Emergency Nursing. For the last 10 years she has been a clinical nurse educator in the hospital setting focusing on the development of Transition Into Practice Programs to help nurses transition successfully from student to the professional nurse role.

The field of psychiatry found **Dilice Robertson** in 2006 while working as a milieu counselor in the inpatient setting at YNHH. She completed her MSN at YSN in 2008 and a DNP at Fairfield in 2014. Her previous positions were in child and adolescent residential care, substance abuse treatment in a community outpatient setting, geriatric-psychiatric care in skilled nursing facilities, adult and pediatric inpatient psychiatry and most recently in the correctional setting. She currently practices privately and

now more excitingly at Fairfield University, transitioning from an Adjunct position to a Visiting Assistant Professor.

Kelly Sullivan is a three-time graduate from the Fairfield University SON, most recently with her DNP in May. She has been a family nurse practitioner in school based health centers for fifteen years and enjoys working with inner city families to support their overall well-being. In her free time she enjoys traveling and going to sports events with her husband and four children.

Dean Bruce Berdanier introduced two new faculty in the School of Engineering.

Adrian Rusu is the Chair of the Electrical and Computer Systems Engineering department. He comes from Rowan University where he was a Professor of Computer Science. His research expertise is primarily in Information Visualization, Software Engineering, and Edutainment, but he is especially effective in interdisciplinary innovations and student mentoring. Through external collaborations with industry, he has created research and teaching opportunities worth over \$1 million. Dr. Rusu chairs the IEEE-CT Entrepreneurs Network. His wife Amalia is also a faculty member in SOE, where their son Alex is now a freshman. As a hobby, Adrian is active as a top-level soccer state referee in CT.

Mehdi Safari has joined the Mechanical Engineering department as an Assistant Professor. His research areas are thermal-fluid science, computational fluid dynamics (CFD), and energy conversion. Mehdi received his Ph.D. from Northeastern University (Boston, MA) in 2014 and was an assistant professor at Miami University of Ohio before joining Fairfield. He enjoys marathon running and hiking when away from work.

Dean Yohuru Williams invited department chairs in the College of Arts & Sciences to introduce their new colleagues.

Prof. Shelley Phelan began,

We are very happy to welcome Dr. **Christine Rodriguez**, who is a visiting assistant professor in the biology department. Christine can't be here today because of a prior appointment, but I'm hoping you will get a chance to meet her soon. Christine received her BS in biology from Benedictine University in Illinois. She went on to receive her PhD in Genetics from Harvard Medical School, where she characterized an important enzyme involved in RNA processing and transcription. She continued postdoctoral work there in the department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics, and she has spent the last several years doing adjunct teaching (here and elsewhere) and leading STEM outreach initiatives in K-12 in Ridgefield, where she lives with her family.

Prof. Qin Zhang introduced a new colleague in Communication.

The Department of Communication is very pleased to welcome our new colleague, **Adam Rugg**. Adam can't be here today because he is out of town attending a conference. Adam received his PhD in communication from University of Iowa. His research critically examines the relationship between media, sports, and social issues, with an emphasis on the NFL. He also studies the impact of Internet and media globalization on geographically based identities and infrastructures. Adam loves to play racquetball and is currently looking for a racquetball partner. Please let him know if you are interested.

Prof. Elizabeth Petrino introduced two new faculty in the English department.

With over 14 years academic experience, **Tim Smith** has worked both as an administrator and educator. He earned a Ph.D. in Rhetoric and Composition with a cognate area in Philosophy from Miami University in Ohio. Most recently, he served as a Visiting Fellow with MIT's Global Education Program in Singapore. While there, he helped develop and implement the writing curriculum for their Capstone, Humanities, and Core courses. Prior to that, Tim was an Assistant Professor for the New York Institute of Technology in Nanjing, China. During his ten years at NYIT, he also served as Assistant Dean of Liberal Arts, English Chair, and ESL Director. A published novelist and award-winning short story

writer, Tim's work has appeared in a variety of literary magazines, and his novel, *Prince of the Blue Castles*, was a finalist for the Silver Falchion Award.

Matt Tullis comes to Fairfield after spending eight years at Ashland University in Ohio. Matt has an MFA in creative writing with a focus on creative nonfiction from the University of North Carolina Wilmington. Having worked as a daily newspaper reporter for 10 years, he has written for regional magazines and national websites, and he has been noted in Best American Sports Writing three times.

Matt's primary areas of interest, both in study and creative work, are literary journalism and sports journalism. He produces and hosts a podcast that discusses literary journalism with the reporters who write it. His reported-memoir, "The Ghosts I Live With," is about Matt's battle with leukemia as a teenager, and his attempts to connect with the families of childhood cancer patients he knew who didn't survive. The book will be published in 2017 and the essay has just been listed in the Notable Essays and Literary Nonfiction section of Best American Essays 2016.

Matt's wife Alyssa is a fourth-grade teacher in Brookfield, and they are living in Newtown with their son, Emery, and their daughter, Lily.

Prof. Irene Mulvey introduced the Math department's Visiting Instructor, **Matthew Duckett**. He has a Master's in Math from Fairfield and another in Math Education from Brooklyn College. As an undergraduate at Syracuse, he worked on TV and film studies. She noted that students are begging to get into his classes, and that he met and bonded with his wife over improv comedy.

Prof. Terry-Ann Jones continued the introductions.

It is my pleasure to introduce my new colleague, **Alfred Babo**. Alfred is assistant professor of Sociology & Anthropology with a joint appointment in International Studies. He got his PhD from the University of Bouaké in Ivory Coast. His research focuses on sustainable socioeconomic development, land tenure, youth, social change, and immigration policy in Ivory Coast. His recent book, *The Foreigner in Côte d'Ivoire: Crisis and Controversies about a Social Category* (published in 2013), explores the significant issue of immigration and identity crisis, especially the transformations introduced by violence and wartime conditions. His current research project examines the practical issues associated with the concepts of "refugee" and "immigrant." His prior appointments include Assistant Professor at University of Bouaké – Ivory Coast (2003 – 2010), Visiting Scholar at Smith College (2012 – 2016), and Director of the Smith College Humanities Lab on "Immigration, Forced Displacement and Refugees" (2015 – 2016). In 2004, the Royal Museum for Central Africa in Belgium awarded him with the Belgian Cooperation for Development Prize for his PhD dissertation.

Alfred was welcomed and resettled at Smith College with his wife and three children. He came to the United States as a refugee with the support of Scholars-at-Risk and the Five College consortium to escape political persecution during the civil war in his native country Ivory Coast.

Prof. Laura Nash introduced two faculty in Visual and Performing Arts.

Richard Parkin is a VAP in Film, Television, and Media. He received his undergraduate degree from University of California, Berkeley and earned an MFA in Film Production from UCLA's School of Theater, Film and Television. He has taught film production at UCLA and Wesleyan Universities.

His work as a filmmaker has screened at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Los Angeles Film Festival, and has earned awards from the Directors Guild of America and the Academy of Motion Pictures Arts and Sciences. He is currently at work on a feature length documentary on 1960s folk singer Jackson C. Frank. He has secured Frank's archive of personal letters and documents and has interviewed fellow musicians including Al Stewart and John Kaye of Steppenwolf.

Richard is a citizen of Mexico and thus has a Mexican passport, which he plans to put to good use once he learns Spanish.

Patrick Brooks is now tenure track in FTM. He earned his BA from the University of Chicago, MFA from UCLA, and he has taught at Northwestern and DePaul. Patrick is an active filmmaker who has also worked as a producer at Little Monster Films, collaborating on projects such as the award-winning documentary *Meru*, as well as content for National Geographic, The New York Times, and The North Face. *Meru* won the Sundance Audience Award.

His short, *The Boy Scout* – was selected for many incredible festivals, including Tribeca and Palm Springs and won best film at the BendFilm festival. And he has gone rogue on the streets of LA, without permits. Patrick, his wife, Katie and son, Leo, live in NYC where Katie is doing a post doc in biology at Columbia. This past weekend, Patrick just wrapped shooting on his next film, *Seen From Above*, which follows a love triangle between two teenagers and a drone helicopter.

In 2010, Patrick almost died as a result of a film directed by Richard in Mexico, while shooting from a small, barely seaworthy fishing skiff in extremely high seas. Also, Richard learned how to swim last year – now he can shoot his own death-defying scenes.

Prof. Janie Leatherman introduced the new faculty member from Politics, **Gayle Alberda**. She will be teaching American politics along with graduate courses in the MPA program. She holds a BS and MPA from Central Michigan and her PhD is from Wayne State. She is working on a project about the current elections for which she is recruiting students to work as election observers. She has many publications, and her dissertation on the influence of early voting on voter turnout in municipal elections has won awards. She recently taught at Drake. She has also worked in politics at various levels and regularly serves as a political analyst for media. Her 6 year-old son often accompanies her to events and begs to be interviewed as well. Among her other interests are Nigerian food, which her colleagues are eager to sample.

Dolan School of Business Dean Don Gibson invited his department chairs to introduce their new colleagues.

Prof. Joan Lee began,

I want to welcome **Greg Burke** back to Fairfield. Greg is an alum, participated in the Honors Program, and was the Loyola medalist. Greg joins the Accounting department as an Instructor of the Practice. After leaving Fairfield, Greg worked in public accounting and earned Certified Public Accountant licensure. Immediately prior to returning to Fairfield, Greg spent a year as a volunteer at Rostro de Cristo in Duran, Ecuador. Having been immersed in a Spanish speaking culture for a year, Greg welcomes opportunities to converse in Spanish so he doesn't lose his ability to converse in Spanish.

Prof. John McDermott introduced two new faculty in Finance.

Ms. **Rosalind Looby** comes to us from industry. She has worked at Morgan Stanley, JP Morgan, Credit Suisse and most recently the Carlson Group. She has a BA from Vassar College and MBA from NYU. She has used her talents to benefit the community as a member of the investment committee for Save the Children in Westport. She is joining us as a visiting instructor of finance.

Dr. **Michael Puleo** comes to us from his doctoral program at Temple University where he received an excellence in teaching award. He also earned a BS and MS in Finance from the University of Florida. He is joining us as a tenure track assistant professor and is already popular with students.

Because Prof. Carl Scheraga was teaching, Dean Gibson made the introductions for the Management department. **Jeff Moretz** has worked in Canada and Ireland exploring open source issues. He has an MBA from Michigan State and a PhD from the University of Texas at Austin. Among other places where he has traveled, lived and worked, is Japan, and he is an avid fan of sumo wrestling.

Paul Daulerio has taught for nine years as an adjunct and is now a Professor of the Practice. He is a graduate of the Naval Academy where he was a member of the hockey team when it won its only championship. He has an MBA from Drexel, MS from MIT, and PhD from Pace.

From the Graduate School of Education & Allied Professions, Prof. Pat Calderwood introduced two faculty specializing in Educational Technology.

Joshua Elliott has a 2014 University of Phoenix EdD in Educational Leadership with a specialization in Educational Technology, an MA in Teaching, and Certificate of Advanced Studies in Educational Leadership From Sacred Heart, and two undergrad degrees- a BS in Education from Central Connecticut State University 2002 and his initial BA in psychology from UConn in 1997.

Josh has been an adjunct at Sacred Heart since 2011. He was a High School Social Studies Teacher in New Milford CT from 2006 until this past June, and has taught adult education courses in New Milford from 2010 - 2012. Josh also has 2 book reviews and 2 manuscripts out under review in Educational Technology Journals.

A note about Josh's work ethic: The man cannot sit still and wait for things to happen. I've tried to get him to slack off, but he is just not wired to take it easy. Since being hired, and well before he saw his first paycheck yesterday, Josh completed an innovative redesign of the Ed tech program, organized a major professional development extravaganza for CT teachers to be held here on campus during spring break, and personally repainted his office. And he's just learned this morning that he's been appointed to the Educational Technology Committee, where I'm certain that he will be very welcome!

Josh lives with his 3 young sons, his wife and her parents in a century-old house in New Milford. With his contractor father-in-law offering guidance, Josh has been repairing, repurposing, deconstructing, and reconstructing the house and grounds, battling with bats, nesting birds and all sorts of creatures in the age-old pursuit of home maintenance. He's got skills. He also promises to share bounty from the home garden.

I speak for all my ESTP and GSEAP colleagues when I say that we joyfully and enthusiastically welcome **Jay Rozgonyi** to our department as affiliate faculty. (At this point, Prof. Calderwood had to pause for the warm ovation to die down.) He's been such a wonderful colleague and friend over the years to us in GSEAP and such a significant member of our University community since 1991.

Most of us at the University have had the privilege of working with Jay in his evolving leadership roles related to academic computing and all things IT, from comprehensive infrastructural design and innovation, to the very human and gentle support he shares with the more terrified technophobes among us. Our university is so well positioned at the leading edge of technologically infused instruction through his leadership in faculty development. We've profited from his innovative work in designing and helping us understand how to use the cutting edge classroom spaces in our classrooms. We've benefitted from his collaborative nature and his expertise, and have come to love his sunny disposition, his sincerity and his enthusiasm.

Our undergraduate education students absolutely love Jay, and tell me that they've learned so much from his teaching in their technology course, as have the graduate students in technology and in teacher education. We are truly blessed that Jay has not only accepted our invitation to join our department, but has also committed to full participation, even unto participating in our monthly department meetings. Welcome, Jay.

Dr. Diana Hulse concluded the introductions.

I am pleased to introduce you to Dr. **Stephane Morrison**, our newest member in the Counselor Education Department, as assistant professor with an emphasis in school counseling. Originally from Jamaica, Stephane has a degree in Theology and Guidance and Counseling from the Jamaica Theological Seminary. After implementing the first developmental comprehensive school counseling program in Jamaica and receiving recognition from the Ministry of Education and the Jamaica Association of Guidance Counselors in Education, she continued her passion for school counseling by completing a master's degree in school counseling from the University of Wisconsin-Platteville and a doctorate from Western Michigan University.

Stephaney has worked as an assistant professor at Hunter College where she directed the school counseling program. She has published a number of articles which focus on school counselors meeting the needs of immigrant students in the K-12 school system and will continue this work at Fairfield University.

Stephaney is married to Rayon and is the mother of twin girls, Victoria Grace and Sara Elizabeth. She enjoys spending time with her family, cooking, and reading. She is an ordained minister and provides service to the Caribbean immigrant community, where she informs members about mental health issues and provides parenting workshops. The Counselor Education community is thrilled to welcome Stephaney Morrison!

4. Remarks by the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

Provost and SVPAA Lynn Babington offered the following remarks.

As we have all heard, we are fortunate to again welcome a new group of very interesting and diverse faculty to Fairfield University. Please spend some time welcoming them, getting to know them, and helping them as they join our community.

I want to begin my remarks with a brief update on student enrollments for the fall.

Undergraduates: As of 9/12 - 1071 freshman- higher yield, stronger students (higher SAT scores, more merit scholars accepted our admission offer) from 23 states, 19 countries. CAS= 458 (up from last year); DSB= 385 (up slightly); ESON= 152 (largest class ever); SOE= 76 (similar to last year); 14% AHANA students; 41 international students from 19 different countries; 61% female/39% male. Admit rate went down 5 points (61%) Our yield also improved 2 points – 16%

Graduates: 9/2 = 1100 (GSEAP=446, ESON=215, DSB= 165, SOE=160, CAS= 111). We expect these numbers to increase as some graduate programs start later.

I am pleased to once again welcome you to a new academic year. Last year was a very productive one for the Academic Division- your commitment to academic excellence and the success of our students resulted in new programs/majors and minors that are being launched this fall: in the College, minors in humanitarian action and graphic design and a concentration in behavioral neuroscience; in DSB, a minor in sports leadership & management; in the SOE, a five year option for BS/MS in the MOT program; and in the ESON- a Nurse Midwifery specialization in the DNP program which will be launched in the Fall 2017.

Faculty continue to be innovative - experimenting with new pedagogies and teaching methodologies. Innovation and creativity in how we teach and what we teach are increasingly important to our success as an academic enterprise.

This summer many of you were deeply engaged in the work of the University –not just your own scholarship but in areas that benefit the entire academic division, including Core Curricular revision and implementation, diversity and inclusion, innovations in teaching and learning, mentoring students in your labs and studios, sharing your expertise and guidance with our incoming students, teaching classes – on campus, on line and overseas. These are just a few examples of the great work faculty engage in here at the University – whether on contract or not!

This is a year of transition and I would like to share with you my vision and goals on how we continue to move forward as an academic division while the University transitions to a new President.

This is our time! We as faculty need take leadership on forward movement in the academic division. You have already begun this work – One example is the College of Arts & Sciences who voted to organize into four distinctive schools. This year, College faculty will have the opportunity to define what that means –how each school can differentiate themselves yet join together in interdisciplinary/cross disciplinary ways –both in the classroom and in areas of inquiry and scholarship. That is what truly makes Fairfield faculty unique – your/our ability to work together in new and interesting ways for the greater good.

We are challenged with continuing to diversify our revenue streams –I know that business language is off putting to some, but we must take leadership in this area and work has already begun. The professional schools are looking for ways to create certificate programs in unique areas that capitalize on the expertise of faculty and feed into our graduate programs. Some of our new faculty with deep expertise in very specific areas will help us to get there. To that end, we have been recruiting this summer for an Associate Vice President for Continued and Professional Education who will work out of the Provost's office. Some of you have been involved in the recruitment process.

It is critical that the academic division take the lead in defining growth in this arena - both reengaging in the part time continuing studies market and in branching out in ways to engage new students in a Fairfield education- in both traditional undergraduate and graduate programs, degree completion programs, certificate programs, professional development, continuing education and adult enrichment. This approach is part of the long history and success of Jesuit higher education, the ability to meet students where they are in the context of the present reality and craft sound academic programs to meet those needs.

The new Open Minds Institute created in a collaboration between the Quick Center and Academics is one example of faculty in partnership across campus both in the design and launch of a program that reaches new audiences. Another example is the partnership between the SOE and a manufacturing company that provides opportunities for students to work collaboratively with engineers on real life projects and our faculty to collaborate on cutting edge research. Faculty in the ESON, in responding to the needs of local hospitals for nurse manager leadership development, packaged the foundational courses in one of the graduate program tracks as a certificate. We hope that the experience of these students will lead them to seek a master's or doctoral degree in the ESON.

These are just a few examples of what we are already doing in the academic division and why we need to take ownership and be leaders in the growth of unique, high quality educational opportunities for a wide variety of students.

In order to be successful in identifying, developing and launching new programs, we must learn to be nimble. This does not mean circumventing the approval process for academic programs, but we do need to be expedient in how we approach our work. The new AVP for Continuing and Professional Education will help guide and support us in these efforts.

It is important to me that you all know and understand that even when we do not always agree, my role as the chief academic officer is to be the voice for the academic enterprise and advocate for the educational experience at all levels of Fairfield University. I take my position very seriously and spend much of my time in the role of a translator- translating and educating the senior leadership team on the central role that academics (the work we do) plays at a University like Fairfield. Students come here largely because of you, the faculty – the quality of the educational programs you design and execute, the excellent teaching you provide, the mentoring you are committed to – both inside and outside of the classroom, and the rich experiences you provide our students to work alongside you on your research, scholarship and creative endeavors. The faculty role is not only an important role, but central to the success of this University.

As faculty, we must be leaders in assessing the work we do and making changes where appropriate. To that end, this year, we all need to be deeply engaged in the work (and certainly the conversation) on Core revision. In the past 2 ½ years, many of you- from all of the various academic units have worked tirelessly on redesigning the Core; which will be Fairfield's signature integrative educational experience in the Jesuit educational tradition. I look forward to the final product being approved and launched in the Fall 2017. Again, in my advocacy role as CAO, I have secured commitment to resourcing this new Core curriculum as it is fully implemented over the next couple of years.

Another area, not quite as near and dear to our hearts, but nevertheless important is approving a post tenure review process that will take place of the flawed merit system we currently have. A committee of very dedicated faculty worked all of last year, seeking input at various times from all constituents, and the proposal was approved by the Academic Council this week and will come before the general faculty in the coming months. Please read it carefully and recognize that it is a developmental process, not one that is

either punitive or meant to replace in any way the rank & tenure process. The BoT has agreed in principle that this process would replace the current merit process. That is a win for faculty.

In order for us to continue our success as a University, all of us must come together as a community, honoring and respecting each of our unique contributions. All of the faculty here at the University contribute in unique ways to the education of our students and the life of the University. Last year a faculty handbook committee was formed with the purpose of studying and making recommendations regarding non-tenure track faculty. One specific duty outlined in its charge was to draft or review policies on matters pertaining to non-tenure track faculty. To that end, an elected committee worked last year to develop some recommendations for changes in the JoR regarding non-tenure track faculty and will be presenting those recommendations to the Academic Council this year. The recommendations include increasing job stability for these faculty. We must formally recognize not only the unique contributions that our teaching intensive faculty make to the academic mission of the University but also recognize that as we continue to develop new very specialized fields of study, we will continue to have needs for faculty with these specialized skills, experience and knowledge who may not fit neatly into our current faculty categories.

We must be open to new ways of thinking about how we accomplish our academic goals.

I am sure that you noticed the rate change to join the recplex. This change was a direct result of advocacy from the academic division in collaboration with the wellness committee on campus to promote health and wellness for all employees.

Please be sure to attend the University Convocation on Sept. 27. It will provide an opportunity to collectively celebrate our successes in implementing our strategic plan: Fairfield 2020: The Way Forward. It will also be a time to discuss our future as we continue to move forward through a Presidential transition. Continuing to build and sustain a culture of collaboration and community at Fairfield will be critical to our ongoing success.

Collaboration is not easy to achieve in any context; however as communities of learning, Universities above all other settings should strive for this ideal. We need to be intentional about building our community so that it is a JUST place where everyone feels valued.

As I shared with you last year, my role as an academic leader is to provide an environment where we can all flourish- as teachers, scholars and citizens of the University and broader community. I cannot begin to be successful without your support and help. I have learned a lot over the last two years in my position as chief academic officer here at Fairfield and will continue to do so with your help and support. We may not always agree but it is critical that we respect and support each other's work as we move through this year of Presidential transition. As faculty, we must be the leaders during this transition.

John F. Kennedy so eloquently said, "Change is the law of life, and those who look only to the past or present are certain to miss the future." I wish you all the best for a successful academic year!

When the floor was opened to questions, Prof. Mulvey, noting that Provost Babington had referred to the upcoming presidential transition, asked about the plans for next semester. Provost Babington said that the Board meets at the end of September. She fully expects that we will all find out after that about the transition plan. She has no more idea of what the Board is planning than does anyone else in the room.

Seeing no further questions, Provost Babington invited faculty to join her in the Kelley Center to welcome our new faculty colleagues and celebrate the beginning of the academic year.

5. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn [Jae/Keenan] was uncontested at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Prof. Susan Rakowitz
Secretary of the General Faculty

Date: October 5, 2016
To: Members of the General Faculty
From: Faculty Salary Committee
Re: Distribution of 2016-17 Salary Increase

The Journal of Record (a collection of policy statements agreed to by the Faculty and Administration) describes salary increases as divided into standard and further merit, with further merit only being triggered when the increase in the salary pool is above the increase in the cost of living for a given year. The terms of compensation imposed on the Faculty by the Board of Trustees in June of 2016 included a 2% salary increase, which was greater than the increase in cost of living. The administration then produced several documents indicating that the pool would be divided per the Journal of Record (JOR), with 1.025% going to standard merit and the remainder going to further merit.

Since that time, the College and, we are told, the other schools, voted to treat everyone who qualified for standard merit as automatically qualifying for the top level of further merit. Following the JOR, all faculty who qualified for standard merit would then receive the same flat dollar amount for extraordinary merit. Now, the administration has offered to treat the entire salary increase as standard merit. Per the JOR, standard merit is distributed as a percent of salary or of the mean of the rank, whichever is greater. The Faculty Salary Committee supports distributing the salary increase in this way. In order to make this exception to the JOR, the General Faculty will need to agree. We recommend that the General Faculty approve the following motion:

That the entire 2% increase in salary for 2016-2017 be distributed as standard merit.

Post-Tenure Review Report to Academic Council 5-2-16

This document contains three distinct sections:

- 1) Recommendation for replacing the current merit system with a system of annual faculty review and a post tenure review system,
- 2) Rationale for these recommendations based on the feedback received from faculty,
- 3) The actual resolution that we respectfully request faculty approve as a change to the Journal of Record.

Members of the Post Tenure Review Committee: Lynn Babington, Joe Dennin, Dennis Keenan, Carl Scheraga, Emily Smith, Kate Wheeler, Jo Yarrington, Wook-Sung Yoo **Charge:** Discuss in earnest the feasibility of a post-tenure review system that could replace the current merit system and be in place for FY17 (2016-2017).

Recommendations: To replace the current merit system with the following:

1. Annual evaluation and self-assessment for all full-time faculty members.

The purpose of this review is to determine whether a faculty member qualifies for the annual salary increase determined by annual collegial discussions between the Faculty Salary Committee and the administration regarding the “Memo of Understanding: Faculty Compensation (Salary and Benefits).” The annual evaluation and self-assessment (currently three 250 word reflections) should reflect the past year in the areas of teaching, scholarly and/or creative activities and service. Each school may continue to use their current process for the annual evaluation and self-assessment.

2. Post-tenure review process.

The principles guiding this recommendation for a post-tenure review process are drawn from “Post-Tenure Review: An AAUP Response”: “Post-tenure review ought to be aimed not at accountability, but at faculty development. Post-tenure review must be developed and carried out by faculty. Post-tenure review must not be a reevaluation of tenure, nor may it be used to shift the burden of proof from an institution’s administration (to show cause for dismissal) to the individual faculty member (to show cause why he or she should be retained). Post-tenure review must be conducted according to the standards that protect academic freedom and the quality of education.”

The post tenure review process is a formative process and will *not* be tied to the annual salary increase agreed to as part of collegial discussions between the Faculty Salary Committee and the administration regarding the “Memo of Understanding: Faculty Compensation (Salary and Benefits).” The post tenure review process replaces extraordinary merit. There is no financial component tied to this process.

Post tenure review will be conducted at a maximum of every 5 years (with a three year

interval recommended for associate professors with tenure). This formative process will recognize past accomplishments, support goals and identify and address areas for development. Components of the post tenure review include:

1. Completion of a self-assessment by the faculty member on past performance and aspirations for the future.
2. A meeting between the faculty member and the Dean. Though this post-tenure review process is developed by faculty (as recommended by the AAUP), it is not carried out (entirely) by faculty. Given that the purpose of the meeting is to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development, it seems appropriate that the Dean play a role in mentoring process (but it must be emphasized that this review is not a reevaluation of tenure). In preparation for the meeting, the faculty member would submit the self-evaluation, curriculum vitae, and a summary of teaching evaluations.
3. If there are areas identified by the faculty member and the Dean that require further development for the faculty member, a developmental plan with a timeline will be outlined and agreed to by both the faculty member and dean.

Rationale for Recommendations based on Faculty Feedback

1. Recommendation that post tenure review be carried out by a meeting between the applicant and the dean with feedback from peers and/or department chairs as appropriate.
 - a. Department chairs may not be at the same or higher rank than the applicant.
 - b. Deans are responsible for allocating resources.
 - c. Provides an opportunity to have a discussion on career accomplishments and goals with the Dean.
2. Recommendation that we continue with an annual review process for all full time faculty to determine eligibility for an annual salary increase (standard merit).
 - a. As a community of scholars, faculty are committed to our mission of expanding knowledge and deepening understanding, thus supporting and encouraging scholarly research and artistic production of faculty and students.
 - b. It is prudent for any employee to reflect annually on accomplishments and this review is tied to annual salary increase.
3. Recommendation for a maximum of 5 years between reviews for tenured full professors and 3 years for tenured associate professors.
 - a. Since this is a formative process, an associate professor may find more frequent guidance and support than a full professor useful in presenting a strong case for promotion in a timely fashion.
 - b. For a full professor, a maximum of 5 years between reviews allows reflection on accomplishments and goal setting for future career objectives.

Proposal with Changes Shown

Resolution: Be it resolved that the Appendix 12 from the Journal of Record be revised to remove all references to merit, further merit, additional merit and extraordinary merit, and to add text on post tenure review as follows (additions underlined, deletions struck through):

Appendix 12: Guidelines for Faculty Annual ~~Merit Review~~, and Self-Evaluation and post tenure review

Post Tenure Review

The principles guiding this post-tenure review process are drawn from “Post-Tenure Review: An AAUP Response ”Post-tenure review is not a reevaluation of tenure, nor may it be used to shift the burden of proof from an institution’s administration (to show cause for dismissal) to the individual faculty member (to show cause why he or she should be retained). Post-tenure review must be conducted according to the standards that protect academic freedom and the quality of education.”

Post tenure review will be conducted at least every 5 years (with a three year interval recommended for associate professors with tenure). This formative process will recognize past accomplishments, support goals and identify and address areas for development. It will *not* be tied to the annual salary increase agreed to as part of collegial discussions between the Faculty Salary Committee and the administration regarding the “Memo of Understanding: Faculty Compensation (Salary and Benefits).”Components of the post tenure review include:

1. Completion of a self-assessment by the faculty member on past performance and aspirations for the future.
2. A meeting between the faculty member and the Dean. Though this post-tenure review process is developed by faculty (as recommended by the AAUP), it is not carried out (entirely) by faculty. Given that the purpose of the meeting is to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development, it seems appropriate that the Dean play a role in mentoring process (but it must be emphasized that this review is not a reevaluation of tenure). In preparation for the meeting, the faculty member would submit the self-evaluation, curriculum vitae, and a summary of teaching evaluations.
3. If there are areas identified by the faculty member and the Dean that require further development for the faculty member, a developmental plan with a timeline will be outlined and agreed to by both the faculty member and dean.

Faculty members will take part in annual ~~merit evaluation and~~ self-assessment by writing three short ~~essays~~ reflections, one each on teaching, scholarly and/or creative activities, and service. ~~The essays~~ They should inspire reflection on the year’s achievements and suggest areas for improvement. Schools or curriculum areas may request that evidence be appended to the essays, e.g., annual teaching evaluations, new pedagogical materials or reprints of published work. The ~~essays~~ reflections and appended materials will constitute the application for ~~merit pay~~ annual salary increases. In addition, faculty members will receive qualitative feedback on their performance from their chairs, program area directors, or a duly constituted committee.

This document describes the process and provides guidelines for writing the essays. ~~There will be three potential levels of merit: “standard” and two levels beyond this (called “additional” and “extraordinary”).~~ Whether ~~merit is~~ salary increases are actually awarded in a given year will depend on budget considerations, but the yearly assessment should be done regardless of the status of the budget.

Below you will find an overview of what might constitute ~~standard, additional and extraordinary merit~~ eligibility for an annual salary increase in the three categories of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service, and additional detail on how to submit the assessments.

~~Standard Merit~~

Eligibility for an Annual Salary Increase

~~Standard merit~~ Eligibility for an annual salary increase is a threshold that the great majority of faculty should be able to achieve annually. Because Fairfield University recognizes that **effective teaching is critical to our mission and a fundamental promise that we make to our students**, each faculty member must make a case for teaching effectiveness. In addition to demonstrating professional and quality engagement with teaching, the ~~standard merit threshold~~ eligibility for an annual salary increase requires a positive professional contribution in scholarly/creative activity or service. The evaluation period for ~~standard merit~~ eligibility for an annual salary increase is the calendar academic year.

Eligibility for an annual salary increase requires sufficient achievements or activities in teaching and one other area.

~~Further Merit~~

~~Further merit is characterized by two levels, additional merit, and extraordinary merit. The differentiation among the levels is determined by the standards of the curriculum area according to the quality, impact, prestige, reach, difficulty, and/or rarity of the accomplishments. The lists below reflect some examples that distinguish among standard, additional, and extraordinary merit. These are not checklists but guides. The emphasis should be on the positive, professional contribution the faculty member has made through the activity.~~

~~The evaluation period for further merit includes all calendar years since further merit was funded by the salary pool.~~

~~The lists below indicate the types of achievements and activities appropriate to each level of merit. As stated above, Standard Merit requires sufficient achievements or activities in teaching and one other area. To earn Additional Merit, the faculty member must demonstrate achievements at the Additional level in two areas and the Standard level in the third area. Extraordinary Merit requires achievements at the Extraordinary level in one area and at the Additional level in the other two areas.~~

The Application: Essays on Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service

There is a single application for ~~all three levels of merit~~ annual faculty review. It will comprise three short essays reflections (or annotated lists) in the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service (though only achievements in teaching and one other area are required to be eligible for an annual salary increase for the standard merit threshold). Schools or curriculum areas may request appended information that supports the essays reflections. If the faculty member has no activities or achievements to discuss regarding either service or scholarly/creative pursuits, that essay reflection should be devoted to plans for that area. Candidates should have flexibility in making their case,

and the arguments should be primarily qualitative because they are meant to inspire reflection. Each essay reflection should be focused and concise, no more than 250 words or one double-spaced page. Each essay reflection should discuss important highlights in that particular area and not be a detailed list of every activity. ~~In years when there is further merit, the faculty member will specify the level of merit for which he or she is applying.~~

Below are some guidelines for what could be included in the three essays reflections. The examples listed are not intended to be exhaustive or used as checklists; rather, they are illustrations of typical or common activities in the three areas. ~~Within each area, activities that qualify a faculty member for a higher level include qualification for any lower level.~~

Note that the relative importance of the three areas within the review is reflected by their ordering. That is, consistent with the norms of the profession and the mission of the university, teaching is the most important thing we do, followed by scholarly/creative accomplishments, and then by service. However, individuals may emphasize different areas at different points in their professional lives.

The structures above reflect campus-wide values for teaching, scholarship and service in order to ~~achieve standard merit~~ be eligible for an annual salary increase. However, schools and curriculum areas differ in their disciplinary approaches to pedagogy and scholarship, accreditation requirements, and even service needs based on the size of the school. These differences may have an impact on the determination of ~~merit~~ eligibility for an annual salary increase through the addition of items in the bulleted examples below and through the ~~merit~~ annual review process itself.

Examples of Activities in Support of Merit an Annual Salary Increase

Teaching:

Teaching includes curriculum design and review, classroom instruction, quality advising, clinical/practicum supervision, close work with students outside the classroom, assessment of learning outcomes, and work that contributes to the improvement of teaching at the university. **To qualify for an annual salary increase ~~standard merit~~ in teaching, the faculty member must fulfill the relevant duties specified in the *Handbook* and provide evidence of active engagement in quality teaching.** These duties include: preparing, administering and grading exams; directing, grading and discussing papers and projects; submitting grades in a timely manner; maintaining office hours; and beginning and ending classes on time (*Handbook*, sections C.1.a, b, c, and d).

Besides meeting these basic professional responsibilities, the faculty member must make the case for being actively engaged in quality teaching. The member should have teaching evaluations that support the case for teaching effectiveness, and the lists below contain some of the additional standard ways to demonstrate teaching effectiveness. The essay and supporting materials are not limited to these activities, and **should emphasize how the activity contributes in a positive way to teaching in the department or program and at the university**. Finally, where teaching evaluations are relatively weak, the essay reflection should include explanations and plans for addressing any weaknesses.

Teaching effectiveness and contributions in the area of teaching should comprise the most significant part of any annual review.

Typical activities that, done well, might demonstrate eligibility for an annual salary increase:

- Consistently strong teaching evaluations (benchmarked by discipline, course level, and other considerations).
- Developing a new course or substantially revamping an existing course to meet program or university goals.
- Teaching a course that is significantly more labor intensive than a typical course in the curriculum area.
- Supervising an intensive student learning experience outside the traditional classroom (e.g., independent research, clinical/practicum supervision).
- Serving as the director of a master's thesis or project.
- Incorporating ideas from the Center for Academic Excellence or other pedagogical workshops into teaching.
- Above average student advisement load.
- Other activities that contribute significantly to effective teaching.

~~Activities that, done well, might demonstrate achievement of Additional Merit:~~

- ~~• Consistently very strong teaching evaluations (benchmarked by discipline, course level, and other considerations).~~
- ~~• Participating in peer review with colleagues in other departments or significant mentoring of others' teaching.~~
- ~~• Innovative advising and/or unusually heavy advising load.~~
- ~~• Directing student research teams.~~
- ~~• Teaching that contributes to institutional initiatives (e.g., team teaching, interdisciplinary teaching, cluster course teaching, service learning, or teaching in conjunction with a residential learning community).~~
- ~~• Developing and/or maintaining clinical or other placement sites.~~
- ~~• Contributing substantially to a program self-study, or academic assessment or accreditation activity in a curriculum area.~~
- ~~• Other comparable achievements that contribute significantly to effective teaching.~~

~~Activities that, done well, might demonstrate achievement of Extraordinary Merit:~~

- ~~• Consistently superior teaching evaluations (benchmarked by discipline, course level, and other considerations).~~
- ~~• Contributing significantly to the institutional culture of reflective practice and peer review of teaching.~~
- ~~• Significant mentoring or unusually intensive work with students outside class or beyond the usual teaching load.~~
- ~~• Leading a program self-study, or academic assessment or accreditation activity in a curriculum area.~~
- ~~• Receiving a teaching award.~~
- ~~• Other comparable achievements that contribute significantly to effective teaching.~~

Scholarly/Creative Activity:

It is the responsibility of all professional scholars to participate in their academic communities, through innovation, application, and dissemination of scholarly work. The *Handbook* specifies forms of participation in the scholarly and professional community, namely: "Involvement in scholarly research or other professionally recognized creative activities; active participation in professional societies and educational organizations; and keeping abreast of current developments in one's field" (*Handbook*, sections C.1.h, j, and k). The lists below contain some of the standard ways to demonstrate this active participation. Again, the essay reflection is not limited to the

activities listed below and should **emphasize how each activity makes a positive professional contribution and enhances the university.**

Evidence of and commentary on scholarly and creative contributions to one's field should comprise a significant portion of any annual review.

Typical activities that, done well, might demonstrate ~~achievement of Standard Merit~~ eligibility for an annual salary increase:

- Contributing in peer reviewed publications or creative works relevant to one's discipline or field.
- Presenting at a professional conference or meeting.
- Serving on a panel, roundtable, or special session at a professional meeting.
- Serving as a reviewer for a scholarly journal or professional society.
- Participating regularly in an ongoing scholarly or professional seminar.
- Serving as a reviewer of a tenure application at another institution.
- Communicating academic findings or contributing one's academic expertise to public dialogue through publishing, presenting, media commentary, or task force participation.
- Maintaining clinical licensure or certification relevant to one's professional program.
- Other significant activities that demonstrate contributions to the candidate's discipline or field.

~~Activities that, done well, might demonstrate achievement of Additional Merit:~~

- ~~• Publishing a peer-reviewed article in a mid- to top-level journal, chapter, or equivalent in exhibit or performance~~
- ~~• Leading a scholarly or professional workshop or seminar.~~
- ~~• Organizing a significant panel or program for a professional meeting or for a public forum for which one's academic expertise is needed.~~
- ~~• Giving a notable invited address or similarly notable exhibit.~~
- ~~• Making a scholarly contribution to the professional organization.~~
- ~~• Serving on the editorial board of a peer-review journal or publication series.~~
- ~~• Procuring external funding for one's research.~~
- ~~• Preparing and submitting a well-reviewed, but unfunded, major external grant proposal.~~
- ~~• Other comparable achievements that demonstrate scholarly/creative contributions to one's field.~~

~~Activities that, done well, might demonstrate achievement of Extraordinary Merit:~~

- ~~• Publishing a book that has been subject to some form of peer review, article in a top-tier journal or equivalent in exhibit or performance.~~
- ~~• Giving a major invited address or keynote at a major meeting.~~
- ~~• Planning and leading the program for a major scholarly meeting.~~
- ~~• Receiving a major grant from an outside funding source.~~
- ~~• Serving as editor of a peer-review journal or publication series.~~
- ~~• Receiving an award for research or similar recognition from one's academic peers.~~
- ~~• Other comparable achievements that demonstrate scholarly/creative contributions to one's field.~~

Service:

Service to the institution, at the level of departments, schools, or the university, is a vital aspect of our professional responsibility. The *Handbook* specifies basic forms of service to the institution namely, "Attendance at and participation in general faculty and curriculum area meetings; attendance at commencement, convocations and other functions at which the Academic Vice President may request attendance; and service on, and cooperation with, University and curriculum area committees" (*Handbook*, sections C.1.e, f, and g). Besides fulfilling these basic obligations, faculty members who want to qualify for ~~merit~~ an annual salary increase in this area must

demonstrate active participation in shared governance and promoting the well-being of the institution.

The lists below contain some of the standard ways to demonstrate active membership in the life of the university and/or the profession. Again, the essay reflection is not limited to these activities and should **emphasize how the activity makes a positive contribution to the institution and/or the profession.**

Typical activities that, done well, might demonstrate achievement of Standard Merit eligibility for an annual salary increase:

- Actively serving on university, school, or department committees.
- Service to a professional organization.
- Organizing campus events.
- Ongoing volunteer community service that fits the mission of the university.
- Actively participating in recruitment, admission, and retention of students.
- Other activities that contribute significantly to the university or the profession.

~~Activities that, done well, might demonstrate achievement of Additional Merit:~~

- ~~• Chairing a department or directing a program.~~
- ~~• Serving the department, school, university and/or the profession in a significant way through participation on committees.~~
- ~~• Holding and fulfilling the responsibilities of a formal office in a professional association.~~
- ~~• Contributing substantially to the non-academic elements of an accreditation activity.~~
- ~~• Significant participation in the admissions process (e.g., reviewing applications, interviewing applicants, and contributing to the admission decision).~~
- ~~• Participating on a major university or school task force or equivalent.~~
- ~~• Other comparable achievements that demonstrate service to the institution and/or profession.~~

~~Activities that, done well, might demonstrate achievement of Extraordinary Merit:~~

- ~~• Providing major leadership to faculty and shared governance or making a particularly significant contribution through committee leadership.~~
- ~~• Providing leadership for a major university initiative.~~
- ~~• Holding a major leadership position in a professional organization.~~
- ~~• Leading the non-academic elements of an accreditation activity.~~
- ~~• Receiving a major service award from the university, professional society, or civic body.~~
- ~~• Other comparable achievements that demonstrate service to the institution and/or profession.~~
- ~~• Support for any activity in the form of a course release, a university or school stipend, or other university funding for the work should be disclosed in the essays. Significant remuneration for an activity may be considered by the curriculum area head or merit committee to reduce the impact of the activity in the merit review.~~

Application Process Guidelines:

The lists are not intended to be checklists but rather used as guides for faculty members to contemplate and present their significant accomplishments for the year. Schools and departments may expand upon items in the various lists and/or add to the lists those items appropriate to their disciplines and should maintain and distribute the revised list. However, because these lists reflect the activities that the institution as a whole values, schools or departments may not remove any items, although some items may receive greater or lesser emphasis consistent with disciplinary distinctions or programmatic and curricular goals.

In applications, the emphasis should be on the quality of the work and how it reflects the faculty member's productive engagement with his or her department, school, university or profession.

Because they are already extensively reviewed each year and they should be focused on longer-term, rather than annual, goals, untenured, tenure-track faculty members automatically qualify for standard merit an annual salary increase as long as their continuing (tenure track) contracts are renewed. ~~In years when further merit is available, they may apply for it.~~ In addition, the merit assessments annual reviews for untenured, tenure-track faculty should recognize that they do not have as many opportunities for leadership in service as tenured faculty do. Faculty members who are promoted in rank during the course of an academic year, automatically qualify for an annual salary increase ~~standard merit and may apply for additional merit.~~

By a specified due date, each faculty member will submit her or his application to the head of the appropriate curriculum area or a committee within the area or school. The head or committee will make a recommendation to the ~~appropriate dean as to what level of merit the candidate qualifies for.~~ After the dean makes a final decision, the head or committee will communicate this decision to the faculty member. Individuals (whether the head of a curriculum area or on a committee charged with making merit annual salary increase recommendations) may not make recommendations regarding their own merit annual review application.

The annual review process should be summative for the purposes of awarding merit annual salary increases, but also must be formative. Each faculty member should receive feedback from the appropriate administrator (department chair and/or dean) indicating areas in which the faculty member can improve as well as areas in which he/she is doing well. This feedback should include constructive ideas for how this improvement might be accomplished and consideration of the support that is available to enable those improvements.

The role of the Deans and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs will be to ensure that the results of the merit annual review process in each curriculum area are appropriate and have a reasonable degree of consistency across curriculum areas. At the same time, the assessment of these results must be cognizant of distinctions in disciplinary approaches and programmatic and curricular goals.

An appeals process will be developed by the joint Salary Committee (FSC and administrative team) in collaboration with the Deans and SVPAA prior to the first implementation of this plan.

Distribution of Funds

~~If the increase in the salary pool is at or below the increase in the cost of living (CPI-U), the entire increase in the pool will go to Standard Merit. If the increase in the salary pool is above the increase in the cost of living, then the percent going to Standard Merit will be cost of living plus one quarter of the remainder of the increase in the pool. Standard Merit Annual salary increases will be distributed to recipients as a percent of salary or of the mean of the rank, whichever is greater. Additional and Extraordinary Merit will be distributed in such a way that each faculty member who receives Extraordinary Merit in a given year will receive the same dollar amount, and it will be twice the amount awarded to each recipient of Additional Merit.~~

GF: 10/23/2009
Amended AC: 02/25/2013

Proposal with Changes Incorporated

Resolution: Be it resolved that the Appendix 12 from the Journal of Record be revised to remove all references to merit, further merit, additional merit and extraordinary merit, and to add text on post tenure review as follows (proposed changes incorporated):

Appendix 12: Guidelines for Faculty Annual Review, Self-Evaluation and post tenure review

Post Tenure Review

The principles guiding this post-tenure review process are drawn from “Post-Tenure Review: An AAUP Response” Post-tenure review is not a reevaluation of tenure, nor may it be used to shift the burden of proof from an institution’s administration (to show cause for dismissal) to the individual faculty member (to show cause why he or she should be retained). Post-tenure review must be conducted according to the standards that protect academic freedom and the quality of education.”

Post tenure review will be conducted at least every 5 years (with a three year interval recommended for associate professors with tenure). This formative process will recognize past accomplishments, support goals and identify and address areas for development. It will *not* be tied to the annual salary increase agreed to as part of collegial discussions between the Faculty Salary Committee and the administration regarding the “Memo of Understanding: Faculty Compensation (Salary and Benefits).” Components of the post tenure review include:

4. Completion of a self-assessment by the faculty member on past performance and aspirations for the future.
5. A meeting between the faculty member and the Dean. Though this post-tenure review process is developed by faculty (as recommended by the AAUP), it is not carried out (entirely) by faculty. Given that the purpose of the meeting is to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development, it seems appropriate that the Dean play a role in mentoring process (but it must be emphasized that this review is not a reevaluation of tenure). In preparation for the meeting, the faculty member would submit the self-evaluation, curriculum vitae, and a summary of teaching evaluations.
6. If there are areas identified by the faculty member and the Dean that require further development for the faculty member, a developmental plan with a timeline will be outlined and agreed to by both the faculty member and dean.

Faculty members will take part in annual self-assessment by writing three short reflections, one each on teaching, scholarly and/or creative activities, and service. They should inspire reflection on the year’s achievements and suggest areas for improvement. Schools or curriculum areas may request that evidence be appended to the essays, e.g., annual teaching evaluations, new pedagogical materials or reprints of published work. The reflections and appended materials will constitute the application for annual salary increases. In addition, faculty members will receive qualitative feedback on their performance from their chairs, program area directors, or a duly constituted committee.

This document describes the process and provides guidelines for writing the essays. Whether salary increases are actually awarded in a given year will depend on budget considerations, but the yearly assessment should be done regardless of the status of the budget.

Below you will find an overview of what might constitute eligibility for an annual salary increase in the three categories of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service, and additional detail on how to submit the assessments.

Eligibility for an Annual Salary Increase

Eligibility for an annual salary increase is a threshold that the great majority of faculty should be able to achieve annually. Because Fairfield University recognizes that **effective teaching is critical to our mission and a fundamental promise that we make to our students**, each faculty member must make a case for teaching effectiveness. In addition to demonstrating professional and quality engagement with teaching, the eligibility for an annual salary increase requires a positive professional contribution in scholarly/creative activity or service. The evaluation period for eligibility for an annual salary increase is the academic year.

Eligibility for an annual salary increase requires sufficient achievements or activities in teaching and one other area.

The Application: Essays on Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Activity, and Service

There is a single application for annual faculty review. It will comprise three short reflections (or annotated lists) in the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service (though only achievements in teaching and one other area are required to be eligible for an annual salary increase). Schools or curriculum areas may request appended information that supports the reflections. If the faculty member has no activities or achievements to discuss regarding either service or scholarly/creative pursuits, that reflection should be devoted to plans for that area. Candidates should have flexibility in making their case, and the arguments should be primarily qualitative because they are meant to inspire reflection. Each reflection should be focused and concise, no more than 250 words or one double-spaced page. Each reflection should discuss important highlights in that particular area and not be a detailed list of every activity.

Below are some guidelines for what could be included in the three reflections. The examples listed are not intended to be exhaustive or used as checklists; rather, they are illustrations of typical or common activities in the three areas.

Note that the relative importance of the three areas within the review is reflected by their ordering. That is, consistent with the norms of the profession and the mission of the university, teaching is the most important thing we do, followed by scholarly/creative accomplishments, and then by service. However, individuals may emphasize different areas at different points in their professional lives.

The structures above reflect campus-wide values for teaching, scholarship and service in order to be eligible for an annual salary increase. However, schools and curriculum areas differ in their disciplinary approaches to pedagogy and scholarship, accreditation requirements, and even service needs based on the size of the school. These differences may have an impact on the determination of eligibility for an annual salary increase through the addition of items in the bulleted examples below and through the annual review process itself.

Examples of Activities in Support of an Annual Salary Increase

Teaching:

Teaching includes curriculum design and review, classroom instruction, quality advising, clinical/practicum supervision, close work with students outside the classroom, assessment of learning outcomes, and work that contributes to the improvement of teaching at the university. **To qualify for an annual salary increase in teaching, the faculty member must fulfill the relevant duties specified in the *Handbook* and provide evidence of active engagement in quality teaching.** These duties include: preparing, administering and grading exams; directing, grading and discussing papers and projects; submitting grades in a timely manner; maintaining office hours; and beginning and ending classes on time (*Handbook*, sections C.1.a, b, c, and d).

Besides meeting these basic professional responsibilities, the faculty member must make the case for being actively engaged in quality teaching. The member should have teaching evaluations that support the case for teaching effectiveness, and the lists below contain some of the additional standard ways to demonstrate teaching effectiveness. The essay and supporting materials are not limited to these activities, and **should emphasize how the activity contributes in a positive way to teaching in the department or program and at the university.** Finally, where teaching evaluations are relatively weak, the reflection should include explanations and plans for addressing any weaknesses.

Teaching effectiveness and contributions in the area of teaching should comprise the most significant part of any annual review.

Typical activities that, done well, might demonstrate eligibility for an annual salary increase:

- Consistently strong teaching evaluations (benchmarked by discipline, course level, and other considerations).
- Developing a new course or substantially revamping an existing course to meet program or university goals.
- Teaching a course that is significantly more labor intensive than a typical course in the curriculum area.
- Supervising an intensive student learning experience outside the traditional classroom (e.g., independent research, clinical/practicum supervision).
- Serving as the director of a master's thesis or project.
- Incorporating ideas from the Center for Academic Excellence or other pedagogical workshops into teaching.
- Above average student advisement load.
- Other activities that contribute significantly to effective teaching.

Scholarly/Creative Activity:

It is the responsibility of all professional scholars to participate in their academic communities, through innovation, application, and dissemination of scholarly work. The *Handbook* specifies forms of participation in the scholarly and professional community, namely: "Involvement in scholarly research or other professionally recognized creative activities; active participation in professional societies and educational organizations; and keeping abreast of current developments in one's field" (*Handbook*, sections C.1.h, j, and k). The lists below contain some of the standard

ways to demonstrate this active participation. Again, the reflection is not limited to the activities listed below and should **emphasize how each activity makes a positive professional contribution and enhances the university.**

Evidence of and commentary on scholarly and creative contributions to one's field should comprise a significant portion of any annual review.

Typical activities that, done well, might demonstrate eligibility for an annual salary increase:

- Contributing in peer reviewed publications or creative works relevant to one's discipline or field.
- Presenting at a professional conference or meeting.
- Serving on a panel, roundtable, or special session at a professional meeting.
- Serving as a reviewer for a scholarly journal or professional society.
- Participating regularly in an ongoing scholarly or professional seminar.
- Serving as a reviewer of a tenure application at another institution.
- Communicating academic findings or contributing one's academic expertise to public dialogue through publishing, presenting, media commentary, or task force participation.
- Maintaining clinical licensure or certification relevant to one's professional program.
- Other significant activities that demonstrate contributions to the candidate's discipline or field.

Service:

Service to the institution, at the level of departments, schools, or the university, is a vital aspect of our professional responsibility. The *Handbook* specifies basic forms of service to the institution namely, "Attendance at and participation in general faculty and curriculum area meetings; attendance at commencement, convocations and other functions at which the Academic Vice President may request attendance; and service on, and cooperation with, University and curriculum area committees" (*Handbook*, sections C.1.e, f, and g). Besides fulfilling these basic obligations, faculty members who want to qualify for an annual salary increase in this area must demonstrate active participation in shared governance and promoting the well-being of the institution.

The lists below contain some of the standard ways to demonstrate active membership in the life of the university and/or the profession. Again, the reflection is not limited to these activities and should **emphasize how the activity makes a positive contribution to the institution and/or the profession.**

Typical activities that, done well, might demonstrate eligibility for an annual salary increase:

- Actively serving on university, school, or department committees.
- Service to a professional organization.
- Organizing campus events.
- Ongoing volunteer community service that fits the mission of the university.
- Actively participating in recruitment, admission, and retention of students.
- Other activities that contribute significantly to the university or the profession.

Application Process Guidelines:

The lists are not intended to be checklists but rather used as guides for faculty members to contemplate and present their significant accomplishments for the year. Schools and departments may expand upon items in the various lists and/or add to the lists those items appropriate to their

disciplines and should maintain and distribute the revised list. However, because these lists reflect the activities that the institution as a whole values, schools or departments may not remove any items, although some items may receive greater or lesser emphasis consistent with disciplinary distinctions or programmatic and curricular goals.

In applications, the emphasis should be on the quality of the work and how it reflects the faculty member's productive engagement with his or her department, school, university or profession.

Because they are already extensively reviewed each year and they should be focused on longer-term, rather than annual, goals, untenured, tenure-track faculty members automatically qualify for an annual salary increase as long as their continuing (tenure track) contracts are renewed. In addition, the annual reviews for untenured, tenure-track faculty should recognize that they do not have as many opportunities for leadership in service as tenured faculty do. Faculty members who are promoted in rank during the course of an academic year, automatically qualify for an annual salary increase.

By a specified due date, each faculty member will submit her or his application to the head of the appropriate curriculum area or a committee within the area or school. The head or committee will make a recommendation to the dean. After the dean makes a final decision, the head or committee will communicate this decision to the faculty member. Individuals (whether the head of a curriculum area or on a committee charged with making annual salary increase recommendations) may not make recommendations regarding their own annual review application.

The annual review process should be summative for the purposes of awarding annual salary increases, but also must be formative. Each faculty member should receive feedback from the appropriate administrator (department chair and/or dean) indicating areas in which the faculty member can improve as well as areas in which he/she is doing well. This feedback should include constructive ideas for how this improvement might be accomplished and consideration of the support that is available to enable those improvements.

The role of the Deans and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs will be to ensure that the results of the annual review process in each curriculum area are appropriate and have a reasonable degree of consistency across curriculum areas. At the same time, the assessment of these results must be cognizant of distinctions in disciplinary approaches and programmatic and curricular goals.

An appeals process will be developed by the joint Salary Committee (FSC and administrative team) in collaboration with the Deans and SVPAA prior to the first implementation of this plan.

Distribution of Funds

Annual salary increases will be distributed to recipients as a percent of salary or of the mean of the rank, whichever is greater.

2015-2016 MOU- Excerpt

The increase identified in C(2) is agreed to and conditioned on the following stipulations:

- (a) ...
- (b) the agreement to form an appropriate group made up of faculty and administration to discuss in earnest the feasibility of a post-tenure review system that could replace the current merit system and be in place for FY17 (2016-2017). If no change is mutually recommended by this group, it is understood that the current system for distribution of merit remains in full force and effect.

GF Minutes from 9/2/15- Excerpt

Consideration of a 2015-2016 Memo of Understanding/Benefits Plan Overview

Prof. Chris Bernhardt, Chair of the 2015-2016 Faculty Salary Committee (FSC), made the final presentation from the 2014-2015 FSC. Prof. Bernhardt went on to explain paragraph b. The Journal of Record describes our current merit pay system. Part of that system is that when salary increases are above cost of living, higher levels of merit pay should kick in. The FSC has argued that considering cost of living in only one year is problematic so that language should be tweaked. In the meantime, they asked to have all of this year's increase distributed as sustained merit. The administration agreed but insisted on the language in paragraph b forming a committee to look into post tenure review. He thinks that this language is talking about merit because it explicitly says that if no agreement is reached then the current merit system remains in effect.

AC Minutes from 9/21/15- Excerpt

Discussion of formation of a committee to discuss Post-Tenure Review.

SVPAA Babington noted that she would really like to have a system of annual review. Currently there is a system for non-tenured faculty and for merit pay. The idea is to add a post-tenure review to it to make it a comprehensive annual review system. A committee needs to be formed to do that. Professor Crawford asked what would be the purpose of the committee. SVPAA Babington replied that to put in place an annual review system. Maybe it can look into other Jesuit schools and see what is happening there. Professor Downie noted that many businesses are going away with Annual Review, so why are we considering it now? Also it is important to consider what makes sense for us in terms of teaching, research and service. Maybe a comparison with top twenty liberal arts schools will be better. Professor Yarrington asked SVPAA to elaborate on about the context she is referring to. SVPAA Babington responded that she just did a review that has some percentages to fill up. She has no preconceived notions; but would like to see what businesses are doing. Professor Boquet said that it seems that we are talking about the composition of the committee. We have a Rank and Tenure Committee, Faculty Development Committee, Committee on Non-tenure Track faculty – where can we pull the members from? Professor Strauss added that Faculty Salary Committee should also be included.

Professor Rakowitz said that it is not clear what the SVPAA is proposing, because the current Merit system for standard merit is doing exactly the same thing. What rationale is there to overthrow the current merit system? How can we talk about composition without re-inventing everything? Also how do the Handbook committees liaison with this committee? Professor Yarrington asked what the goal of the annual review was. Professor Epstein noted that the General Faculty has agreed to the formation of a post-tenure review committee. So we have to do this. Professor Strauss noted that the current system will stay in place unless a new one is agreed upon to replace it. Professor Weiss noted that in the College there is a pre-tenure review system.

Professor Kris said that it seems that we need to decide on the composition of the committee. She proposed a committee of 7 members from the General Faculty – 3 from the College and 4 from the professional schools (1 each). Professor Lane seconded the proposal and added that the purpose of the committee is to address the post-tenure review issue. Professor Downie noted that the committee should liaison with all relevant Handbook committees. Professor Boquet said that this is a high stakes committee as there are long-term implications for salaries, etc. So a system with people who are identified in a standing committee should be involved. Professor Preli asked her whether she is suggesting that handbook committee members be part of this committee. Professor Boquet said that either way could work. Professor Klug said that it is assumed that the recommendation would come to the Academic Council to be vetted.

Professor Rakowitz expressed discomfort at the disproportionate representation of the professional schools. Two may be adequate for the number of faculty. Professor Kris said that it is not so much as representation but for more information. Also the perspective of the non-tenure track faculty should be incorporated. Professor Yarrington reiterated that the Rank and Tenure Committee should get a voice. Professor Steffen spoke against the motion. It is a major challenge to bring together Faculty Salary, FDEC, R&T and to choose people who are really interested. Professor Lane spoke in favor of the motion. Half of R&T have less than two years' experience. Salary committee does not have anything to do with this committee. The Academic Council can recommend the members. Professor Boquet said that faculty got into handbook committees in order to discuss these issues. We cannot make changes to the charge of the handbook committees.

Professor Epstein spoke in favor of the motion. Professor Preli suggested if it would be appropriate to get another motion to get recommendations from this committee through handbook committees. Professor Rakowitz said she needs some guidelines on what to send out to the General Faculty in a call for nominations. Professor Crawford said that the first charge of the committee would be to figure out the process and how to vet the process by handbook committees. Professor Strauss said that means there are two things here: 1) Charge of the committee – that is already in the language of 2015-16 MOU; 2) Process – how to do its work regarding the post-tenure review system.

Professor Weiss asked who would be the representative from administration. SVPAA Babington said she would be it. Professor Rakowitz asked whether the Academic Council wants her to look into the nominations to see who has served on faculty salary, R&T, FDEC committees. Then Academic Council can select the members.

Motion [Kris/Lane]: To form a committee of 7 members from the General Faculty – 3 from the College and 4 from the professional schools (1 each) to discuss the feasibility of a post-tenure review system as stated in the 2015-16 MOU.

Motion passed unanimously.

AC Minutes from 10/5/15- Excerpt

Election of members to committee to discuss Post-Tenure Review

Smith, Wheeler, and Yoo elected by acclamation
Dennin, Keenan, Yarrington, and Scheraga elected on the first ballot

Rakowitz notes that the official charge uses the language approved by the General Faculty and asks what instructions she should give to the committee: Do we want them to have formal consultation with FSC, R&T, and FDEC? Are there any other instructions we want to give to the committee?

Lane says they have a charge but we should give them a date: On or before the first Monday of next semester. Boquet agrees. Crawford suggests that we could let them know that we think there should be consultation and that they should work collaboratively with whomever they need to. Strauss and Rakowitz suggest a memo plus attached minutes. Klug notes overlap between Academic Council members and committee membership, so those faculty can convey the sense of the Council. Rakowitz adds that some faculty have requested public hearings and that any proposal will have to come through this body, with discussion of whether it should go to General Faculty. The current merit guidelines did go through General Faculty.

Smith asks about the purpose, especially since the post-tenure review system will presumably not cover anyone who is untenured. Babington agrees it makes no sense and suggests that the group could come back to this body with recommendations. Epstein says there are vagaries in the language. Boquet states that the committee is constrained by the language of the charge to the adjective “post-tenure.” Babington hopes that the discussion could include recommendations for a single system. Klug says the post-tenure review seems separate from the merit process because post-tenure faculty currently are reviewed through the merit system. Discussion ensues regarding the expectations for pre-tenure faculty in relation to merit.

Crawford says that we have a post-tenure review process and the only thing that confounds it is the false promise of some kind of extra money. There is no way to squeeze the long-term arc of an academic career into an annual review. Rusu observes this might not necessarily be an annual review. Boquet hopes that the committee will look at post-tenure review processes at a number of different institutions and also consider how they differ from processes for pre-tenure faculty. She reaffirms the expectation that the committee will adhere to the post-tenure language of the charge. Strauss says that the charge represents the voice of the General Faculty and the history of the Faculty Salary Committee conversations that resulted in this specific language.

Motion: Lane moves that the committee we have just elected be asked to do the work as described in the Memo of Understanding and report back to the Academic Council on the status of their work on or before the first Academic Council meeting of the spring semester; Kris seconds. Unanimous in favor.

AC Minutes from 2/1/16- Excerpt

Subcommittee discussing post-tenure review

Prof. Yarrington spoke for the subcommittee. She briefly summarized the report of the subcommittee, including the recommendations that there be an annual review for all full-time faculty members, and also a periodic post-tenure review process that will not be tied to compensation considerations.

Prof. Preli asked if there would still be merit review. Provost Babington said that there would still be merit review in some form, likely its current form, but it would just be a baseline review for all faculty to review an annual salary increase. That is, faculty would not simply be granted automatically any salary increase agreed to through collegial discussions with the administration. Prof. Preli responded that there was a time, before merit review, when faculty did automatically receive salary increases. Provost Babington said that there will be a review for standard merit, according to the plans established by the individual schools. There will also be post tenure review, separate from compensation decisions. Prof. Yarrington said that the subcommittee is looking at some schools where post-tenure faculty go through some kind of review for developmental purposes. This is ideally not an onerous process, but rather a 3-5 year review with the appropriate dean. It is an opportunity for mentoring.

Prof. Bhattacharya asked for clarification that there would be annual review and also a 3-5 year review. Prof. Yarrington explained that the two processes would be decoupled. Prof. Bhattacharya asked about “additional merit.” Prof. Rakowitz explained that since functionally there has never been funding above standard merit, the annual review will only be to confirm that the standards for sustained merit have been met. It would be totally separate from a 3-5 year, post-tenure review process.

Prof. Steffen asked if those categories exempted from the merit review process (untenured faculty) will continue to be exempted, and Provost Babington confirmed that they would. Prof. Steffen then asked what the purpose of this second step was for faculty. Provost Babington said that the rationale of post-tenure review is for feedback and professional development. In theory, it could be tied to compensation, but that is not what is being proposed by the subcommittee. But some funding, for instance for research, could be connected to post-tenure review.

Prof. Boquet said that it seemed as if a lot of this process locates around meetings with the appropriate dean, whereas at other institutions this is not necessarily the case. She said that she is all for meeting with the Dean, but for the formal process it is not necessary. She asked, therefore, what the incentive structure was for faculty, and what is it that we are trying to accomplish with this process. Prof. Yarrington said that the subcommittee discussed the possible burden to the Dean of CAS. Staggering the periods of review for faculty would allow the Dean not to feel overburdened. Provost Babington noted that the subcommittee did what it was tasked to do - recommend a process, not develop the implementation plan.

Prof. Lane asked if the subcommittee was looking for approval of the language in the report. Provost Babington said that at this point the subcommittee was just looking for feedback. They have presented draft language, because the subcommittee was charged to report back to the Academic Council in February.

Dean Hannafin commented that GSEAP is smaller and does annual review, but not necessarily in meetings. Would this proposal require that the Dean of GSEAP meet face-to-face for post-tenure reviews? Prof. Yarrington responded in the affirmative: this was considered important by the subcommittee.

Prof. Preli said that her concern was with the onerous nature of merit review process. If we still have to do yearly reviews, and if we also have to do an additional level of review, she doesn't see the advantage to the faculty. Provost Babington said that there are a wide range of possible models; the one proposed is not the least or the most onerous. Prof. Yarrington noted that the merit review process in CAS is not terribly onerous.

Prof. Rakowitz expressed concern about leaving the entire process to the individual schools at the level of merit. She noted that we had agreed that standard merit was to be uniform across schools, and that the CAS process with three statements of 250-words maximum was actually what's in the Journal of Record for all schools. If the merit review processes in some schools are especially onerous, or if they added hurdles to standard merit, those are problems.

Prof. Crawford said that he saw nothing wrong with annual review, and that he did not consider the CAS process onerous. He would argue for a 5-year review rather than 3-year, given the long gestation period of some academic projects.

Prof. Klug asked if this model eliminated additional merit, and was met with a chorus of yeses. She then asked whether the post-tenure review would be optional, and Provost Babington said that it would be required; this would be in exchange for the elimination of additional merit.

Prof. Bhattacharya said that her department meets as a group to discuss merit. Provost Babington reiterated that merit processes would be left to the schools.

Prof. Strauss suggested that the first part of the draft report should be made more clear to indicate that the first recommendation is referring to the current merit system. She also asked if there would be a prescribed model for review for all schools. Prof. Yarrington and Provost Babington said that that question will be determined once an implementation plan is developed. The committee will be sending this to the General Faculty for feedback on a website and then bring it back to the Academic Council.

Prof. McDermott asked whether there might not be value in keeping open the possibility of additional merit in the future, adding that he thought the post-tenure review model is a very good response to Board of Trustee concerns because it was linked to AAUP standards.

Prof. Boquet asked if there had been discussion of when post-tenure begins; that is, should it only start with the achievement of the rank of Full Professor. Provost Babington said that that had not been discussed yet. Prof. Yarrington said that she was assuming that it would apply to all post-tenure ranks, and that she thought it would be beneficial to all faculty members. Prof. Crawford agreed that evaluation at the Associate as well as Full level would be beneficial. Prof. Boquet said that there should also be discussions about the goal and means of shepherding faculty from the Associate to the Full rank.

AC Minutes from 4/4/16- Excerpt

Post tenure review subcommittee report.

Prof. Smith noted that the committee met and discussed feedback from faculty. They tried to include, where possible, rationale for language to be considered. Professor Yarrington notes that they carefully reviewed the document with consideration of the word “merit”. There was a discussion of the reasoning regarding the types of broader and deeper conversations that faculty might have with their Deans at the time of annual evaluation. The document aims to clarify language, and still have a review system which addresses the needs of Associate and Full professors. Prof. Rakowitz asked about the inclusion of the terminology for calendar year instead of an academic year. She asked clarification about the reference to the word “minimum” as it modifies the term “5 years”. Prof. Rakowitz notes that this language is confusing throughout the document. Prof. Smith clarified that the word should be a “maximum” of five years for Full professors and “3 years” for Associate professors. There was also a question about the need to sit down with a Dean instead of a Department Chair. Prof. Smith explained a scenario in which a full professor, with potential subpar teaching may be sitting down with a Chair, who may hold a lower rank. As a result, the conversation may be difficult. This is the rationale for having faculty sit down with the Dean. Prof. Yarrington noted that Chairs are typically most focused on faculty coming up for tenure.

Prof. Boquet noted that in her department there are very few untenured faculty members. Therefore, the annual evaluation is an important time to think about mentoring faculty at the Associate and Full Professor levels. She noted that she is worried about ceding what should be departmental concerns to Deans. In addition, she feels that it is concerning that Department Chairs could feel unable to have difficult conversations with professors who outrank them. Prof. Boquet is concerned about moving these conversations from the faculty level to the administrator level. Professor Yarrington notes that nothing in this document removes the ability of Chairs from being able to have these conversations, this simply adds another level of review.

Prof. Preli notes that she is concerned that there is an underlying message that Professors need to continue to prove they are worthy of tenure, “If we are continually needing to make the case that faculty are doing their jobs in order to get their pay, it sends the message that tenure is no longer tenure”. If a senior faculty member gets to a point where their teaching is no longer sufficient, why would this conversation not already have happened? Prof. Preli asked, “What is the consequence if

a faculty member elects not to participate in this process?” In addition, Prof. Preli noted that she objects to the use of the language “all the ways faculty may be deficient” – this clarification should be a side note, not part of a formal document.

Prof. Klug asked about a situation in which a timeline is set between a Dean and a faculty member: What if the timeline is not met? What is the consequence? Prof. Klug noted that in her experience, she was not sure that this would necessarily motivate a change in behavior. She noted that there are already numerous opportunities for a faculty member to seek help with their teaching.

Prof. Downie asked if there was a timeline for the development of these guidelines. In addition, he thanked the committee for their hard work on their document. He noted that this is something that is necessary to address.

Prof. Strauss noted that the language “we agreed to”, is that we needed to have a conversation, not necessarily agree to a plan. Prof. Downie noted that we would not want to rush into any language.

Dean Kazer wanted to point out that there are schools on campus that do not have Department Chairs, so by including references to Department Chairs, some schools will be excluded from the process. She notes that each school may need to come up with an individual process which meets their own needs.

Prof. Behre noted that tenure is not about job security, it is about the ability to maintain intellectual integrity. This document seems to cement the fallacy that this is about job security.

Prof. Epstein argued that tenure is about academic freedom by way of job security. This document is trying to separate out something like tenure from performance assessment. He notes that this is something that may be a job requirement, like graduation. The point of this, is to separate out performance assessment from the process of pay and tenure. Prof. Yarrington asked Prof. Epstein if his comments were in support of the document. Prof. Epstein agreed, he is in support of the document.

Prof. Downie wanted to make sure that the language is clear that this is not a process that can be used to remove jobs from the University. Prof. Downie noted that this is a tool of professional development apart from other processes.

Dean Williams argued that he feels qualified to evaluate teaching in his own academic area. He can assess, “Are faculty going to the conferences in their areas? Are they integrating the latest scholarship?” He noted that this should be a formative assessment.

Prof. Smith noted that this process ties into the mission of the University. This should be a formative assessment aimed at faculty development. In any organization you would hope that faculty would seek out guidance and reflect on their professional development. She noted that it was never thought of as being anything other than opportunity for development.

Prof. Yarrington noted that it was being looked at in a positive light. They looked at the AAUP language and other documents to incorporate best practices to strive for academic excellence. Prof. Klug notes that one of the positive aspects of this process is separating the merit system from professional development. However, both in this document as well as in the journal of record, those two things are still linked.

Prof. Epstein noted that the aim is for a decoupling of these two ideas. This is what this document hopefully achieves.

Prof. Steffen noted that this process is meant to be formative. He asked, “Does this reasonably end the current merit system? If so, does it replace it with something worse?”. We need to decide if this will put us in a better position in terms of a formative evaluation and in merit. Under Appendix 12,

point 3c., he suggested the removal of the words “a bit” from the sentence. The language should simply use the word “stalled”.

Prof. Boquet asked if the committee discussed the use of something like elected bodies, or faculty bodies rather than relying on the structure of a Dean. Prof. Smith noted that they did discuss other possibilities. The committee decided early in the discussion that that might lead to a substantially more complicated process.

Prof. Crawford noted that generally speaking, he is somewhat ambivalent about the proposal. He notes that although he would engage in the process, there may be others that might not participate. He asked to clarify what might happen in that situation.

Prof. Preli read a section of the preamble to the AAUP policy in contradiction, noting that she does not believe that a formal process needs to be in place. These discussions can occur outside of a formal process. Prof. Preli noted that she would be happy to engage in these conversations, however she does not believe that the direction that this is going happens to be in support of a formative process.

Prof. Lane noted that he believes that Deans should be meeting with their faculty members, as per protocol. It would be better to put as little as possible in writing and take out negative language. He notes that he believes this document should go to faculty for more feedback and consideration.

Concerns were noted about the negative language in the document, noting that it is hard to believe that if someone is not fulfilling their contract that they would not be removed.

Prof. McDermott stated that it should be kept in the realm of development, take out deficiencies and use language of continuing excellence.

Prof. Yarrington says that there is not a process in place for formative evaluation. Prof. Bhattacharya noted that big companies are getting away from this type of performance appraisal process because it not productive. Prof. Weiss noted that this is a “good document” in response to the conversations we had last year. Prof. Strauss asked for the will of the faculty in terms of moving forward with the document.

Motion (Rakowitz/Epstein): The council recognizes the work of the committee in addressing their charge and suggests that the council send specific feedback on the language to the committee.

Prof. Rakowitz says that she feels that this is better than the current merit system. She noted that she would like some changes in some of the language. While she is aware that the committee has gone through several rounds of revisions, she noted that this may be the first opportunity that we are looking at specific feedback on language.

Prof. Smith noted that in the event that it is not possible to get all of the feedback quickly, she reviewed the timeline of what needs to happen to have this happen this year. If this is not approved, it may not be ready for the General Faculty to approve at the next faculty meeting.

Prof. Strauss noted that the minutes of these meetings are all public record which demonstrate robust discussion on this issue. Prof. Epstein noted that the language we had agreed to is that there would be a discussion, and it seems that we have met that requirement. Prof. Strauss notes that the charge of the committee is verbatim from the language of the MOU. Prof. Rakowitz noted that the language may need to be updated to go to the FSC, as well as the General Faculty.

Motion passed unanimously.

AC Minutes from 5/2/16- Excerpt

Post-tenure review subcommittee

Prof. Smith introduced Prof. Dennin as a guest. Prof. Smith received written feedback from 5 faculty on the previous draft of post-tenure review proposal. This written feedback and oral feedback received at last AC meeting were incorporated into current version of proposal. The subcommittee met again since last AC meeting and had a conference call to agree on revisions to the proposal. Highlights of revisions are (1) clarification of time intervals (2) deleted examples as inappropriate, and, (3) clarified meetings to be held with the respective Dean. In general, the proposal is not aimed at “accountability” but is intended as “formative.” The post-tenure review proposal is to replace the existing process for “extraordinary merit.”

Prof. Dennin offered that while the proposal is “not perfect” that it does accomplish the end of extraordinary merit which he views as a “huge plus” and the proposal is clearly not a reevaluation of tenure.

Prof. Smith offered that page 12 (Recommendation 1.) of the proposal should read “past academic year” not “past year” as to be distinct from calendar year.

Prof. Weiss offered it is a “great document.” Wanted wording to make clear annual “review” was a “salary review.”

Prof. Boquet wished to highlight the faculty role in the process. Wondered if last sentence on page 14 of proposal was new?

AVP Babington answered no. That sentence was carried over from original document.

Prof. Boquet asked what other schools are doing this? What type of schools? How about AJCU schools specifically? She noted post-tenure review processes are more common in mid-sized to large public university systems; they are rare at private institutions --post-tenure review processes are not as common at private universities, and I'm not sure how common they are at our peer institutions --we should not confuse the support for and interest in mid-career and faculty mentoring with a post-tenure review system --this proposal does not describe anything that does not already fall within the purview of academic deans. It does not provide a process, it does not provide for substantial faculty input in the process (not simply the development of a process) at any point.

AVP Babington responded they reviewed many other schools including Case Western, University of San Francisco, and Seattle University to name but a few.

Prof. Klug stated that the annual review and post-tenure review processes should be separate and distinct in the Journal of Record as is the pre-tenure review process.

Motion to postpone a vote on the post-tenure review proposal until the first fall 2016 meeting of the Academic Council (Boquet/Lane).

Prof. Boquet offers 2 reasons for the motion. First, mentoring is an articulated strategic goal of Fairfield 2020. I expect that various task forces and committees are in discussions about how to improve mentoring for all faculty and staff, including mid- and late-career faculty. Those groups should be free to begin developing proposals that meet the needs of faculty, staff, and administrators in this regard. It seems premature to forestall the work on this priority of Fairfield 2020 with a vote on a post-tenure review process. Second, the request to discuss a post-tenure review process came forward from the administration's salary team last year and the faculty have considered the idea in earnest this year. We have more than met the spirit of the agreement. With thanks to this committee,

the Academic Council should recognize the ongoing work of this year's Faculty Salary Committee, who are currently deep in discussions with the administration to reach agreement on salary and benefits. With no rush to vote on this process, we should withhold from a decision on this proposal until a successful conclusion to this year's contract discussions have been reached.

Prof Preli speaks strongly in favor of the motion. Difficult salary negotiations are ongoing. This is part of the salary/benefits discussion. Let's see how this year falls out. Expressed concern that this could threaten tenure. Why does this have to replace extraordinary merit?

Prof. Crawford likes the proposal in that it gets rid of extraordinary merit. The document is not likely to be supported by the administration. Opposed to giving administration anything at this time.

Motion to allow Prof Dennin to speak (Lane/ Preli).

Motion passed unanimously.

Prof. Dennin does not see this as a mentoring process but rather as a way to get rid of extraordinary merit which is flawed. It is "huge plus" to get rid of extraordinary merit.

Prof. Rakowitz speaks strongly in favor of the motion. Shares concerns related to "limited trust."

Dean Hannafin has heard no talk of anti-tenure in the administration. He is a strong supporter of tenure.

Prof. Behre speaks in favor of the motion. She recognizes the hard work of the sub-committee. Concerned that post-tenure review process will increase workload for faculty without commensurate benefit. Concerned that proposal is open-ended if faculty member does not meet the plan. Needs more time to study the proposal.

Prof. Kris speaks against the motion. Similar process in School of Nursing works well as a formative process.

Prof. Epstein suggests that if postponed that we consider adoption of wording and sentiment related to "reflection." View this as an institutional opportunity for faculty reflection. Positive that this is separate from compensation.

Prof. Behre reiterated her concerns about increasing faculty workload.

Prof. Rakowitz noted that this proposal would require the dean to have about 30 meetings with individual faculty a year in CAS alone.

Prof. Dennin suggests a change of title from "post-tenure review" since it is not a review.

Prof. Crawford states it is a problem with the timing not the document.

AVP Babington stated the sub-committee efforts are a response to last year's MOU with no threat to tenure.

Motion to call the question (Lane/ Crawford).

Motion to call the question passes unanimously.

Motion: To postpone a vote on the post-tenure review proposal until the first fall 2016 meeting of the Academic Council.

Motion passed 12-1 with 3 abstentions.

AC Minutes from 9/12/16- Excerpt

Post-tenure review report, postponed on May 2 to September

Prof. Yarrington started by providing a general background about the current proposal for a post-tenure review system, and the discussions that took place over the summer.

Prof. Smith summarized the proposed plan in its two parts including the post-tenure review that involves regular meetings with the administration's academic representative.

Prof. Wheeler indicated the potential additional workload that may come out of the proposed policy on both the faculty members and the deans' offices.

There was some discussion about whether the proposal clearly indicates that it addresses the past "academic" year, how it relates to mentoring, and whether distinctions should be drawn between financial and non-financial resources.

GFS Rakowitz mentioned that the language going to the JOR cannot leave it up to the individual schools to come up with their own implementation system for the proposed policy.

Prof. Downie asked about the regularity of conducting these post-tenure reviews for professor and associate professor ranks.

Prof. Staecker also suggested to clarify the language regarding the regularity of conducting the reviews: "at a maximum of every 5 years", or "at least every 5 years", or "no longer than 5 years".

Prof. Boquet indicated that we may need to move from the "feasibility" phase to the "implementation" question.

SVPAABabington mentioned that we had good discussion about this proposal so far and it may be time to speed its approval and send it to the next step.

Dean Williams asked why this proposal was tabled last meeting.

Prof. Boquet mentioned there are concerns about the lack of faculty input into the process. The process was initiated by the BOT as part of the final resolution of the salary negotiations last year.

Prof. Steffen mentioned we need to decide if the proposed policy as presented is better than the system we currently have before we can move forward.

Prof. Wheeler argued that the proposal is a general structure that we think is better than what we currently have and schools can adapt it to fit their individual needs.

Prof. Boquet argued that this will be new to all schools and it should be consistent across schools. The mentoring piece of the proposed policy should be supported.

Prof. Yarrington mentioned that we have been working as a committee with faculty for their input for over a year now. For the proposed language, we will have to decide on the exact language including the positive mentoring aspect that might come out of it.

Prof. Lane asked what language needs clarification for us to move forward. He referred to appendix 12 on page 24 of the meeting materials.

Steffen/Babington moved to approve the proposed policy language as presented

Discussion of the Motion:

Prof. Staecker asked about the effect of the proposed review on the annual salary. It doesn't seem to affect the eligibility for the annual salary increase.

GFS Rakowitz suggested that the proposed policy may start with no effect on or connection to salary increase. However, it may end up actually affecting salary increases in the future. That may be the first step down that road. Now that the administration explicitly agrees with the faculty that the merit system is bad, they shouldn't be using it as leverage to get us to accept post-tenure review. If it's bad, we should get rid of it, independent of post-tenure review.

Prof. Wheeler noted that we have an appeal system that can always be utilized.

Dean Kazer indicated that the proposed policy has no HR consequences.

Lane/Babington moved to call the question. The vote was 5-7-1 and the motion failed. Prof. Ebrahim asked if the proposed policy has no financial or HR consequences, why we believe it will be an effective tool for mentoring and faculty development.

Prof. SVPAA Babington mentioned that the main goal of the proposed policy is to support faculty development. Profs. Yarrington, Wheeler, and Weiss confirmed that the main goal is to help faculty “stay on track”.

Prof. Staecker raised his concern that the process may be affected by the personal relation between faculty member and school dean, and it may develop some unconstructive culture. We may need to look at examples from other institutions.

Prof. Wheeler mentioned that there are always exceptions, but the process will “carry itself”. The process in general may encourage faculty to channel their energy in a positive direction.

Prof. Boquet argued that we cannot sacrifice the process for simplicity. Some protections may need to be added to the process especially with the fact that it will survive after us to new faculty members and deans.

Dean Williams wondered if there is any discussion or language about these protections like an appeal process or others.

Prof. Yarrington mentioned that the committee looked at ideas for protection or appeals. The proposed policy can be a starting point for positive changes in the University.

Dean Williams mentioned that, in general, it is always good and needed to have a model for post-tenure oversight in both the areas of research and teaching. Any proposed policy for a faculty development model could be a good “point of intervention” for tenured faculty who are not meeting their responsibilities.

Prof. Downie indicated that if our motion is approved, it is to bring the proposed policy before the general faculty. We don’t have a final approval.

GFS Rakowitz confirmed that whatever policy the AC votes on should go before the general faculty. Even if the proposed policy is rejected by the AC, Rakowitz will include it in the general faculty agenda for consideration.

Prof. Downie mentioned that it will be different if the proposed policy is presented to the GF meeting with the AC approval or without it.

Prof. Steffen had to leave the meeting and gave Downie his proxy. GFS Rakowitz mentioned that proxies are not allowed in committee meetings.

Downie/Lane called the question. The motion to call the question passed (10-2-0)

The motion to approve post-tenure review passed (6-4-2).