

Villanova University Faculty Congress

Academic Year 2016-2018

FACULTY CONGRESS MEETING

September 21, 2016

**Present**: Aronte Bennett, Sheryl Bowen, Joseph Betz, Sohail Chaudhry, Jerusha Conner, Alice Dailey, Angela DiBenedetto, Rick Eckstein, Edward Fierros, David Fiorenza, Ruth Gordon, Marylu Hill, Shelly Howton, Stephanie Katz, Jeremy Kees, Christopher Kilby, Rory Kramer, Michael Levitan, Eric Lomazoff, Peggy Lyons, Joseph Micucci, James Peyton-Jones, Michael Posner, Jennifer Ross, Kelly Welch, Catherine Warrick, Dennis Wykoff, Tina Yang.

**Absent:** Sherry Burrell, Danai Chasaki (NIA), Gordon Coonfield, Mirela Damian (NIA), Jennifer Dixon (NIA), Diane Ellis, Mike McGoldrick, Olukunle Owolabi (NIA), Alan Pichanick (NIA), Salvatore Poeta, Rees Rankin, Quinetta Roberson, Joseph Schick, Mark Wilson (NIA), Rosalind Wynne.

**Other Guests:** University Staff Council (Emily Irving and Kimberly Reilly) and Student Government Association (John Puszcz and Robert Roenitz)

The meeting convened at 3PM in Rm. 300, Saint Augustine Center.

**Housekeeping**

1. Jerusha Connor introduced the invited guests from University Staff Council.
2. Introductions of Faculty Congress members present.
3. Minutes from the April 29, 2016 re-organization meeting were approved with one correction. There was one abstention.

**Standing Committee Reports:**

1. Academic Policy Committee (APC; Christopher Kilby, chair).

 APC has met twice thus far, and in that time, they have approved the revision of the University class attendance policy, and they have formed new sub-committees to address the following items this academic year:

* University core curriculum (chair: Marylu Hill)
* On-line CATS evaluation (chair: Michael Posner)
* Honors Program review (chair: Dennis Wykoff)
* Academic Integrity Violation Procedures (chair: Andrea Welker)

In addition, APC will also explore concerns about the impact of the new R3 designation on tenure standards, specifically concerns about changing research expectations and the possible impact on teaching expectations and tenure track faculty workloads.

A short discussion ensued about why there were concerns about the Honors Program. It was noted that questions had been raised by CLAS and VSB faulty concerning several issues, including the designation of courses as Honors in other departments; regular courses counted as Honors with additional work; and the implementation of the senior thesis.

The Academic Integrity Subcommittee of APC announced that they will be gathering data regarding the current AI procedures. Faculty who have had adverse experiences with the AI procedure should email Eric Lomazoff, at eric.lamazoff@villanova.edu.

1. Adjunct Faculty Representatives (Mike McGoldrick and Joe Micucci). Joe Micucci reported that the adjunct faculty will be meeting soon. They will address the evaluation process for adjunct faculty, including concerns about the quality of education. In addition, an article on labor unions, adjuncts, and Catholic universities was brought to the attention of FC, and members were encouraged to read it.
2. CNT/FTNTT Faculty Representatives (Stephanie Katz and Alan Pichanick)

Stephanie Katz reported that they were reaching out to the CNTTF constituency (which includes approximately 200 faculty.

1. Elections and Credentials Committee (Bob Styer, chair)

On behalf of the Elections and Credentials Committee chair, it was noted that elections are now open for three seats on the University Rank and Tenure Committee: the Engineering seat, the VSB Seat and the Undesignated Seat. All tenured or tenure track faculty members in A&S, Engineering, Nursing, or VSB may vote, and should vote for each of the three open seats. The election will close on October 7, 2016. To vote, faculty should go to:[https://webappvip.villanova.edu/vvs/vote/univranktenure/election](https://webaccess.villanova.edu/owa/redir.aspx?SURL=Mo5eZPh025jLn-DMtmde-Nu4AnvqDlpgJUdHnevwibHeiwvGyOzTCGgAdAB0AHAAcwA6AC8ALwB3AGUAYgBhAHAAcAB2AGkAcAAuAHYAaQBsAGwAYQBuAG8AdgBhAC4AZQBkAHUALwB2AHYAcwAvAHYAbwB0AGUALwB1AG4AaQB2AHIAYQBuAGsAdABlAG4AdQByAGUALwBlAGwAZQBjAHQAaQBvAG4A&URL=https%3a%2f%2fwebappvip.villanova.edu%2fvvs%2fvote%2funivranktenure%2felection" \t "_blank)

1. Faculty Athletics Representative (Jeremy Kees)

The Faculty Athletics Representative reported on the status of the pilot program for early registration for athletes.  The pilot is set to begin in spring 2017.  The rationale is that student athletes (approximately 10% of the undergraduate population) frequently find that they are shut out of classes due to practice schedules and games, with the result that they often cannot pursue the majors that they want. It was noted that the student athletes have unique needs due to NCAA rules, along with the amount of time they must give to their sport which reduces flexibility in scheduling and allows only a small window for course availability. The only recourse at present for student athletes facing limited course choices and closed courses is to request a course override from department chairs and faculty, with the result of potentially over-crowded courses.

It was noted that the College of Nursing already has an early registration model set up for student athletes. It was further noted that within the athlete population there are under-represented groups in terms of diversity concerns.

 This announcement generated a great deal of discussion and concern among Faculty Congress members. There was concern that this will shut out other students for registration (non-athletes). Other questions included: how many students have to access overrides (approximately 70% of student athletes); how many are not on scholarship (60%); the distinction between required and elective courses for priority registration; whether better advising might solve the problem rather than priority registration; and finally whether the pilot is for all student athletes or a small sample (it will be for all 590 athletes with the argument that it is not fair to privilege certain athletes). There was further discussion about the “downstream” impact on other students, and about how overrides work. It was noted that overrides increase class size and increase faculty labor without compensation.

The conversation concluded with the note that faculty were not initially invited to weigh in on the priority registration issue since it was viewed as a Registrar issue. The FC is eager to be involved with the governance of this pilot.

1. Faculty Rights & Responsibilities Committee (FRRC; Alice Dailey, chair)

The FRRC is working on the following items:

• At the request of the Provost, the FRRC is examining the protocol for creating selection committees for academic deans in order to create more diverse selection committees.

• Faculty grievance protocols (since the former grievance protocols relied on University Senate which no longer exists).

• Revisiting policies preventing FTNTT faculty from voting for their department chairs. The Middle States report raised a significant concern about this form of exclusion of FTNTT faculty.

• Faculty salary and summer teaching. New policies regarding pro-rated salaries and the lack of contracts for summer courses are in violation of the faculty handbook.

• New faculty orientation and the start of faculty contracts: orientation takes place before the start of contracts, and a concern was raised regarding requiring these faculty to be on campus with no pay or benefits. The FRRC is working with the Provost to adjust contract dates or explore other solutions.

• FTNTT promotion process and standards

• Research support and policy

Clarification was requested concerning the Deans’ search committee concern. The Provost was concerned that recent search committees have been consistently lacking in diversity, with a preponderance of white male professors, and the Provost urged FRRC to help in creating a protocol that will encourage more diverse committees.

1. Retired faculty members (Joe Betz). On behalf of retired faculty, Joe Betz shared an article by Gerald J. Beyer entitled "Labor Unions, Adjuncts, and the Mission and Identity of Catholic Universities"  Horizons 42, pp. 1-37, College Theology Society, 2015 ( [http://journals.cambridge.org](https://webaccess.villanova.edu/owa/redir.aspx?SURL=ZPUFk6xWxdSCgOdWXfW92RJ4FmZ7a-rgAUoOLGY7BK1ZRxmqPvHTCGgAdAB0AHAAOgAvAC8AagBvAHUAcgBuAGEAbABzAC4AYwBhAG0AYgByAGkAZABnAGUALgBvAHIAZwA.&URL=http%3a%2f%2fjournals.cambridge.org)). He also shared information about security issues and university monitoring of threats on university computers. He noted that the Augustinians were working on re-settling a refugee family. Finally, he noted that the Quarterly Club of retired professors was sponsoring a mass for deceased faculty.

**Ad-Hoc Committee or Liaison Reports**

1. *American Association of University Professors* (Michael Levitan, campus chapter president). Michael Levitan reported on his attendance at the AAUP Summer Institute at Portland State University, 7/21 – 7/24. He shared with the FC the following reports:

* **Academic Freedom in the Classroom**

This was a discussion concerning the potential impact of trigger warnings, intellectual property, recording lectures, posting material on public websites, etc. It was an expanded presentation of material found at: <https://www.aaup.org/article/copyright-academics-digital-age#.V9wV8LWrcwQ>

<https://www.aaup.org/issues/copyright-distance-education-intellectual-property/resources-copyright-distance-education-and/intellectual-property-issues-faculty>

<https://www.aaup.org/report/academic-freedom-and-electronic-communications-2014>

* **The History, Uses and Abuses of Title IX**

This was an expanded presentation of material found at: <https://www.aaup.org/report/history-uses-and-abuses-title-ix>

* **Crash Course in Institutional Financial Analysis**

This was a discussion and presentation of a source of university data found at <https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/datacenter/>

Other items in the news:

M.I.T., N.Y.U. and Yale Are Sued Over Retirement Plan Fees.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/10/your-money/mit-nyu-yale-sued-4013b-retirement-plan-fees-tiaa-fidelity.html?_r=0>

Finally, he shared a link to an article on why the business model does not fit the university model:

[**https://www.aaup.org/article/how-many-ways-must-we-say-it#.V\_VDTo8rLIV**](https://www.aaup.org/article/how-many-ways-must-we-say-it#.V_VDTo8rLIV)

**2.** Police Oversight Committee (Tim Horner, Crystal Lucky, Catherine Warrick). Catherine Warrick reported that the committee had met with the assumption of providing oversight; however the committee is not adjudicating complaints. Thus the committee is still sort out its role as Public Safety implements a police presence on campus. She noted that the committee needs to hear about the experiences people are having on campus regarding the police, and she asked that any comments or experiences be sent to oversightcommittee@villanova.edu. A question was raised as to confidentiality, and she noted that the email was not officially confidential, although the committee would treat all information as confidential. Discussion ensued about the possibility of forums where the police officers could be introduced to people on campus, and whether programming could be held in the residence halls or other forums for students to connect with the police. The committee is considering all of these possibilities. They are also exploring non-intervention models.

**Board of Trustee Committee Reports**

No reports at this meeting.

**Old Business:**

1. Awards

The Awards Committee will review and re-envision the awards selection process. In addition to the existing awards, there are now three additional awards. The full list of awards is:

* The Facultas Award
* The Pohlhaus-Stracciolini Award for Teaching Excellence
* The Faculty Award for Innovative Teaching
* The Outstanding Faculty Mentor Teaching Award
* The Junior Faculty Award for Excellence in Teaching
* The Gallen Award
* The Academic Leadership Award (new)
* The Student Engagement Award (new)
* The Mid-Career Service Award (new)

David Fiorenza has agreed to chair the committee to re-envision the awards selection process. Several questions were raised about the process including the possibility of inviting former award winners to serve on the committee, and including on the committee departments that are currently under-represented in these awards.

**New Business:**

1. Needs assessment

In response to the Provost’s ongoing needs assessment, the Faculty Congress solicited suggestions from faculty across the university. Sixteen needs were identified and shared at the meeting. These needs included:

* Reduced course load for research active faculty
* Enhanced library resources
* Higher salaries that are competitive with peer institutions
* Compensation (monetary or course release) for unpaid labor (independent studies, thesis supervision, grad programs directors with fewer than 60, service, etc.)
* Support for membership dues for main professional organizations
* Individual research budgets that aren’t linked to conference travel or professional development
* Functional classrooms/classroom renovations
* Office space, research space, collaborative space for faculty
* More permanent full time teaching lines, including tenure track, (to counteract trend of adjunct reliance)
* Secretarial support for some depts.
* Need to identify emerging research areas and invest in them
* Need more powerful voice in decision making
* Need more say in forming and approving research policies
* Need strong faculty input into new strategic plan

FC members discussed how to prioritize these perceived needs. This discussion included a distinction between needs versus wants, and the importance of strategic prioritizing; the emphasis was on the things that faculty need to do their jobs. It was noted that with the move to R3, there will be some expectation of stepping up research activity. The question was raised as to whether the vision will be matched by action, and whether the Administration has the political will to act.

Discussion ensued regarding course loads; it was noted that reducing the course loads of some faculty impacts others, including the necessity of hiring more adjuncts and CNTTF. There are also compensation issues, including the unpaid labor associated with service. It was also suggested that the University hire more tenure-track faculty to keep these faculty in the classroom and still give them a 2/2 load. It was recognized that it is a critical balance to help faculty be research-active while still keeping tenure-track and tenured faculty in the classroom.

The motion was made and approved to move ahead with a letter to the Provost to start the conversation.

2. The FC reviewed the University Council proposal intended to replace the former University Senate. The stated purpose of the proposed University Council is “to advance dialogue and decision-making for the betterment of Villanova University.” The proposed Council will

* + meet with the President once a semester to discuss matters of mutual interest
	+ discuss university policy or action
	+ make recommendations to the President
	+ In conjunction with the President and Executive Council, participate in a bi-annual Community Forum

The FC reviewed the proposal and raised several concerns and suggestions for revisions to the proposal. Specific concerns included a question about the size of the proposed council and whether it was too big to effectively schedule meetings. In addition, there was a perceived imbalance of students to faculty. A question was raised regarding the power of this council and whether it would have the power to vote on issues. Questions of transparency were also raised.

Other concerns includes including the following: 1) who defines the agenda? 2) is this a rubberstamp committee? 3) what should be the appropriate balance between students and faculty , undergraduates and graduates, and administrators and faculty? It was suggested that administrators should be completely eliminated from the Council.

The last part of the conversation centered on the various committees that would be part of the University Council. These committees were drawn from the original University Senate committees. Several questions were raised, including whether faculty on these committees should be drawn from Faculty Congress, or appointed, or whether the FCEC should solicit nominations. It was recommended that faculty be chosen to represent various constituencies, including Tenured, Tenure-track, FTNTT, and adjuncts. Further questions about these committees included whether they would be stand-along committees with by-laws and constitutions, whether administrators would be ex-officio, and whether these committees should be chaired by faculty. Finally, it was noted that there should be a faculty ombudsperson.

It was decided that a letter of response would be drafted and sent to Fr. President.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Submitted by Marylu Hill, Faculty Congress Secretary

October 5, 2016