FACULTY CONGRESS MEETING
MARCH 20, 2015


Absent: Wayne Bremser, Lillian Cassel, Diane Ellis (NIA), Frank Falcone, David Fiorenza, Judith Hadley, Paul Hanouna, Jeremy Kees (NIA), Julie Klein (NIA), Edward Kresch (NIA), Kenneth Kroos, Michael Levitan, Mi Luo, Wenhong Luo (on sabbatical), Susan Mackey-Kallis, Joseph Micucci, Michael Risch (NIA), Louise Russo (NIA), Nancy Sharts-Hopko Fayette Veverka, Joyce Willens, Miron Wolnicki

Other Guests: Kim Reilly (University Staff Council) Bob Styer (University Senate)

The meeting convened at 10AM.

Housekeeping
1. Approval of minutes from February 12, 2015. Motion was made to accept, with a typo pointed out; unanimously approved.

Old Business

REPORTS:
1. Standing Committees
   a. Academic Policy Committee (Russo): Louise Russo was not present but sent in the following report:

   The APC reviewed a portion of the results from the HERI survey which was completed in spring 2014. Jim Trainer and Kathy Nazar presented the data and highlighted a number of areas where trends were substantively different from the survey three years ago. Since that presentation the data summary has been posted on the VPAA website. The APC will complete a follow-up discussion at our upcoming meeting next week. Faculty are encouraged to look at the HERI report on the VPAA’s website and be in touch with Louise Russo with comments before March 27th APC meeting, and after that, be in touch with Seth Whidden with any comments. We will also begin a discussion of the role of and support of adjunct faculty at Villanova. This issue was raised by faculty and student representatives. Concern is based on the increasing dependence upon adjunct faculty to facilitate the curriculum and the lack of uniformity in adjunct faculty evaluation. The APC will draft a working
document with major discussion and investigation issues and will share that with COF. The plan will be to create a task force comprised of APC and COF members in addition to other stakeholders including students and adjunct faculty.

b. Adjunct Faculty Representative (Micucci/McColdrick): There is a social for the adjunct faculty on March 26th. Adjuncts at the law school have been invited for the first time!

c. Awards Committee: Thomas Way reported on the committee’s work on the Gallen Award. They presented a slate of two nominees, in order of preference. A motion was made to accept this slate, and forward it to Fr. Donohue. The motion was seconded, and passed without objection.

d. Committee on Faculty (Kulkarni). Craig Wheeland brought two recommendations to the committee. 1) The faculty handbook is not clear on when retiring faculty ought to inform their chair. This is important in order to give departments the ability to make plans for staffing. He suggested March 1st as a report date. The committee approved this. 2) The Academic Integrity Plan in the Faculty handbook is also unclear in that it says the Dean of the particular college is the final arbiter of academic integrity issues, yet the university has an academic integrity panel at the university level that resolves these matters. So, the Dean is not now the final arbiter. Language reflecting this was suggested and approved by the committee.

On another matter, CoF is looking at the selection of the chair of departments. The Faculty Handbook was written many years ago, and many procedures outlined there are left open to interpretation. For example, the distinction between “acceptable” candidate and “preferential” candidate is one area of ambiguity. Discussions on this are ongoing.

e. Elections and Credentials Committee. (Styer). (Rank & Tenure nominations will be called for at the end of April, beginning of May, with elections in early September.)

f. Employee Issues Committee (Conner): No updates to

g. Continuing Non-Tenured Track Faculty (Falcone and O’Neil): Robert met with some senior tenured faculty members who raised a number of questions with him about what the university offers in terms of retirement for continuing non-tenured track faculty. Perhaps this is something EIC can take a look at.

h. Retired Faculty Committee (Joe Betz): He asked the group to remember that kind of adjunct known as the “gypsy,” that these people’s rights are attended to. He also wondered if it might be useful for the faculty to let the Law School clinics know what languages they are proficient in as this could be a helpful resource to the clinics in their work.

Ad hoc committees

i. Task force on Carnegie reclassification (Daily, Eckstein) A draft report will be available for the April Congress meeting.

2. Reports from Faculty representatives to other committees (as necessary)

Committees that report to the University President

a. Facilities Committee (Lisa Rodriguez): See Appendix
b. Benefits (Lyn Silets): Fr. Donohue is seeking to reorganize this committee; more news in the future.

c. Retention Committee (Krista Mallot): See Appendix.

**Old Business**

3. Swearing and arming campus security officers. The only thing to report is that Fr. Donohue expects to bring the matter before the Board of Trustees at its April meeting.

4. 2013-14 HERI results: a report can be found at https://vsites.villanova.edu/vpaa/SitePages/Reports.aspx


6. College of Professional Studies: We have a new Dean of this new college: Deborah J. Tyksinski, PhD. We welcome her to our campus and wish her well in her efforts

7. Provost Search: Faculty are encouraged to watch the videos of the meeting between each candidate at representatives from the Faculty Congress. Faculty are also encourage to fill out the survey available for each candidate. As of the FC meeting, only the survey on the third candidate was still available. A faculty only meeting will take place after this Faculty Congress meeting to provide an opportunity for faculty response/reaction to the three candidates’ interviews. See Appendix for Nancy Sharts-Hopko’s report to the FCEC on February 20, 2015

8. Resolution on good practices for surveying faculty (Jerusha Conner, Michael Posner, Catherine Warrick, Kelly Welch) A resolution was presented for Congress review. Jim Trainer and Kathy Nazar of OPIR were helpful resources in arriving at the content of the resolution. A discussion ensued in which some minor editing was done to the resolution. A motion was made to pass the resolution as edited. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously. See the appendix for the full text.

9. Term limits for governance leadership (Seth Whidden). Seth presented proposed edits of the Faculty Congress by-laws to reflect a term limit on faculty chair, vice-chair and committee chair appointments. A discussion ensued centered around two perspectives on this issues. First, there is the value of a principle of rotation that might encourage more and more faculty to be involved in faculty governance. Second, not having term limits enables a person to develop a wisdom about the role of chair, a wisdom that time in service can bring. Faculty Congress members discussed these two principles. A motion was made to accept Seth’s proposed revisions. The motion was seconded and brought to a vote. The vote was 18 in favor (including three proxy votes), 5 opposed (including 1 proxy vote) and 0 abstentions. There was some question about what was needed as far as “yes” votes to amend the by-laws. Seth will consult the by-laws and determine if the motion passed.

10. 2015 faculty computer refresh (Seth Whidden). UNIT was responsive to faculty concerns about the specs for the MAC refresh. Many of those concerns were positively met, and so those faculty who need the more powerful machines will get them. Faculty Congress is working with UCIT and UNIT to be more involved in the refresh process well in advance of the decision about what machines to purchase for faculty.

**New Business**

11. Resolution on academic freedom (Faculty Congress Executive Committee) Seth presented the Congress with the draft of a resolution on academic freedom, to emphasize that the Faculty Congress strongly supports the capacity of faculty to determine the curricular
content of their classes and the character of their scholarship. Discussion ensued. The suggestion was made to see if the university has signed onto the AAUP’s statement on academic freedom before we move forward on a resolution like this. Seth will look into this for the next meeting.

12. Possible new governance structure involved Senate and Congress (Seth Whidden) Bob Styer, with input from Seth, has a proposal for a re-structuring of the Senate that will impact the Faculty Congress. Bob will send this out to Congress members for consideration at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30AM

Respectfully Submitted by
Mark Doorley, FC Secretary

Next Faculty Congress meeting: Monday, April 20, 2015, Noon- 1:30PM, SAC 300.

APPENDIX (Committee Reports)

Facilities Committee (Lis Rodriguez)

- Preliminary approval has been granted by Radnor Township for the West End Zone Athletic Building that will replace and upgrade the current Butler Annex. The building will primarily house new facilities (locker rooms, work out spaces) for the Football program, but additional renovations and movement of other sports teams will occur as football is relocated. In particular, women’s programs will see a comparable improvement in their facilities. 77% of the cost of this construction has been received through pledges.

- Details of the Capital Budget for Facilities was outlined – the four priority needs were then discussed in more detail:
  1. Public Safety requires a new office location as they have surpassed the space and facilities of Farrell Hall. Currently, the most likely move is to Garey Hall. This is plan is still pending a final decision and Board approval.
  2. Pavilion will be renovated – the court will be rotated on an angle to maximize seating – as this will then become a Basketball-only space, Facilities are considering the addition of a “Bubble” or dome on West Campus soccer fields to house intermural sports and other varsity practices during the winter months. The “Bubble” will be 2+ story structure with lighting, heat, etc. but will be temporary – only erected during the winter for student use. Planning approval is still pending and there are other options that might be selected instead, but the “Bubble” is currently the most preferred option.
  3. Mendel Hall will be upgraded in terms of HVAC systems and roofing.
  4. Villanova Conference Center will be upgraded to make it a more competitive option with local hotels.

- Plans for the Lancaster construction are still on-going. Due to a zoning code change, the move-in date for residences has been pushed back one academic year to August 2020. Construction to expand existing parking garages – mainly the SAC garage, but there are others – (and allow for supplementary parking during the primary construction) is set to begin this summer.

Retention Committee (Krista Mallot)

- We meet three times a semester to discuss current cohort retention and also trend data.
- We are in the process of collating information and feedback from the January 8th summit we conducted in conjunction with CMA and are planning to release a report regarding some of that feedback with next steps.
- Finally, you can direct anyone who is interested to follow the link to the annual report.  http://www1.villanova.edu/villanova/enroll/registrar/retention.html

Provost Search (Nancy Sharts-Hopko)

The Committee is meeting 2/20/2015 to identify from all active candidates at this time 7-9 of them who will be invited to a first interview with the Committee. These interviews are planned for February 26-27 off-campus. The finalists will be selected after those interviews are completed, and we anticipate that we will identify 4, per Fr. Peter's charge to the Committee. We are planning that all finalists' campus visits will take place in March, after Spring Break, well before final exams. I hope everyone will join me in praying that we don't upend the schedule due to weather, as it has been exceedingly challenging to accommodate all scheduling considerations, most importantly Fr. Peter's schedule.

Resolution on Faculty Surveys

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS it is appropriate and useful to conduct occasional surveys of faculty in order to collect attitudinal, demographic, and other data;

WHEREAS the importance of accurate and ethical survey methods is a matter of long-established consensus in academia;

WHEREAS participants in survey and other research have a right to informed consent regarding their participation and the use of the data they provide;

WHEREAS faculty members appreciate the confidential and sensitive nature of data collected from survey respondents;

WHEREAS faculty members may be reluctant to participate in research on faculty without seeing the results of the research once it is completed, and low participation will affect the quality of findings;

And

WHEREAS data from surveys are easy to deliver in a timely fashion to faculty in a manner that does not compromise confidentiality or anonymity;

BE IT RESOLVED:

1. The Faculty Congress calls for the application of existing ethical standards for research on human subjects, such as are required for research approval by the Internal Review Board, to all University-sponsored or –conducted research on faculty. This means that respondents will be informed of

   a. the survey’s purpose,
   b. how the findings will be used,
   c. whether responses are anonymous, confidential, or neither,
   d. who will have access to personally-identifiable information provided in surveys, and
   e. whether and when the survey’s findings will be reported to the community.

2. When possible, data collected from surveys should be made available, consistent with the responsible treatment of survey data, to respondents.

3. The Faculty Congress strongly recommends that all surveys conducted or sponsored by the University be reviewed by a survey methods expert in OPIR before dissemination. The Faculty Congress further recommends the creation of a list of faculty members with expertise in survey research who are willing to serve as occasional consultants for University surveys.

4. Surveyors should share with the participants, no later than three months from the close of the survey, the descriptive statistics of the faculty responses to each item, disaggregated by rank, gender, College, and all other relevant variables for which there are more than ten responses. Exceptions to the three-month deadline are acceptable if stated explicitly in the survey.

5. The Faculty Congress will not encourage faculty participation in campus surveys that fail to adhere to these standards.

Resolved this 20th day of March, 2015.