Meeting on October 18, 2010, 3:00 PM, Bartley 1030


Absent: Bremser(nia), Chaudhry(nia), Copel(nia), Glasgow(nia), Groch(nia), Karson(nia), Mackey-Kallis(nia), McLaughlin(nia), Pasles(nia), Payne(nia), Rosier(nia), Santhanam(nia), Styer(nia), Wang(nia), Welch(nia), Whidden(nia), Zaleski(nia), Zamani(nia).

Guests: Sally Scholz, John Kelley, Steve Merritt, Maghan Keita.

1. Meeting called to order at 3:05 PM.

2. Invocation: Victoria McWilliams

3. All members and guests introduced themselves.

4. Middle States Self-Study
   - John Kelley introduced background to the Middle States organization and the self-study. He explained that faculty volunteers for the committees were readily obtained, demonstrating high interest among the faculty.
   - Sally Scholz described the standards that are broken into fundamental elements, each of which is addressed in the reports drafted by the subcommittees. She explained how the subcommittee chairs worked to keep the process open. Information for the self-study was obtained from both archival data and discussion groups. At this point comments on the report are being obtained from the community. Comments will be accepted until October 27. The recommendations that have come out of the self-study were made only for issues that are not already being addressed by the university.
   - Steve Merritt provided a Summary of Recommendations document and described highlights from the document.
   - Maghan Keita reported on the work of the subcommittee addressing faculty issues. The discussion groups were designed to allow for a fully representative sampling of faculty and their concerns. The intent is to spur a continuing dialog between faculty and administration. There are additional findings that will not be a part of the report because they will be addressed locally through a continuing discussion.
- Question: What happens if there are opinions and new ideas come back in feedback? All comments are reviewed and included in a manner consistent with the document requirements. (At this point the length restriction has already been exceeded.) All comments involving factual statements are verified. Although none have been received to date, the Steering Committee will review any suggestions that disagree with the established recommendations.

- Question: What is the process for following-up on the recommendations? A manager is appointed to assure each recommendation receives proper consideration. Could faculty be involved in the following-up process? Most likely. Will information obtained in following up be made available to the community? Yes.

- Workload and pay discussed in the faculty? Mostly Adjuncts and FTNTT brought up these issues, because of the issues surrounding their employment.

- Is there a university-wide salary & workload policy? No.

- Feedback to the community? Does it happen? And will the faculty get periodic feedback? There is no specific plan for feedback at the moment but access to the information is open. Example: the 2006 climate survey was not completely disseminated but is available to faculty at the aggregate level.

- Board of Trustees also suggested making updates available to the community.

- Some recommendations are followed up in a more organic fashion.

- Rick Eckstein sent comments in an email to be read at the meeting on the subjects of community and the faculty, the creation of the current structure of faculty governance and its foundation in the continuing need for better sense of involvement in decision making, a request for the definition of ‘Executives’ found in Table 2.4 of the report, and a request to add a section on the financial impact of the athletics program in the report.

5. Announcements and Committee Reports
- Revised minutes of the previous Faculty Congress meeting will be voted on at the next meeting
- Reports from the committees of Faculty Congress will be delayed until the next meeting

6. Villanova Football
- Q Chung summarized the current status – Questions and the Faculty Congress resolution from the last meeting were sent to Fr. Donohue who appointed Vince Nicastro to provide the answers to these questions. The discussion between Fr. Peter and Vince Nicastro is occurring now. Information when available will be shared with Faculty Congress and with the faculty at large. Rather than our simply constructing an opinion for the faculty, we plan to engage the faculty in the discussion in the form of Faculty Forum opportunities that were originally organized by Mike Levitan as a function of the local AAUP. After some discussion the members present decided that Faculty Congress will also sponsor these forums. There was discussion over the details of how the forums will be conducted. There was a sense that comparison to the events in the 1980s when football was previously canceled and reinstated may be useful to consider at this time. It was the sense of the members present that it would be most helpful if the information from Vince Nicastro were available to the Faculty Congress before the Forums to allow
time for consideration of this information prior to discussion. There was further
discussion over the fact that this information was not immediately provided despite its
previous presentation to the Board of Trustees and to the Athletic Advisory Council.
Finally discussion of this will be taken up by Committee on Faculty at its meeting with Fr.
Donohue on October 19.

7. The meeting adjourned at 4:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Joe Schick
Faculty Congress Secretary