MINUTES


Invited Guests: Alice Dailey, Aaron Wemhoff, Jean Lutes

AGENDA

Housekeeping

• Welcome
• Approval of minutes from Apr. 26, 2022 meeting (Minutes Approved)

Preliminaries

• Dr. Alice Dailey, Villanova’s first Director of Faculty Affairs

Professor Dailey introduced herself and the new position, the focus of which is to serve faculty needs and to facilitate communication between faculty, particularly faculty governance, and the Provost’s Office. She will also serve as chair of Academic Integrity Committee. For more information: https://www1.villanova.edu/villanova/provost/resources/faculty/faculty-affairs.html
• Dr. Aaron Wemhoff and Dr. Jean Lutes, information on the WRI Cool Food Program (see Appendix A)

The Cool Food Program would assist Villanova in reducing the carbon footprint of dining service, aiming at a 25% reduction by 2030. To participate, this would require the hiring of a coordinator position at no less than 50% full-time. Faculty Congress was invited to offer a vote of support in favor of further pursuing this initiative with the administration. This was approved.

- Faculty Congress voted to support the Cool Food Program initiative with 18 yes, 3 no, and 4 abstentions.

• Brief overview of FC structure; APC/FRRC chair approval

Bridget Wadzuk re-elected as chair of the APC.
Amanda Knecht re-elected as chair of the FRRC.

Standing Committee Reports (brief intro to committees)
1. Awards Committee (Andrew Scott [chair, external member], Sherry Burrell):
2. Adjunct Faculty Representatives (Tina Agustiady, Eric Hamberger)
3. CNT/FTNTT Faculty Representatives (Frank Pryor, Sue Metzger, John-Paul Spiro)

CNT representatives continue to examine the CNT promotion policies, especially for uniformity across colleges and departments. Discussions are ongoing on questions of CNT voting rights (for the election of departmental and programmatic chairs), as well as CNT faculty compensation.

4. Election and Credentials Committee (Q Chung, Jen Palenchar, Qi Wang, Bob Styer [emeritus]) - see appendix
5. Research Policy Committee (RPC; Jared Paul, chair)
6. Faculty Rights & Responsibilities Committee (FRRC; Amanda Knecht, chair)
7. Retired faculty members (Joe Betz)

Committees with Faculty Representation
1. Academic Policy Committee (Bridget Wadzuk, chair)
2. Intellectual Property Policy Board (tbd)
3. COVID Policy Committee (Jennifer Altamuro, Jake Elmer)

Professor Altamuro reported that the Policy Committee is on standby and will meet as needed. Contact tracing and dashboard are no longer in service.

Old Business
1. FC Constitution Committee continuing work (Bob Styer; see Appendix B)

Faculty Congress voted in favor of the motions:
• “If the faculty congress constitution needs changes that require a full faculty vote, then the addition of a voting graduate student member to the faculty congress constitution should be among the proposed changes.”

  o The motion passes with 10 yes, 2 no, and 3 abstentions.

• “If the faculty congress constitution needs changes that require a full faculty vote, then the addition of an adjunct faculty member to the APC and FRRC committees of Faculty Congress should be among the proposed changes.

  o The motion passed with 11 yes, 0 no, and 1 abstention.

New Business
1. Universal Lecture Capture – see Appendix C for further info (Katie Haymaker)
2. Support for robust discourse about abortion rights on campus (Katie Haymaker)
3. Fact-finding: Course developer agreement – summer 2022 online courses

The new business items were not addressed, but they will be part of the agenda for the next FC meeting on October 17.

Reminders
Upcoming Congress events:

FC leadership meetings with Provost & Vice Provost
(Katie, Joe, Bridget, Amanda)
• TBD
• TBD

Fall 2022 Faculty Congress general meetings (Zoom)
• Wednesday, Sept 7, 2pm – 3:30pm
• Monday, October 17, 11:00am-12:30pm
• Wednesday, November 16, 2pm-3:30pm
• Monday, December 12, 11am–12:30pm

Spring 2023 Faculty Congress general meetings
• TBD

2022-23 Faculty Fridays, 2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. (The Refectory; west entrance)
• Friday, August 26
• Friday, September 30
• Friday, October 28
• Friday, November 18 (3pm – 5pm)
APPENDIX A

To: Villanova Faculty Congress
From: Aaron Wemhoff (Engineering) & Jean Lutes (English)
Date: 9/4/22
Re: WRI Cool Food Program

We request that FC endorse joining the World Resources Institute’s Cool Food Program as a critical next step toward fulfilling Villanova’s commitment to reducing its carbon footprint. This is an ideal time to advocate for food sustainability on campus, since the Sustainability Leadership Council has convened a small group of graduate students and some faculty to begin to address this issue.

Cool Food is an ambitious program that uses educational materials to reduce the overall carbon footprint associated with patron meal choices in dining facilities. In this program, WRI works with businesses, including several universities (e.g., Pitt, Harvard, and several universities with dining facilities serviced through Aramark including Arizona State and UVA) to implement best practices and strategies to reduce food-based carbon emissions due to meal choice. Through 2021, the program’s 8 university members have decreased GHG emissions per plate by 16% from the base year.

The reduction of our food-generated carbon footprint is essential for several reasons [1]:
1. The overall global food demand is projected to increase by over 50% from 2010 to 2050, with the demand for carbon-heavy meat-based products projected to increase by over 70% during this period, including an increase in 88% for the highest-carbon foods, ruminant meats [2].
2. The agricultural sector currently generates about 25% of greenhouse gas emissions per the IPCC [3]. If a business-as-usual approach is adopted, then the projected increase in agricultural-based emissions would account for the majority of allowable emissions from all sectors to hold global warming below 2°C above pre-industrial temperatures and exceed the entire annual emissions budget for holding warming below 1.5°C – the warming target per the Paris Agreement on climate change. The emissions associated with food must be reduced by at least two-thirds between 2010 and 2050 to achieve the 1.5°C goal.
3. The approaches to reduce the agricultural sector include reforestation (which is highly difficult due to increased food demand), improving the productivity of agriculture while reducing carbon emissions, reducing food loss/waste, and shifting diets towards low-carbon diets (i.e., shifting away from meat-based diets to plant-based diets). The latter two areas have potential for implementation as part of a broader university sustainability plan, and therefore programs have been identified in these areas.
4. No one solution will address the emissions problem associated with food. However, education regarding meal choice in wealthier countries provides an essential strategy to counterbalance the anticipated increase in meat-based foods seen in the developing world. In fact, a successful large-scale adoption of more plant-based diets in wealthier countries would nearly eliminate the need for agricultural expansion (and related deforestation) to meet the increased global food demand, while achieving 50% emissions reduction, making the 1.5°C goal set by the Paris Climate Accord reachable.
The reason for the potential effectiveness of a meal choice education program lies in the vast difference in carbon emissions for different proteins. For example, a quarter-pound hamburger patty has roughly the same carbon emissions as 10 chicken or fish patties and 40 Beyond Burger patties.

The ability to convince the patrons, primarily Villanova students, to change their eating habits is difficult and requires proven strategies and related expertise. Fortunately, the World Resources Institute (WRI) recently established a Cool Food Pledge program that provides consultations with business entities to reduce their carbon footprint by 25% by 2030 relative to a 2015 baseline by positively affecting patron meal choice, helping these entities to achieve a pledged goal in carbon emissions reduction due to meal choice. The program would work at Villanova in the following manner through the following once per year:

1. Villanova would compile food purchase statistics, enter the values into WRI’s Cool Food calculator spreadsheet, and submit the spreadsheet to WRI.
2. WRI experts would examine Villanova’s data and work with Villanova Dining Services to implement strategies that would be the most effective for enacting positive meal change based on research studies and lessons learned with other university clients.

The Cool Food pledge program has obvious advantages in reducing the university’s Scope 3 carbon emissions, but it has the added visibility of being featured as a new member on the Cool Food website and showing that Villanova is serious about environmental sustainability, potentially drawing in donations to offset the small costs of running the program. The annual membership cost is on the order of a few thousand dollars, which could potentially be covered within the budget for implementing the university sustainability plan. However, the compilation of food purchase statistics is a time consuming endeavor, along with meeting with WRI and implementing food sustainability strategies. Dining Services has indicated that they do not have the current bandwidth to properly handle these duties, and the level of sophistication associated with compiling statistics requires long-term practice (i.e., temporary student assistance is not sufficient). Therefore, a new permanent employee line is warranted for this endeavor.

References
Appendix B: Constitution and bylaws revision issues

1. Membership on APC (changes would not go into effect until 2024 term)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current (FC)</th>
<th>Current (Univ. Council)</th>
<th>Proposed (FC bylaws)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts-Humanities (2)</td>
<td>Arts-Humanities (2)</td>
<td>Arts-Humanities (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts-social science (2)</td>
<td>Arts-social science (2)</td>
<td>Arts-social science (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts – humanities or social science (2)</td>
<td>Arts – humanities or social science (2)</td>
<td>Arts – humanities or social science (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences (3)</td>
<td>Sciences (2)</td>
<td>Sciences (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSB (3)</td>
<td>VSB (3)</td>
<td>VSB (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering (2)</td>
<td>Engineering (3)</td>
<td>Engineering (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (2)</td>
<td>Nursing (2)</td>
<td>Nursing (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law (0)</td>
<td>Law (2)</td>
<td>Law (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The constitution committee has also discussed having an adjunct faculty member on the APC. Adding an adjunct member would need to be coordinated with the office of the VPA, and potentially require a change in the FC constitution.

2. Adding a graduate student voting member to FC
   a. Given continuing issues such as healthcare that face the graduate students, should the Congress add a graduate student member? Or perhaps add a non-voting graduate student member? Or perhaps a graduate student member on FRRC? There are two graduate members on the APC. In particular, members of the Doctoral Student Committee have met with us and argued persuasively that we would benefit if they had a representative on the Congress. The full-time doctoral students teach courses so are effectively adjunct faculty, they do research that effectively matches faculty research, and their concerns about benefits and working conditions mirror the concerns of the faculty. Below is an Appendix with suggested amendments to add a doctoral student representative to the Congress.
   b. If the Congress approves, then we can decide if there are other high priority items (changing required three years service to three semesters service? And adding adjunct members to APC and FRRC?) that would require faculty voting, then prepare a timetable and webpage for a full faculty vote on these amendments.
Appendix C: Universal Lecture Capture (ULC) information

For original context, see the Aug 16 email announcing ULC (attached).

Additional information from the Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning:
- We emailed 517 faculty teaching in ULC rooms (this does not include Law faculty has they are required to record their lectures by Law School policy) with the option to opt out and instructions
- 88 faculty (17%) have opted out which is slightly up from 15% last spring
- 502 faculty (including law) are using ULC
- We are recording 992 courses which are 47% of the courses scheduled on campus this fall in the 75 ULC rooms
- We have had some requests to move into ULC rooms and are trying to accommodate
- We will explore future methods for scheduling faculty who regularly opt out into non ULC rooms
- All of the faculty in ULC rooms that did not opt-out as of 3 pm Monday received an email Monday afternoon with their channel link, Mediasite training info, and information on how to opt out.
- We will continue to process any opt out requests within 2 business days (can be faster)

- **Who has access to the recordings?**
  - Employees within Instructional Technologies have access to recordings to maintain the system, provide support, and when helping faculty with their materials.
  - Sonic Foundry (the company behind Mediasite, our enterprise video platform) technical support may also access recordings when necessary to assist our staff.
  - Unless requested otherwise, ULC recordings are private unless the faculty makes the recording viewable.

- **How long are recordings kept?**
  - Recordings are kept online for approximately one year and one semester, consistent with other systems such as Blackboard.
  - We notify faculty when recordings will be purged from the Mediasite system and provide the options to retain those recordings if they wish.

- **Are students notified that they are being recording?**
  - It seems that students are notified if the professor announces it, or if there is a sign in the classroom.

- **How many announcements are made for opting out?**
  - In addition to the AVPTL email, when a ULC room is scheduled for recording, an automated email is sent to faculty containing the opt-out instructions again.