



VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY
FACULTY CONGRESS

Academic Year 2020-2021

December 7, 2020
10:00 am to 11:30 am
via Zoom

Present: Ani Ural, Aronte Bennett, Benjamin Scheick, Bridget Wadzuk, Debra Shearer, Gerald Beyer, Gregory Hoskins, Ilia Delio, James Peyton Jones (Vice Chair), Jared Paul, Jennifer Altamuro, Jennifer Ross, Jeremy Kees, Joe Betz, John-Paul Spiro, Kamran Javadizadeh, Kathryn Haymaker, Lisa Sewell, Melissa Hodges, Metin Duran, Paul Bernhardt, Paul Steege, Peter Busch, Rebecca Winer, Rory Kramer, Ruth Gordon, Samantha Chapman, Sherry Burrell, Stephanie Katz Linkmeyer, Stephen Liedtka, Sue Metzger, Tom Way (Chair)

Absent: Eugene McCarraher, Javad Siah, John Sedunov, Meredith MacKenzie Greenle, Rabih Moussawi, Rachel Skrlac Lo (sabbatical), Shannon Hamlin, Tina Agustiady, Travis Foster, Wenqing Xu

Housekeeping

- Minutes from Oct. 8, 2020 were approved unanimously by those in attendance

Standing Committee Reports (*reports submitted in advance; please see appendix; this time set aside for elevated issues and/or questions*)

1. Awards Committee (Andrew Scott [chair, external member], Sherry Burrell): The Awards Committee, with Faculty Congress approval, finalized the selection of the winner of the Facultas Award. This year's winner is Imelda Montemayor, Office of Facilities Management. Nominations for Faculty Awards closed on December 2. The committee will meet during the week of December 14 to select finalists.
2. Adjunct Faculty Representatives (Tina Agustiady, Shannon Hamlin)
3. CNT/FTNTT Faculty Representatives (Sue Metzger, J-P Spiro)
4. Election and Credentials Committee (Q Chung, Jennifer Palenchar, Qi Wang, Bob Styers [advisory])
5. Research Policy Committee (RPC; James Peyton Jones, chair): James reported that RPC provided feedback and suggestions for the Small Research Grant (SRG) pilot program from the Villanova Institute for Research & Scholarship which is currently open for applications. RPC also discussed graduate student pay schedules; AVP Amanda Grannas is putting together a working group to look into this more closely. The IRB subcommittee / working group has been reviewing Villanova's current IRB policies and benchmarking against peer schools. RPC also commented on proposed changes to the Faculty Handbook under Course Buyout which was being considered by FRRC.
6. Faculty Rights & Responsibilities Committee (FRRC; Metin Duran, chair) – FRRC approved changes to faculty handbook on Title 9.
7. Retired faculty members (Joe Betz)

Committees with Faculty Representation (*time set aside for questions about reports received*)

1. Academic Policy Committee (Bridget Wadzuk, chair)
2. Intellectual Property Policy Board (James Peyton Jones)
 - James reported that the Intellectual Property Policy has been looked at by FRRC and changes were proposed. There are two versions currently and administrators have expressed the need to align them. Faculty on the IPP board support that but would also like to see significant changes for IP of online courses. At the time the policy was written online courses were quite new; changes will be forthcoming.

Old Business

1. General Protocol, final version, endorsement discussion (James) (see Appendix A)
 - a. James explained that the general protocol covers all University committees and task forces to regarding procedure and communication. A brief history was given: the former University Senate had the power to legislate, but effectively ceased to exist because most of the work was happening in subcommittees. There were headless subcommittees that ended up being chaired by administrators, and faculty had less of a voice (apart from APC). For the past 2.5 years we have been working to establish basic principles of shared governance, which resulted in the General Protocol document. FC looked at it last spring, as did SGA and Staff Council. There was one minor modification that minutes of meetings should be password protected. With approval of Faculty Congress today it would go into the policy library.
 - b. There was a discussion about when minutes of committees should be posted on the website, and whether a timeline should be included. Another point was that the document must reach our constituents in order to be useful. It will be sent with meeting highlights, but another idea is for FC representatives to share the document with colleagues in department meetings, for example.
 - c. **A motion to endorse this general protocol was passed unanimously by those in attendance.**
2. Caregivers assistance, status update (Katie Haymaker)
3. Brief recap of budget and retirement benefits related discussions (James) - James pointed out that at the time the cuts were announced things were uncertain and the situation is very different now. Sympathy has been expressed from some administrators, but there is no concrete decision to reinstate benefits due to concerns over the spring semester. If things go well in spring, then there is a strong case for making up the financial impact and a willingness to do that.

New Business

1. PhD Student Insurance, discussion, potential for Faculty Congress support (Yue Jennifer Wang, founding member of the doctoral student council, and Greg Hoskins, faculty advisor) (see Appendix B)
 - a. Yue Jennifer Wang explained the precarious situation of doctoral students at Villanova due to insufficient health insurance. She shared a [link](#) to the 2020 PhD Healthcare Report prepared by the doctoral student council. In summary, 11% of students are uninsured and that has been growing by year; 38% of students are inadequately insured. Students on high deductible plans forgo care or have incurred debt from healthcare costs. After a 2016 survey of students, the administration offered a \$1000 subsidy of health insurance costs to doctoral students at Villanova. The effort to obtain comprehensive coverage has been going on for a decade. The graduate student council is asking for subsidized comprehensive health care. They have asked for plans similar to those offered by

benchmark institutions. The total estimated cost is \$1 to \$1.5 million per year. The council is awaiting a response from Dean Emory Woodard that may include an increase in the subsidy. Jennifer pointed out that there is a task force for graduate student healthcare whose near-term goal is comprehensive healthcare for doctoral students. The taskforce also has a long-term goal to include master's students as well.

- b. Tom pointed out that Faculty Congress is ready to look deeper into this and ready to consider more formal support in the future depending on how the recent discussions go. It was explained by another member that historically, the Philosophy Department wanted to do at least as well as peer institutions regarding assistantships for doctoral students, so that is a strong argument in support of this petition. It was also pointed out that this is also an ethical issue in Catholic higher education. The research component of the strategic plan was also brought up as a justification to help PhD programs thrive through competitive stipends and healthcare coverage on par with peer institutions. **A follow up in early 2021 is necessary to see whether a formal discussion of FC support would be helpful depending on the status of the discussions between the doctoral student council and the administration.**
2. CATS Question Committee of APC (Stef Katz) (see Appendix C)
 - a. Stef introduced the proposal in Appendix C for revised CATS questions for distance learning (DL) courses. The main points of discussion were: (1) modality reporting; (2) open-ended questions; (3) CATS being used for both evaluation and feedback; (4) the question including the word 'community'. (1) The reporting of modality of courses by OSPIE was a topic of extended discussion, and Jim Trainor and Kenneth Tsang indicated that OSPIE will look into the best way to report this information. Previously DL courses were 5-10% of what VU offered and this semester they are 80% so the modality should be considered. (2) The new open-ended questions for DL courses are also going to be considered for all CATS in the future. Several people pointed out that the proposed question "What did you like least about the course?" primes students for a negative response, and the committee should consider a rewording. (3) Using CATS as a tool to serve both evaluative and feedback purposes is a much larger issue. The extent to which these new questions are evaluative needs the attention of FC, as well as the general use of CATS for both evaluation and feedback. (4) There was a lengthy discussion of the ambiguity of the word "community" in the context of the proposed fourth question in Appendix C. It was observed that the community question seems inconsistent with three earlier questions, which are all on technology deployment. The first three questions are getting at ideas similar to existing questions, and the community question is injecting a new issue. The general recommendation was to roll out first three and table the fourth DL question for revision or reconsideration.
 3. Open discussion – the meeting ended at 12:07 PM with no time for open discussion.

Reminders

Upcoming Congress events:

Fall 2020 Faculty Congress general meetings (Zoom)

- ~~Friday, September 11, 2020, 1:30-3:00~~
- ~~Thursday October 8, 3:30-5:00~~
- ~~Wednesday November 4, 12:30-2:00 canceled~~
- Monday December 7, 10:00-11:30

Fall 2020 Faculty Congress office hours (Zoom)

- selected Thursdays, 4-5 pm

Spring 2021 Faculty Congress general meetings (Zoom)

- tbd

2020-21 Faculty Fridays, 2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. (Presidents' Lounge, Connelly Center)

- Canceled till further notice

APPENDIX A: General Protocol Draft

Guiding Principles and Protocols for University Committees.

DRAFT Version February 27, 2020

Guiding Principles: Except as limited by law or confidentiality issues, all University Committees and Task Forces (collectively termed Committees) are expected to operate under certain guiding principles for matters within their purview which include:

- **Informed Consultation:** Unless urgent action is required, the Administrators responsible for a given Area of University operation will consult with the Villanova Community in a meaningful manner on issues related to this Area. Often this consultation is through interaction with a Committee.
- **Documented Opinion:** Committees have no executive powers (unless such powers are specifically assigned), but they have the right to express a documented opinion on the matters within their purview.
- **Independence:** Committees are expected to provide a voice for the Community and offer independent feedback to the Administrator.
- **Membership:** Membership of the Committee should be broadly representative of the Community group or groups most closely associated with, or affected by, the Area of responsibility. Members are often elected or appointed by, or in consultation with, the leadership of Faculty Congress, Staff Council, or Student Government Association, or other representative group. Terms should be limited.
- **Transparency:** Except as limited by law or confidentiality issues, the operation of Committees should be as transparent as possible. Committee members are encouraged to engage their respective communities in topics under consideration, for example by sharing agendas and minutes in a timely fashion.
- **Collegiality:** All committee discussions will be conducted in a free and open manner, with respect for differing opinions and recognition of a common purpose in support of the University mission.
- **Integrity:** Committee members and Administrators will maintain high standards of integrity and trust in their interactions with one another. They will also disclose any actual or potential Conflict of Interest that they may experience and will recuse themselves if this affects their ability to deliberate or vote impartially.

The General Protocol, described below, defines more formally a best-practice procedure for achieving these goals.

A General Protocol

Applicability: This General Protocol applies to University Standing Committees and to any other Committees and Task Forces that adopt it. A list of these Committees (which shall be updated as necessary by revision of this document) currently includes the following:

- Academic Policy Committee (APC)
- Research Policy Committee (RPC)¹

¹ The RPC is a subcommittee of Faculty Congress that has chosen to follow the General Protocol.

- The Athletic Advisory Committee (AAC)
- The Budget Committee
- Mission and Social Justice Committee
- Student Life Committee.

Membership: The Administrator or Responsible Officer who oversees the area associated with each University Committee is, *ex officio*, a member of that Committee (see footnote 4). To the extent possible, the Administrator will also act as a hub for communication between the Committee and other Administrators whose work may intersect with that of the Administrator and the area associated with the Committee. These other Administrators may also serve on the Committee according to committee-specific protocols or may be invited to attend Committee meetings if their work relates to the topic(s) under discussion. The remaining Committee members are selected by their respective constituent organizations, e.g. the Faculty Congress, the Student Government Association, the Staff Council. Terms are limited to two years, and members may serve a maximum of two consecutive terms. The names of those selected will be sent to the President. All members of these Committees serve at the pleasure of the President.

Purpose and Procedure: The purpose of the University Committees is to make recommendations and advise on policy, strategic plans, and other matters that significantly affect Villanova University as a whole, and to engage the University Community in this process.

Committee recommendations and opinions are not binding on the Administrator. However, the Administrator will consult with the Committee Chair about all relevant policy changes² and (unless immediate action is required) significant new policy may not be implemented without formal consultation with the Committee and without documentation of Committee opinion by written statement and, when appropriate, committee vote. The Administrator will respond to such input with an update and rationale for the final outcome or decision that was taken.

In cases where the matter falls within the domain of interest of several different Administrators or Committees, one Administrator / Committee will typically take the lead role in consultation with the other Administrators and Committee Chairs. This does not preclude consideration by multiple Committees should the Chairs or Administrators feel the need to do so.

Unless immediate action is required, the timeline for policy formation shall include ample time for Committee members to consult with their constituents. Proponents of new policies are encouraged to share their ideas as early as possible in the process in order to ensure informed decision-making. Both the Committee and the Administrator will work in good faith to ensure timely responses (ideally within forty days), while recognizing that more complex and weighty issues may take significantly longer to process (e.g. a semester or exceptionally even longer).

Voting: All members are voting except for the Administrator and others identified (with rationale) in the committee-specific protocol³. Decisions are by consensus or by a simple majority of the votes, providing at least half of the eligible voting members cast a vote or formally abstain.

² This is intended to be a brief consultation between the Administrator and Committee Chair in order to reach agreement on what constitutes a 'significant' matter that needs the attention of the full Committee.

³ Administrators are non-voting since they already have executive power and since the aim of the Committee is to provide independent feedback to the Administrator.

Motions may be put to a vote in regular meetings, or by email solicitation of all Committee Members.

Organization: Committee years typically run from May to the following April. New Committee members should be selected by the beginning of May. The outgoing Chair, the Administrator or the parent body of the Committee will convene a meeting of the incoming Committee in May for the purpose of selecting the incoming Chair who serves a renewable one-year term. Any non-Administrator member may serve as Chair⁴, unless additional eligibility requirements are specified by the Committee.

The Chair will call meetings, set the agenda, solicit constituent input, organize subcommittees as needed, and ensure the timely distribution of minutes to the Committee and to the University Community as a whole. The Chair will collaborate with the Administrator (or designee) to perform the above duties. As a courtesy and where possible, the Administrator's Office will assist the Chair with secretarial support if requested. The Chair will work closely with the Administrator to move issues forward in the intervals between meetings, and to lay the groundwork for productive use of Committee time. Committees and sub-committees of Faculty Congress, Staff Council and the Student Government Association may meet without Administrators at the discretion of the Chair. Otherwise, independent meetings of the Committee require the consent of the Administrator.

Subcommittees of the Committee may include any member of the University Community; the function of subcommittees is to make recommendations to Committee as a whole.

Transparency: The agenda, minutes or meeting summaries⁵, and recommendations will be posted in a timely fashion on Villanova University's website on a secured page requiring authentication for faculty, staff, and students (as appropriate) to protect this sensitive information. The site may be linked to from the Administrator's Office and from Faculty Congress, Student Government Association, Staff Council, and Alumni Board as appropriate. Committee members are expected to bring items in the minutes and on the agenda to the attention of their various constituencies, and to solicit their input on these matters. Any member of the University Community may request an invitation to observe Committee deliberations. Such requests are granted at the discretion of the Chair.

Conflicts of Interest: Any participant in Committee deliberations should disclose the existence of any potential or actual Conflict of Interest to the Chair or to the Committee as a whole. The participant will recuse themselves from a particular topic under discussion, or do so at the direction of the Committee, if the conflict impacts the participant's ability to deliberate or (in the case of members) to vote on the topic in question. The Chair will document any disclosed Conflicts of Interest and their impact with any relevant Committee recommendations or opinions. If the

⁴ This structure (separating Chair and Administrator) encourages constructive collaboration between the Administrator and a clearly identifiable Committee representative (the Chair), making the Committee more effective in its operation. The Chair serves as a representative of the Committee which aims to provide independent feedback to the Administrator from the Community.

⁵ Meeting 'summaries' may omit content from the minutes that is not appropriate for sharing with the general community, e.g. for reasons of confidentiality.

conflict is experienced by the Chair, then the Administrator will assume the Chair's responsibilities in this regard.

Customization: Individual Standing Committees may extend this protocol according to their specific needs. Such extensions should include a definition of the Area of Responsibility of the Committee, details of membership terms, and additional eligibility requirements (if any) to serve as Committee Chair. These additional protocols, or subsequent modifications thereof, require a 2/3 majority vote of the Committee.

APPENDIX B: Letter from doctoral student council to the Deans regarding healthcare (Nov. 2020)

Dear Dean Lindenmeyer, Dean Havens, Dean Marcolongo, and Dean Woodard,

We, the Doctoral Student Council of Villanova University, wish to bring your attention to the present financial and healthcare situation facing many doctoral students at Villanova. These past few months have revealed the precariousness of the doctoral student situation at Villanova. Many doctoral students face an increased cost of living burden after losing summer income and many students contend with the stresses of returning to campus to teach, complete TI/TA assignments, take classes, and work at labs. Like the rest of the student body, we have also experienced overwhelming academic and social pressure to function at a “normal” capacity during these peculiar times, with predictably negative effects on both mental and physical health. However, in this letter, we wish to focus on the situation of doctoral students regarding the lack of affordable and adequate healthcare. We seek support from our community during this difficult time and beyond.

In September, the Doctoral Student Council conducted an annual healthcare survey of doctoral students. The results of this [survey](#) revealed that many doctoral students struggle with their health and healthcare coverage, and for some, the situation is dire. The results are startling to people who may not be close to the doctoral student population at Villanova. Doctoral students are prohibited from seeking outside employment while on assistantship. That is, they are entirely dependent on the stipend they receive for all of their living expenses, which limits their options for affordable healthcare. We found that of 77 doctoral students surveyed, 39% find themselves underinsured in 2020. Students could be underinsured because they cannot afford their insurance plans’ high deductibles or because they have long-term health needs not covered by the insurance they can afford. 12% of students responding to our survey do not have health insurance at all. One student responded that they are “*one medical emergency away from leaving Villanova.*” The risk that doctoral students run and the difficult choices they face because of their healthcare situation have real consequences, such as forgoing urgent care and incurring massive medical debt.⁶ Needless to say, COVID-19 has exacerbated the precarity faced by doctoral students. While doctoral students might not have to pay for surveillance testing for COVID-19, the cost of treatment for a student who contracts COVID-19– for instance, while on campus teaching, working or taking required courses – and who may require extended care or even hospitalization would be financially catastrophic.

Because the situation faced by many of our doctoral students at this moment, *we ask that Villanova University implement comprehensive healthcare coverage for all doctoral students.* More specifically, we are asking that a healthcare plan be available at no cost to doctoral students beginning in the 2021-2022 academic year. We are asking for this plan to include comprehensive medical, prescription drug, vision, and dental coverage.

⁶ See the [2020 Ph.D. Student Healthcare Report](#) for more detailed data and testimonials to see the range of healthcare experiences amongst graduate students.

Providing full healthcare coverage to doctoral students would benefit Villanova's competitiveness compared to other benchmark institutions. According to our research, peer Catholic universities, such as Notre Dame, Boston College, Georgetown, and Loyola University Chicago offer their doctoral students fully subsidized healthcare; Fordham and St. Louis University offer substantial subsidies.

We are aware that doctoral students are not the only group within Villanova's community who might be experiencing precarity during this time, and especially remember adjunct faculty, service workers, facilities workers, and other non-doctoral students. We are in solidarity with these community members and urge Villanova administrators to address the needs voiced by these groups. However, in representing the doctoral student body, we are presenting the situation of doctoral students as best we can and are asking that the University address an urgent need within our particular group in order to fulfill its commitment to its mission and community.

As doctoral students at a Catholic and Augustinian University, we understand the importance of the mission to our community. We support the call to "commit to the common good, and apply the knowledge and skills of our students and faculty to better the human condition"; to put *Community First*. Further, we are aware that within the Catholic Social Tradition (CST), this call to uphold the community and commit to the common good includes a consideration of the dignity of work and of solidarity among all members of the community. Our work too is a way to participate in God's creation and like all workers, we need protections to ensure we can be faithful contributors to the common good. These protections, in our eyes, include comprehensive health coverage. Our request for comprehensive healthcare is also a gesture of solidarity with those doctoral students who will come after us. We hope to help build structures and create policies that can protect them as well, long after the COVID-19 pandemic is over.

We deeply appreciate all of the time and effort that has already been dedicated to the improvement of the situation of doctoral students at Villanova, most especially the stipend to offset the cost of healthcare. Also, we gratefully acknowledge the support of the Graduate Healthcare Task Force (through the Sustainable Leadership Council), the Villanova University Anti-Poverty Fellow, and the CLAS Office of Graduate Studies, and thank them for their invaluable work. We look forward to hearing back from you and working together to create a more beloved community.

Sincerely,
Jen Wang, Philosophy Ph.D. Student
Jacques Linder, Theology Ph.D. Student
Sunshine Qi, Engineering Ph.D. Student
On Behalf of The Doctoral Student Council

APPENDIX C: CATS Distance Learning Questions Subcommittee Report

CATS DL Questions Subcommittee proposed New CATS Questions

Presented to the Faculty Congress and APC, December 2020

Committee Members: Chair, Stephanie Katz; Meredith Mackenzie Greenie; Sherry Burrell; Christine Palus; Randy Weinstein; Seth Fishman; Jim Trainer; Kristy Irwin; Julie Helverson; Ken Tsang; Gabriele Bauer.

Committee goals and charge:

- (1) promote faculty development/improvement;
- (2) support faculty evaluation; and if possible,
- (3) help the university plan/improve/deploy resources.

New/Proposed Questions:

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements about the instructor for this [modality] course (where [modality] is Distance Learning, Asynchronous, Hybrid Format, Simulcast Format, or 50% Distance Learning):

The instructor (name) for this course...	Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree
uses the online classroom technology effectively.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
arranges the online materials in an organized manner.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
employs the online activities effectively.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
fosters a sense of community in this course.*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**we suggest that these questions could be added to all CATS questionnaires at some later time; however, this is conversation for a later date, as it is not part of our current charge.*

Our subcommittee asks for your approval to take these questions to the Deans for approval.

A couple of things to note:

-
-
-
-