

**Meeting of the Villanova University
Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee**

Tuesday, January 23, 2018, 3:30-5:00, Mendel 103

Minutes

Present: Aronté Bennett, Alice Dailey (Chair), Mirela Damian, Angela DiBenedetto, Quinetta Roberson, Catherine Warrick, Mark Wilson, Rosalind Wynne

Not in Attendance: Sohail Chaudhry (NIA), Diane Ellis (NIA), Ruth Gordon (sabbatical), Rory Kramer (NIA), James Peyton-Jones (sabbatical), Jennifer Ross (sabbatical)

The meeting was called to order at 3:30.

The committee had received, in advance, four new policies / policy changes from the Provost's office that were the subject of the meeting. Craig Wheeland was in attendance to describe how these new policies and changes had evolved and what they are intended to accomplish. Here is a summary of our conversation:

1. Administrative Sabbatical

Dr. Wheeland briefly described the intent of the proposed Administrative Sabbatical. This policy will be discussed more fully in a subsequent meeting.

2. New Retirement Plan for Faculty

The university is developing a new set of retirement options for faculty. The current Steady State plan only accommodates faculty who are age 60 to 69. The proposed plan retains the current option for faculty age 60 to 65 and offers three new options for faculty 66 and older. The proposed plan does not have an age limit. These new options include plans in which faculty phase out over either two or three years and one in which faculty retire over the course of a single year. FRRC is the first faculty committee to receive these proposed plans and will be sharing them with Faculty Congress and the Benefits Committee to gather input from a broader group of faculty, including retirees.

3. Use of Villanova Names and Marks

This policy, elaborated from a much shorter current policy that appears in the Faculty Handbook, has been developed by University General Counsel and University Communications and Marketing to reflect legal limitations on the use of Villanova's name and logos by employees of the university. The committee raised several concerns about the policy. Dr. Wheeland will be inviting someone from General Counsel or University Communication and Marketing to a subsequent meeting to address these concerns. They are:

- a. Anecdotal evidence suggests that it is becoming increasingly difficult for university departments and programs to print items such as t-shirts, given restrictions on using, for example, the Villanova “V.” What might be done to ease these restrictions and make it easier for these groups to use Villanova’s name and marks?
 - b. Because all Villanova insignia are restricted, faculty often encounter difficulty getting business cards printed off campus. But there can be compelling reasons to do so, for example, if a faculty member needs a bilingual business card with English on the front and another language on the back. Further, the current business cards are restricted to one design that has “Ignite Change, Go Nova” on the back, a slogan more appropriate to athletics than academics. How might Villanova faculty be offered more business card options or be authorized to have cards printed off campus?
 - c. Faculty have frequent need of electronic letterhead, which the university does not currently provide. How would the use of homemade electronic letterhead be affected by the proposed policies, and how can authorized electronic letterhead be made available to faculty?
 - d. As written, the policy prohibits mention of the university’s name on any unauthorized social media account. This seems far too broad a policy. The committee suggested it be revised to encompass more specific prohibitions.
4. Academic Integrity Section of the Faculty Handbook

This is a policy revision that has gone through APC and is now awaiting approval by FRRC so that it can be included in an update to the Faculty Handbook. The committee offered a few minor recommendations that Dr. Wheeland will discuss with APC:

- a. The committee agreed that the description of course penalties should not suggest that the normal penalty is failure on the assignment, with failure of the course representing a “more severe” penalty. This language characterizes failing a student in the course as outside of the norm, which might dissuade faculty from doing so when such a penalty is warranted. The committee instead recommended that the description neutrally name failure on the assignment and failure in the course as two possible penalties for an academic integrity violation.
- b. One member of the committee thought the statement about Appeals (currently the first sentence under “Penalties and Appeals”) should come later in the document, perhaps at the end of the “Penalties and Appeals” section.
- c. One member noted that faculty can sometimes be subject to harassment by students or parents in cases of academic integrity violations. It was suggested that a statement be added to the policy that allows faculty who have filed an academic integrity violation to refer subsequent communications from a student or parent to the dean.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05.