VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY
FACULTY CONGRESS

Academic Year 2020-2021

May 13, 2021
3:30 pm to 5:00 pm

<u>MINUTES</u>

Housekeeping

- Welcome – expression of thanks to all members of FC (28 present)
- Minutes from the Apr. 15, 2021 meeting were approved

Invited guest: Dr. Crystal Lucky, Associate Dean of Baccalaureate Studies, CLAS

- Dr. Lucky gave a presentation about Aequitas Goal 8B (Professional Development—Faculty) and the work of a subcommittee of the Aequitas Task Force on this goal. The results of this work will not be a mandate, but a resource to help and support faculty colleagues who wish to engage in professional development in antiracism. The subcommittee is working to develop a goal statement that will be added to larger Aequitas report to Fr. Peter. The earliest tasks include getting an inventory of the anti-racist work being done in the colleges/deparmtents/ programs already to create a repository (potentially on Blackboard/learn@Nova). The hope is that when situations arise, such as reports on EthicsPoint, that those who are working with the faculty will be able to give them resources to support them. Dr. Lucky is hoping to reach out to some members of FC for focus group conversations to find out what faculty wish they had: such as programs or events, or other ideas. If you have any ideas or feedback, please reach out to Dr. Lucky.
- One idea offered by a member of FC was to develop an antiracism guide to selection of course material, for example.

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)
   - Brief note: winners and runners-up have been notified by the Provost's office. The awards committee has also let nominees know that they were put forward for an award this year.
2. Adjunct Faculty Representatives (Tina Agustiady, Shannon Hamlin) – Tina asked about a list of benefits for adjunct faculty. [The list was included in the FC Highlights email of May, 2021, and is also added as appendix C to these minutes.]
3. CNT/FTNTT Faculty Representatives (Sue Metzger, J-P Spiro) – JP made a suggestion that there to be a designated person on FC specific to adjunct/PhD students (beyond their 5th year); these students are adjuncts, classified as employees of the University, and since they function as faculty it seems like they should have direct representation. Grad studies said that Philosophy and

eventually Theology may also have some people in this position. They have different issues/concerns than other CNT/non-PhD student adjunct faculty.

4. Election and Credentials Committee (Q Chung, Jennifer Palenchar, Qi Wang, Bob Styer [advisory])
5. Research Policy Committee (RPC; James Peyton Jones, chair) – The committee met to to look at policy on PI eligibility on sponsored projects.
6. Faculty Rights & Responsibilities Committee (FRRC; Metin Duran, chair) – James reports that FRRC is providing feedback on suggestions from VISIBLE related to the ad hoc subcommittee on the COVID-19 impacts on faculty; FRRC will have the final say since it is their domain. Currently the recommendations are with the deans; items that if approved would take effect very quickly. FRRC was also considering changes to the regular R&T process (started in the last FC) including: credit toward tenure; hiring with tenure; remote participation in R&T committees; logistic changes to do with workflow; including CPS in the CNT promotion section; currently CNT promotion is decided at the department level and then it goes straight to University, so they want to insert a college level in that; the change that deans do not present R&T cases at the University level (put in writing, since it is now happening). There was a suggestion to establish a deadline for these decisions to be communicated, given the impact on the tenure and promotion process that begins in summer.
7. Retired faculty members (Joe Betz) – Quarterly club is revived for the fall (luncheons with speakers); meeting of board of that will be on campus and on Zoom

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

1. Academic Policy Committee (Bridget Wadzuk, chair) – Revisions to the University's Academic Integrity Code (see Appendix A) – Bridget explained that a subcommittee updated the AIC to make the policy more formative, for example to help teach the students to cite, etc. The updates create more of a participatory process between students and faculty; all should read it. The committee welcomes feedback about those aspects. In addition, the CATS subcommittee is also continuing.
2. Intellectual Property Policy Board (James Peyton-Jones) – James stated that a subgroup of the board did meet recently to work on the details. They discussed abolishing the separate section on electronic courses since we do so much online teaching now; clarifying that digital works of scholarship are also scholarship; clarifying what University-sponsored work means. James explained that members of the board may be trying to introduce a new concept about "substantial use of resources" from the University leading to an ownership role by the VU. From here the proposal will move back up the chain and need to eventually be reviewed by FRRC.

Old Business
1. Doctoral student healthcare initiative - brief report on status (see Appendix B), resolution posted on FC website (4/15/21) – JP added that there is a plan for a line item to be considered in the next budget, but there is no guarantee for how long it will take to phase in full coverage. It meant a tremendous amount for the students to come speak to FC and get our support, and they are resolved to continue their work. The direct response from the administration this time was significant.
2. University Council meeting - brief recap (James, Tom) – James reported that Fr. Peter did acknowledge that the committee hadn't met in over a year. Everyone gave their reports, as was usual. We tried to focus on how the council could be changed to be forward-looking and part of the decision-making process, and to suggest better communications, generally. For example, the FC townhalls this year were appreciated, and one with Fr. Peter in the beginning of the fall would be welcome. An inventory of governance is needed: a directory of the committees in University: what they do, who is on them? Term limits? Regular reports? Some info is on the FC page and

Provost's page, but the overall project needs administrative support for that to happen. An upside of the meeting was that leaders of FC met with leaders of student and staff groups.

3. Pandemic Lessons Learned Task Force – Tom reported that the overall goals of the task force were clarified; Jen Altamuro and Rebecca Winer were nominated to the HR subcommittee which met for the first time yesterday; the subcommittee includes many administrators from across the University. The main charge is to focus on what the pandemic and the work arrangements were during the past 18 months, and what that will look like moving forward, as we return to "normal". The main word was flexibility: most employees are not looking for a 100% remote work arrangement. What would a flexible work environment look like? How would it be handled? There was conversation about equity and compensation for those who cannot work remotely, and about sustainability as well as community. Jen and Rebecca were asked for the faculty perspective -- for example, how would having staff partly remote impact our ability to do our jobs? The committee is called "The future of work". Follow up discussion included plans for fall 2021.

   a. One FC member commented (and several seconded): Flexibility has not been reflected in the decisions for the fall: we were told that we would all be in person. No one has *asked* whether certain people would like to be 100% remote (students or faculty), due to medical concerns and concerns about the level of vaccination nationally and locally. Jen replied: There are two phases: where are we over the next 18 months, and then post-pandemic. They are not currently thinking of the first phase, but that needs to be considered. Jen and Rebecca will take this feedback to their HR subcommittee.

   b. Another member brought up that the University must make a vaccination mandate for students if they expect us to be back in the fall. The Covid policy group said that they are considering it, but a decision has not been made. A discussion followed. A strong opinion from this meeting of FC would help to bring to the meeting with administrators, and also to the policy committee. One question that we might want to consider is: students, and/or all in-person employees? Many of the Universities have done so only for the students and not the staff. Some have made the requirement for both. For the interest of taking that to the committee, it would be good to separate those questions.

   c. Faculty congress took a straw poll on requiring vaccines on campus:
      i. Question 1: Should vaccination be required for students? (23 yes; 1 no);
      ii. Question 2: Should vaccination be required for in-person employees? (21 yes; 3 no)

   d. These results were reported to the faculty members on the COVID-19 policy and operations committees.

4. Childcare support proposal – there has been no response to the proposal.

New Business
   1. Meeting adjourned at 5:13pm

APPENDIX A

<h2 align="center">Committee Reports & Updates</h2>

APC report on Academic integrity policy.

To: Faculty Congress
cc: Craig Wheeland, Bridget Wadzuk
From: Lisa Sewell, Crystal Lucky, Candace Centano, Jennifer Altamuro, Bette Mariani
Date: May 10, 2021
RE: Revisions to the University's Academic Integrity Code

With the approval of Vice Provost Craig Wheeland, during the fall of 2020, a CLAS ad hoc committee was formed to review and update the language of the university's academic integrity policy. The ad-hoc committee* focused on the "introduction" and the section on plagiarism with an eye toward making the language of the code less punitive.The revisions were passed along to an APC subcommittee; we considered the changes and further revised sections on "cheating" and "multiple submissions of work" in order to clarify certain points and make the overall language more oriented toward student learning.

*Mary Beth Simmons (Writing Center), Stephen Nesbitt (Philosophy) and Lynne Harnett (History).

==

The Code of Academic Integrity

Statement of Purpose

Academic integrity lies at the heart of the values expressed in the University's Mission Statement and inspired by the spirit of Saint Augustine. When students come to Villanova, they join an academic community founded on the search for knowledge in an atmosphere of cooperation and trust. The intellectual health of the community depends on this trust and draws nourishment from the integrity and mutual respect of each of its members.

Institutional experience suggests that maintaining academic honesty can most easily be achieved by planning ahead and keeping lines of communication open. By consulting with their instructors, students can resolve any questions they have *before* submitting their work.

The development of knowledge relies upon the synthesis and analysis of existing sources and the work of scholars across nations, cultures and time periods. Proper citation and attribution are fundamental elements of advanced learning; they acknowledge the intellectual work upon which new scholarship builds and they serve as guideposts for future projects.

Code of Academic Integrity

The following are some rules and examples regarding academic dishonesty. Since academic dishonesty takes place whenever anyone undermines the academic integrity of the institution or attempts to gain an unfair advantage over others, this list is not and cannot be exhaustive. Academic integrity is not simply a matter of conforming to certain rules; it must be understood as an ongoing, collaborative process and part of the broader academic purposes of a Villanova education.

A. Cheating:

While the university encourages and lauds collaborative learning (i.e. sharing notes and resources, forming study groups), when completing an individual class assessment (i.e. assignment, quiz, lab report, exam, etc.) students shall rely on their own mastery of the subject and not attempt to receive help in any way not explicitly approved by the instructor; for example, students should not rely on others' work (code, programming, spreadsheets, etc.) or use outside sources unless the assignment specifically allows it. Please consult with your instructor if you are uncertain whether outside sources/support are allowed. Such cheating includes trying to give or obtain information about a test, trying to take someone else's exam or trying to have someone else take one's own exam.

B. Fabrication:

Students shall not falsify, invent, or use in a deliberately misleading way any information, data, or citations in any assignment.

This includes making up or changing data or results, or relying on someone else's results, in an experiment or lab assignment. It also includes citing sources that one has not actually used or consulted.

C. Assisting in or contributing to academic dishonesty:
Students shall not help or attempt to help others to commit an act of academic dishonesty.

This includes situations in which one student copies from or uses another student's work; in such situations, both students are likely to be penalized. If the assisting student is not enrolled in the particular course, the student's Dean will formulate a suitable and equivalent penalty. Students are responsible for ensuring that their work is not used improperly by others. This does not include team projects where students are told by their instructor to work together or when the student whose work is used by another did not know their work was being used.

D. **Plagiarism:** (new from CLAS committee with some APC sub-committee additions)

Plagiarism is defined as the appropriation of another's work and the unacknowledged submission or incorporation of that work as one's own offered for credit. Plagiarism takes place whether it is accidental or intentional. The most common way to acknowledge reliance on another's work or indebtedness is to use footnotes or other documentation. Instructors will introduce students to the tools used in their disciplines, providing guidance on how to show clearly when and where they are relying on others—and students are expected to apply these tools in their writing.

Unacknowledged appropriation involves either using another's work without any citation or acknowledgement or using one's own work from a previous or different assignment.

Examples of unacknowledged appropriation include not fully citing quoted text, paraphrasing another's ideas without referencing the source(s), and acquiring a pre-written paper. Unacknowledged appropriation also includes borrowing sentences, phrases, and paragraphs from outside sources, and can also occur when students follow the expression of another's ideas or structure of another's argument too closely. When engaged in knowledge creation and academic research, students must be careful to provide proper attribution and develop their own original language, ideas and arguments in all assignments.

Another's work includes someone else's published statements, ideas, data, or illustrations. Sources of this work include written text (in any format including PowerPoint slides), podcasts, or video lectures.

The following are examples (not exhaustive) of sources that require citation or acknowledgement: blog posts or any commentary found on social media platforms, online articles found on journal sites or websites, comments by a lecturer in an online video lecture, information from another person's PowerPoint slide(s) or other presentation modality, hardcopy texts, any authored source whether it has multiple authors or is institutionally authored, or is listed as anonymous. If a student is uncertain about whether their submission violates academic integrity, whether by failing to adequately acknowledge sources or by adhering too closely to another's argument, it is recommended they contact the instructor to discuss prior to submission.

Ideas that occur to the student in conversation with roommates, other students, etc., should be considered the natural result of collaborative learning and do not require specific citation. At the same time, per academic standards, students may wish to acknowledge indebtedness to conversations with roommates, parents, friends, professors, and others in a footnote at the end of the writing assignment.

E. Multiple submissions of work:
Students shall not submit the same academic work, or substantially the same work, for more than one course without prior approval of both instructors. Faculty create assignments in order to foster a certain kind of learning in a course. Handing in work done for a previous course may preclude this learning.

F. Unsanctioned collaboration:
When doing out-of-class projects, homework, or assignments, students must work individually unless collaboration has been expressly permitted by the instructor. Students who do collaborate without express permission of their instructor must inform them of the nature of their collaboration. If the collaboration is unacceptable, the instructor will determine the appropriate consequences (which may include treating the situation as an academic integrity violation.)

Many Villanova courses involve team projects and out of class collaboration, but in other situations, out of class collaboration is forbidden. While study groups are permitted and even

encouraged, students should assume that they are expected to do their work independently unless cooperation is specifically authorized by the instructor.

G. Other forms of dishonesty:
Acting honestly in an academic setting includes more than just being honest in one's academic assignments; students are expected to be honest in all dealings with the University. Certain kinds of dishonesty, though often associated with academic work, are of a different category than those listed above. These kinds of dishonesty include (but are not limited to) the following:

- Misrepresenting oneself or one's circumstances to an instructor (for example, in requesting a makeup exam or a special due date for an assignment, or in explaining an absence)
- Forging parts of, or signatures on, official documents (including both university documents, such as drop-add slips or excused absence slips, and relevant outside documents, such as doctors' notes).
- Taking credit for work in a team-project even when the student has made little or no contribution to the work of the team.
- Stealing or damaging library books.
- Unlawfully copying computer software.

These serious offenses will be handled by the University's disciplinary procedures.

Appeal of Allegation
Students who receive an academic integrity violation may, if they believe that they have not committed an academic integrity violation, take their case to the Board of Academic Integrity.

Penalties
Individual Course Penalty. The academic penalty will be determined by the student's instructor. The instructor may impose a grade penalty up to and including failure in the course. In the School of Business, all instructors assign a grade of zero to any work in violation of the Code. Students who feel that the penalty is too harsh may appeal their grade through the normal University procedure for resolving grade disputes.

If the penalty for the violation is an F for the course, the student will not be permitted to withdraw from the course. If, after the penalty grade has been taken into account, the student is still passing the course, the student may withdraw from the course prior to the final deadline for withdrawing from a course.

University Penalty. Students who violate the code of Academic Integrity are also referred to their Dean for a University penalty. Two kinds of penalty are available – Class I and Class II. A full academic integrity violation is a Class I violation and Class II violations are usually appropriate for less serious cases, or in cases where there are mitigating circumstances. Typically, a student with two Class I violations will be dismissed from the university. In some cases, the Dean (or designee) may choose to treat a violation of the Academic Integrity Code as a Class II violation. Typically, a student may receive only one Class II violation during his or her four-year career as an undergraduate. All subsequent violations are treated as Class I violations.

Students who have committed an academic integrity violation will be expected to complete an educational program, supervised by the student's college Dean (or designee), to help the student come to a fuller understanding of academic integrity. Students who fail to complete the educational program to the satisfaction of the Dean (or designee), and within the timelines specified by the Dean (or designee), will have a hold placed on their transcript until the program has been completed.

==

The language above would replace the existing descriptions of
- The Statement of Purpose
- Section A. Cheating
- Section D. Plagiarism
- Section E. submission of multiple versions of work

The original language is below:

Statement of Purpose

Academic integrity is vital to any university community for many reasons. Students receive credit for doing assignments because they are supposed to learn from those assignments, and the vast majority do so honestly. Anyone who hands in work that is not his or her own, or who cheats on a test, or plagiarizes a paper, is not learning, is receiving credit dishonestly and is, in effect, stealing from other students. As a consequence, it is crucial that students do their own work. Students who use someone else's work or ideas without saying so, or who otherwise perform dishonestly in a course, are cheating. In effect, they are lying. Such dishonesty, moreover, threatens the integrity not only of the individual student, but also of the university community-as-a-whole.

Academic integrity lies at the heart of the values expressed in the University's Mission Statement and inspired by the spirit of Saint Augustine. When one comes to Villanova, one joins an academic community founded on the search for knowledge in an atmosphere of cooperation and trust. The intellectual health of the community depends on this trust and draws nourishment from the integrity and mutual respect of each of its members.

A. Cheating:

While taking a test or examination, students shall rely on their own mastery of the subject and not attempt to receive help in any way not explicitly approved by the instructor; for example, students shall not try to use notes, study aids, or another's work.

Such cheating includes trying to give or obtain information about a test when the instructor states that it is to be confidential. It also includes trying to take someone else's exam or trying to have someone else take one's own exam.

D. Plagiarism

Students shall not rely on or use someone else's words, ideas, data, or arguments without clearly acknowledging the source and extent of the reliance or use.

The most common way to acknowledge this reliance or indebtedness is to use footnotes or other documentation. It is the students' responsibility to show clearly when and where they are relying on others - partly because others may wish to learn from the same sources from which the original writer learned. Since this indebtedness may be of many kinds, some definitions and examples of plagiarism are listed below.

- Using someone else's words without acknowledgment. If you use someone else's words, not only must you give the source, but you must also put them within quotation marks or use some other appropriate means of indicating that the words are not your own. This includes spoken words and written words, and mathematical equations, whether or not they have been formally published.
- Using someone else's ideas, data, or argument without acknowledgment, even if the words are your own. If you use someone else's examples, train of thought, or experimental results, you must acknowledge that use. Paraphrasing, summarizing, or rearranging someone else's words, ideas, or results does not alter your indebtedness.
- Acknowledging someone else in a way that will lead a reader to think your indebtedness is less than it actually was. For example, if you take a whole paragraph worth of ideas from a source and include as your final sentence a quotation from that source, you must indicate that your indebtedness includes more than just the quotation. If you simply put a page number after the quotation, you will lead the reader to think that only the quotation comes from the source. Instead, make clear that you have used more than the quotation.

The examples above constitute plagiarism regardless of who or what the source is. The words or ideas of a roommate or of an encyclopedia, or notes from another class, require acknowledgment just as much as the words or ideas of a scholarly book do. Introductions and notes to books also require acknowledgment.

The examples above constitute plagiarism even in cases where the student uses material accidentally or unintentionally. So, for example, a paper can be plagiarized even if you have forgotten that you used a certain source, or even if you have included material accidentally without remembering that it was taken from some other source. One of the most common problems is that students write a draft of a paper without proper documentation, intending to go back later to "put in the references." In some cases, students accidentally hand such papers in instead of the footnoted version, or they forget to put in some of the footnotes in their final draft. So the fact that the wrong draft was submitted is not a defense against an accusation of plagiarism. In general, students are held accountable for the work that they actually hand in, rather than the work that they intended to hand in. Furthermore, students are responsible for proper documentation of drafts of papers, if those drafts are submitted to the professor. In general, students are responsible for taking careful notes on sources, and for keeping track of their sources throughout the various stages of the writing process. Notes must clearly identify the information you have obtained and where you acquired it, so that later you can acknowledge

your indebtedness accurately. Do not look at a source without having something handy with which to take such notes.

You need not provide footnotes for items that are considered common knowledge. What constitutes common knowledge, however, varies from academic field to academic field, so you should consult with your instructor.   In general, the harder it would be for someone to find the fact you have mentioned, the more you need to footnote it.

E. Multiple submissions of work:

Students shall not submit academic work for a class which has been done for another class without the prior approval of the instructor.

In any assignment, an instructor is justified in expecting that a certain kind of learning will be taking place. Handing in something done previously may preclude this learning. Consequently, if a student hands in work done elsewhere without receiving his or her instructor's approval, he or she will face penalties.

APPENDIX B

Status on: Resolution in Support of Graduate Student Efforts to Secure Affordable, Comprehensive Healthcare Coverage

Summary:

Hi Tom, James, and JP—

I hope your finals weeks are not too stressful with grading. I write behalf of myself, Jennifer, and the DSC to provide Faculty Congress with an update on our petition for healthcare.

As you may have seen from our update email, Father Peter announced that doctoral students will receive a $500 increase to their healthcare stipend, and masters students will be able to apply for need-based aid to subsidize their healthcare costs. While we are disappointed this is not a complete subsidy from the university, we are reassured that graduate student healthcare remains on the university's horizon.

Towards that end, in a meeting of the Sustainability Leadership Council's Taskforce for Graduate Student Healthcare, Vice Provost Grannas and Dean Palus alerted our taskforce that they plan to propose a line item in next year's budget for full and comprehensive coverage for doctoral students. This line item will be considered by the board in the next budget cycle, while the admins consider alternative healthcare plans, what "full" coverage looks like, and hopefully, engages in dialogue with graduate students to get a sense if the plans they are considering are worth it. They also hedged by saying they are not sure it will be approved for all of next year or if it will be put on a gradual scale to reach full coverage over the next 3-4 years. If nothing else, we have them on the record accelerating the timeline from 2030 (the timeline in the strategic plan).

The Taskforce and the research group headed by Vice Provost Grannas also plan to conduct a survey to consider the need of graduate students healthcare through Jim Trainer's OSPIE. Once that survey comes out, we would love to get a record turnout for that survey to demonstrate the need is real among many of our graduate students dependent on the university.

That is what we have in this moment. Please let us know of any questions. If anything comes up on the horizon, we will be sure to alert you to get out to Faculty Congress.

Peace,
Jacques and Jen

Appendix C
Adjunct Faculty Benefits
(Source: Human Resources June 2018)

Villanova University defines "adjunct faculty" as part-time faculty normally teaching one or two courses per semester. Adjunct faculty <u>are not eligible</u> for medical, dental or life insurance. Benefits available are listed below.

1. Villanova University 403(b) Retirement Savings Plan:

Introduction: The information below regarding the 403(b) plan is correct. Adjunct faculty may contribute to the 403(b) plan at any time. However, adjunct faculty <u>are not eligible</u> to receive the University base or matching contributions (See the Faculty Note in the policy).

Eligibility Requirements for Contributing - Part Time Employees
Part-time employees may contribute to the plan upon date of hire. In order to be eligible to receive University contributions, part-time employees must complete 1,000 hours of service in a 12-consecutive month period and attain age 21. University contributions are made for part-time employees at the end of the plan year upon confirmation that the employee has completed 1,000 hours of service.
Faculty Note: The Office of the Provost advises Human Resources as to the classification of a faculty member. Faculty members who are not eligible to receive University contributions include faculty on temporary status, visiting professors with less than 3 consecutive years of full time service, and adjunct faculty members.
https://www1.villanova.edu/villanova/hr/benefits/financial/retirement.html#hr_benefits_financial_retirement_pagecontent_collapsetextimage_6_body
2. Tuition Remission: This is a lengthy document and you can click on the hyperlink to read the information.

https://www1.villanova.edu/villanova/hr/benefits/financial/tuitionremission.html

3. Tuition Exchange:
TE eligibility is based on an employee's years of continuous full-time service. Minimum eligibility requires at least five (5) years of continuous full time service before September 1st of the year in which the tuition exchange benefit is to be used. For full-time employees who had prior part-time service, the adjusted date of hire will be used to determine eligibility.
https://www1.villanova.edu/villanova/hr/benefits/financial/tuitionexchange.html

4. Eligibility for FMLA:
Adjunct faculty are eligible for FMLA if they have completed 1 year of service and have worked 1,250 hours in the previous 12 months. This leave would be unpaid, since adjuncts don't accrue the sick and vacation benefits that are typically applied to an FMLA leave.

5. Unpaid Leave of Absence:
Adjuncts would also qualify for an unpaid Leave of Absence, please refer them to our policy for specifics.

6. Worker's Compensation:
Adjuncts would also qualify for workers' compensation, if they happened to be injured while here at work.