

---

# FAC'S SHEET

Newsletter of the University of Scranton Faculty Affairs Council  
December 2013

---

## **December Meeting Set!**

FAC Schedules Membership Meeting  
for December 10<sup>th</sup> in the McIlhenny  
Ballroom, 4<sup>th</sup> floor of DeNaples

The fourth FAC meeting for 2013-2014  
academic year is scheduled for Tuesday, December  
10<sup>th</sup> in the McIlhenny Ballroom on the 4th floor of  
the DeNaples Center.

Lunch will be served beginning at 11:15 a.m.  
with the business meeting starting at 11:30 a.m.

The Executive Committee urges all members to  
attend. Check in the right hand column for the  
agenda.

<b><i>FAC Meetings for 2013-2014</i></b>
--

The FAC Executive Committee has scheduled monthly  
membership meetings for the upcoming academic year on  
the following dates and at the places indicated. All regular  
meetings are set for Tuesdays and begin at 11:30 a.m.  
Additional meetings may be called to address special issues  
or concerns.

<b>December 10, 2013</b>	<b>Tues.</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>DeNaples</b>
<b>February 11, 2014</b>	<b>Tues</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>DeNaples</b>
<b>March 11, 2014</b>	<b>Tues.</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>DeNaples</b>
<b>April 8, 2014</b>	<b>Tues.</b>	<b>509</b>	<b>Brennan</b>
<b>May 13, 2014</b>	<b>Tues.</b>	<b>407</b>	<b>DeNaples</b>

---

## **FAC'S SHEET**

is published periodically by the Faculty Affairs Council at  
the University of Scranton. The editor is Betsey Moylan.  
Comments and suggestions from the membership are  
welcomed. Members may also check FAC's Web site at  
[www.scranton.edu/fac](http://www.scranton.edu/fac) for further information on the  
Faculty Affairs Council, an affiliate of the American  
Association of University Professors (AAUP). Copies of the  
Faculty Contract and Handbook are found on the site.

## **AGENDA**

for December 10<sup>th</sup> Meeting

1. Discussion on Shared Governance

## **Luncheon Menu for December 10<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

- ***Green Salad with 2 dressings***
- ***Vegetarian Leek and Broccoli Soup***
- ***Pork Chips with Sweet Potato Hash***
- ***Fresh Winter Vegetables***
- ***Assorted Spunks***
- ***Coffee, Tea, Sodas, Water***
- ***Rolls and Butter***

Luncheon Service begins at 11:15 A.M. in Room  
407 TDC.

## **Minutes from the November 12<sup>th</sup> FAC Meeting**

### **I. Chair's Report**

**A. Preparing for Negotiations** – The FAC officers  
have met with many of the departments on campus to  
conduct Town Meetings, although a few sessions are  
still scheduled for December. The officers wish to thank  
department chairs for scheduling this time for us to  
receive input from the membership, and we appreciate  
the faculty's cooperation in identifying for us the issues  
upon which we should concentrate in the next round of  
contract negotiations.

**B. FAC/Senate Department Chair Committee** –  
The working group is soliciting feedback from the  
response group about the five-part report that will be the  
product of the committee's deliberations. It is expected  
that the committee will finish its work and submit its  
report by the end of this semester.

**C. Shared Governance questions** – The Provost  
confirmed that he had received the inquiries submitted

by the FAC officers and had shared them with Fr. Quinn. He hopes to provide us with a written response to the questions before the President's appearance at the Faculty Senate meeting on Nov. 22. Although the topic of Fr. Quinn's talk is still under discussion, the President has been informed that the faculty consider this meeting to be a crucial one on many levels.

**D. Administrative Changes** – As of the start of the meeting, there had been no announcement regarding an appointment of an Interim Provost to take over when Hal Baillie steps down on Feb. 1. Several members commented that a search for a new provost may be prolonged, since a number of Jesuit colleges are also searching for provosts at this time. Another member suggested that the interim provost continue to serve until the next contract is secured. Still others expressed concern about the Middle States PRR, due out any day. Finally, a member urged that collegiality be observed during the search process. During the Chair's report, a faculty member announced that an electronic message had just been conveyed to the faculty announcing that Dr. Patricia Harrington of the Nursing Department had agreed to serve as Interim Provost, beginning on February 1, 2014. Friedman wished her well and the faculty echoed his wishes.

Friedman also discussed the change in the status of the Title IX Coordinator. Since Rosette Adera's departure, the general counsel, Rob Farrell, has been serving as the acting coordinator.

**E. Executive Committee Elections** – Nominations for election to the FAC Executive Committee (the FAC officers) are due to Betsey Moylan by Dec. 2.

## **V. Old Business**

**A. Visiting Assistant Professors** – Friedman summarized the proposal, which re-names Section 5.1 of the Handbook to refer to both Lecturers and Visiting Professors. The proposal then adds two new paragraphs to distinguish between junior Visiting Professors (Visiting Assistant Professors) and senior Visiting Professors (Visiting Associate Professors and Visiting Full Professors). Visiting Assistant Professors are essentially what we have always called lecturers, but they have a terminal degree and therefore merit a rank widely recognized as appropriate for such a person in academia more generally. The paragraph governing Senior Visiting Professors would generally refer to established faculty members (like Fulbright scholars) who come to the University for short stays and intend to return to their home institution. This second paragraph incorporates material from the current Section 7.0.A of the Handbook, which would be removed under the proposal. No comments regarding the proposed language were raised, so the Chair called for a voice vote. With no audible dissent, the language passed.

## **VI. New Business** –

**A. Reasons for Denial of Released Time** – The Chair explained that, as a result of a recent complaint, the FAC officers became aware of a shortcoming in Handbook Section 5.6. Although there are several places in the Handbook where a faculty member is guaranteed an explanation when an application is denied, that right does not exist for Reduction in Teaching Load (released time). Therefore, the Executive Committee lobbied for this proposal, which guarantees a faculty member the right to request and receive in writing from the dean the reason(s) why a request for released time was denied. The primary benefit to the faculty member is to be in a better position to make a successful application for released time in the future. No comments were made and the Chair called the question. The vote passed with no audible dissent.

**B. Outcomes on Syllabi** - This proposal was brought to the Handbook Committee by the CAS Dean, but several department chairs clarified that the issue originated with them. The proposal attempts to address concerns related to assessment, as mandated by our Middle States accreditation. The revision adds a statement to Section 5.4.I of the Handbook, which requires faculty members to include on their syllabi student learning outcomes and to relate those outcomes to relevant programmatic goals. The document also inserts the word "librarianship" into Section 5.4.A in acknowledgment of the fact that some members of the faculty do not have "teaching" duties in the traditional classroom sense.

The Chair then read comments from two absent colleagues, and a discussion ensued, with a number of faculty voicing strong opinions both for and against the proposal. At 12:45, with several faculty members still waiting to speak, the chair called an end to the discussion, commenting that there was a major divide in the way faculty felt about the issue. He promised that he would bring the comments that had been made back to the Handbook Committee in December, and he assured those faculty who were still waiting to speak that they would be allowed to speak during a continuation of the discussion under new business at the next FAC meeting. He also asked faculty members who had not had a chance to voice their comments to send their thoughts to him directly. The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,  
Betsey Moylan  
FAC Secretary

For your use during the upcoming discussion of Shared Governance, we are printing here the list of questions sent to the Provost on October 30, to which he responded with a brief email shared with the faculty by the Chair of FAC on November 16.

Dear Hal,

On behalf of the faculty, the FAC officers thank you for your willingness to address the following questions regarding Shared Governance at the University. In several cases, these questions will be prefaced by background material or by quotations from documents published by the AAUP or the AGB (Association of Governing Boards), an organization devoted to advising Boards of Trustees to which the University of Scranton belongs. These documents include the AAUP's "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities" (1966) and the AGB's "Affirming Shared Governance" and "Statement on Board Responsibility for Institutional Governance" (both 2010).

1. According to the AAUP, Shared Governance means that, before the administration makes a decision that affects recognized areas of faculty concern, the administration must consult with the faculty and take the advice it receives into serious consideration. Moreover, that consultation must take place with the faculty as a whole, or with representatives chosen or appointed by the faculty, not with individual faculty members selected by the administration.

The AGB's "Statement" on this topic includes the following passage: "Moreover, by virtue of their special mission and purpose in a pluralistic society, colleges and universities have a tradition of both academic freedom and constituent participation—commonly called 'shared governance'—that is strikingly different from that of business and more akin to that of other peer-review professions, such as law and medicine. The meaningful involvement of faculty and other campus constituencies in deliberations contributes to effective institutional governance."

**How does the University of Scranton administration define Shared Governance? Do you accept the definitions of the AAUP and AGB, or are your statements on this topic determined by some alternative definition?**

2. The AAUP's "Statement" contains the following declaration: "Faculty representatives should be selected by the faculty according to procedures determined by the faculty." Accordingly, the Faculty Senate recently voted to endorse the principle that faculty representatives must either be elected by the faculty or appointed by an elected faculty body, such as the Faculty Senate.

**Does the administration accept the principle that faculty representatives must be selected by the faculty according to these procedures?**

3. During the last round of contract negotiations, the administration attempted to impose a unilateral change whereby the position of department chair would be held by an administrator appointed by the Provost rather than by a faculty member elected by the faculty. According to the administration's document "Department Chair Responsibilities," distributed to the faculty on February 25, 2013 (after the conclusion of contract negotiations), the administration continues to imagine the department chair as an administrator who will "[r]epresent the department in meetings called by appropriate administrators."

**If the administration accepts the principle that faculty representatives must be selected by the faculty, how can administrative department chairs appointed by the administration represent the faculty? How can the removal of such positions from the faculty "advance" Shared Governance?**

4. During the last round of contract talks, the administration proposed the removal from the *Faculty Handbook* of the section regarding faculty participation on Search Committees for President. The AGB's "Statement" reads, "The process for selecting a new president should provide for participation of constituents, particularly faculty; however, the decision on appointment should be made by the board." The AAUP declares, "The selection of a chief administrative officer should follow upon a cooperative search by the governing board and the faculty."

**How does the administration's action with regard to Search Committees for President accord with the principles of Shared Governance?**

5. On July 16, 2012, the University Community was informed of the membership of the Search Committee for Vice President of Development and Alumni Relations. This list included two faculty

members who had been appointed to the committee without an election and without any consultation with elected faculty representatives. Fr. Quinn referred to these committee members as “faculty representatives.”

**How do these administrative actions accord with the principles of Shared Governance?**

6. During contract negotiations, the University hired as its lead negotiator Nicholas DiGiovanni, an attorney who published a pamphlet entitled “Negotiating a Faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement” (2005), in which he advises administrations to use financial incentives to encourage faculty to sell off their Shared Governance rights. Mr. DiGiovanni counsels, “a university is better served by trading money for strong management language.” During negotiations, the University offered the faculty merit pay while at the same time seeking to eliminate faculty department chairs and remove faculty members from Search Committees for President.

**If the University is dedicated to advancing Shared Governance, why did it hire and take the advice of an attorney who advocates reducing the faculty’s Shared Governance rights?**

7. Over the past few years, many faculty have observed that the University seems to be moving toward a corporate, top-down conception of governance. For example, listed first among the job duties of department chairs in the administration’s Department Chair Concept was the following responsibility: “Serving as the academic leader of the department, including determining the vision and goals of the department, and bringing those goals into productive alignment with the vision and goals of the School or College, or Library, and of the University.” According to this arrangement, top administrators determine the “vision” of the University, which trickles down to the various colleges and then is imposed upon the faculty by their administrative department chairs, whose job it is to bring such departments in line with the “visions” of the levels above them. The AGB, in a passage quoted in question #1 above, advises that “universities have a tradition of both academic freedom and constituent participation—commonly called “shared governance”—that is strikingly different from that of business.”

**How does the University’s move toward a corporate, top-down model of governance accord with the principles of Shared Governance?**

8. The AGB’s “Affirming” document advises that “it is appropriate for the board’s decision-making process to include a flow of information and ideas to and from the faculty, who can provide much-needed perspective on circumstances and options.” Currently, there is no mechanism by which the University of Scranton faculty can initiate communications with its Board of Trustees in order to participate in its decision-making process. The AGB also acknowledges that at some institutions, we may observe “the presence of one or more students, faculty, or staff as members of the board.”

**Would the administration support a change to the University By-laws whereby two faculty members would serve as non-voting members on the Board of Trustees?**

9. The faculty acknowledge that the University has, on many occasions, solicited advice from the faculty about decisions facing the institution. However, it seems to some faculty that this consultation sometimes occurs late in the decision-making process, after the administration has already committed itself to a course of action, and therefore the faculty’s suggestions do not have a tangible effect on the administration’s behavior.

**By what process does the administration determine which issues to bring to the faculty, which faculty bodies to consult, and when in the decision-making process to consult with the faculty?**

10. The University is hiring non-tenure-track faculty (lecturers, faculty specialists, and adjuncts) in increasing numbers, and these contingent faculty members are not protected by academic freedom to the same degree as tenured faculty.

**What steps can the University administration take to insure that such faculty members may participate openly in Shared Governance without endangering their employment status?**