Faculty Senate Steering Committee  
Tuesday, October 2, 2012  
Meeting Minutes

Present: Joan Shapiro (Pres.), Mark Rahdert (Vice Pres.), Tricia Jones (Secy.), Paul LaFollette (Past-Pres.), Kurosh Darvish (Engr), Deborah Howe (SED), Forrest Huffman (FSBM), Michael Jackson (STHM), Michael Jacobs (Pharm), Chip Jungreis (TUSM), Jim Korsh (CST), Michael Sachs (CHP), Joseph Schwartz (CLA), Jeffrey Solow (BCMD), Karen Turner (SMC), Doug Wager (TFMA), David Waldstreicher (Fac. Herald), Steve Newman (Fac. Herald), Cheryl Mack (Coord.)

Absent: Cheri Carter (SSW), Stephanie Knopp (Tyl), Catherine Schifter (Educ), David Sonenshein (Law)

1. Call to order:  
Meeting was called to order at 1:04pm.

2. Minutes Approved:  
It was moved, seconded and unanimously voted to approve the FSSC meeting minutes from 9/25/2012.

3. Vice President’s Report:  
Mark Rahdert (Law) Vice-President of the Faculty Senate gave his report on Committees. The first committee was the Committee on the Status of Faculty of Color. Mark mentioned that the committee is seriously in need of members and reminded FSSC that all members to this committee are appointed by FSSC. There is one nominee, Lee Kenneth Richardson, NTT (TFMA). Doug Wager (TFMA) spoke highly in favor. It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted to approve Mr. Richardson’s appointment to the committee.

The second committee was the Library Committee, which has 3 current members and needs new participants. Paul Swann (TFMA) (Full Professor) has indicated his interest in serving on the committee. Karen Turner (SMC) spoke highly in favor. It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted that Paul Swann be appointed to the committee.

The next topic of discussion was the Committee on Administrative and Trustee Appointments (CATA). Mark indicated that he has been in touch with current CATA members to ask someone to convene a meeting and have the committee select a chair. He mentioned that CATA needs members; 10 are authorized and we currently have 7. The current membership has a good array from different colleges but all members are male. We need to get people nominated quickly. CATA is an appointed committee. There was discussion about the importance of this committee and the need to have more time for the committee to be constituted and to participate in search committee processes.
4. President’s Report:

Joan Shapiro, President of the Faculty Senate, remembered Mark Haller, Professor of History who recently passed. Michael Sachs mentioned the importance of having speakers acknowledge him at the upcoming Representative Faculty Senate Meeting on Tuesday, October 9th.

Joan mentioned a recent meeting with Stephanie Ives and members of her office and the importance of having them come to a future FSSC meeting.

Diane Maleson and Betsy Leebron Tutelman have asked Joan if we could have a survey link (survey monkey) to Senate Listserv to gather info from faculty. There was some brief discussion of survey monkey but this was ended with the arrival of the guest.

5. Guest, President Richard Englert:

President Englert gave everyone a warm welcome and began with the primary reason for his visit, the Provost Search. He explained that he has talked at length with Incoming President Theobald about his ideas and that they have decided it will be an internal search only. Some of the reasons for this decision are that (1) President Theobald is from outside Temple and he wants a provost who knows Temple faculty and students. (2) He doesn’t want a 2-year learning curve for both he and the new Provost in terms of coming to know Temple. President Englert indicated that he agrees. (3) President Theobald wants to get the Dean’s searches going quickly and have them resolved as soon as possible. We need a Provost on line to attract the best new deans.

The time line for the Provost search will start in next couple of weeks. The goal is to have a February 1 recommendations from the search committee to him. The goal is to not have a search firm. The search committee will be staffed by Ann Nadol from Dick’s office and HR as needed. The Constitution of the Search Committee will probably be: 6 faculty, 3 tenure or tenure-track selected from a CATA generated list of 8-10; 1 non-tenure track faculty from a CATA list of 3; 1 additional Tenured or Tenure-Track faculty selected by FSSC, etc. from people who sit on CATA. 1 additional faculty member selected by Dick. 1 student and President of Temple Student Government is right person or his designee. 3 Deans selected by Dick. 1 University officer. 1 staff member. (within the Provost’s portfolio). Wants Chair to be a senior distinguished faculty member; chair selected by Dick from CATA pool, his selections or FSSC suggestion. Chair would be one of the 6. Committee would be a 12 person committee.

- Some faculty made suggestions for President Englert to consider and to discuss with President Theobald. Paul LaFollette (CST and Past-President of Faculty Senate) mentioned concerns that 2 of the groups have 1 person in them and raised the question about whether we should have 2 students, 2 staff. Michael Sachs suggested the other student could be a graduate student. Michael Jackson (FSB/HRM) suggested the need for an ethnic representative on the committee. He also suggested that the staff member that Dick suggests is outside the provost’s portfolio. Mark Rahdert raised a concern that drawing a member from CATA may confuse roles. He also mentioned that the chair should not be the member Dick selects to serve on the committee.

- No job description has been written yet, but should be done soon.

- All persons who meet rank of Full Professor and are tenured in academic department will be eligible. The goal would be to seek nominations and applications.

- Search committee will hold all names in the strictest of confidence.
-The Search committee will make recommendations of at least 2 candidates to President Theobald.

-Mark Rahdert raised the question of transparency – that there are processes we can use to convey information to the faculty without revealing the names. For example, we can let faculty know the number of candidates, ethnic and gender representation, processes used to interview, etc. He also gave the example of the Yale University Presidential search with faculty, student, alumni and staff liaisons (not serving on the committee but reaching out to constituent groups).

-Karen Turner (SMC) asked what kind of administrative experience is required for a candidate? President Englert said he wants to discuss this with President Theobald but he assumes Full rank and tenured status are the only absolute characteristics.

-Michael Jackson (STHM) is concerned how we do a fair background check and not reflect back on committee? How can we keep candidates identities secret and still do due diligence? (2) Do we have ability of recall of candidates if they are not representative of minorities/gender? (3) Will there be a residency requirement? (4) Person needs to have teaching background.

-Paul LaFollette asked whether President Englert has discussed with Theobald term of office?

-Kurosh Darvish (Engr) asked how many people have to nominate a candidate for that candidate to be in the pool?

-Jim Korsh (CST) asked at what point does a candidate need to indicate willingness to go beyond initial search committee interview? The response was that the search committee should have rights to determine process.

-Joan Shapiro indicated worry about October 15th deadline for CATA. President Englert asked FSSC to come back to him with recommended dates and timelines.

-Mark Rahdert suggested we revisit the idea of 360 degree evaluation; perhaps have an evaluation process for the new provost in place before new provost is selected. He also notes that at some point in the search process for President the faculty should have some chance to meet with candidates.

-President Englert clarified that members of the search committee cannot be candidates for the Provost position.

President Englert indicated that the Dean for the Library search is going forward; all other Dean searches in slow motion, but are assumed to be started after Provost search is complete.

6. Guests: Susan Smith, Special Counsel at Temple and Cameron Etezady, Associate Counsel at Temple University.

Joan Shapiro gave background. Tricia Jones (COE, Faculty Senate Secretary) mentioned some of the earlier discussion about perceived threat and intimidation of faculty and sense that FSSC is interested in learning from University Counsel’s office about policies and protection for faculty – especially for NTTs and adjuncts. Karen Turner gave a summary of the issues she mentioned in the last FSSC meeting. Joe Schwartz (CLA) mentioned that CLA executive committee has dealt with this and there are other issues as well.

Susan Smith mentioned that situations are fact specific and we need to deal with that. It is very difficult to deal with it. Diane Maleson (SVP for Faculty Affairs) is your primary resource from the faculty side. If you are lost, go to her. University Counsels office gives legal advice but not policy. David Waldstreicher (CLA) mentioned that adjuncts, TAs and NTTs are not well
informed. Susan indicated that Diane and Susan met with all chairs last year to discuss this. David Waldstreicher said the Faculty Herald is dealing with bringing the word out as well.

Cameron discussed the Code of Conduct. The process is accused oriented. It is a streamlined process in which evidence is reviewed and consequences are meted out. It is not a punitive process. Part of this process is communicating through 2-3 layers of administrators of what happened. Student has to be able to confront evidence. It has to be a case-by-case basis. And after a case is settled new issues have to start with clean slate. The other issue is a documentation issue. If documentation is imprecise there is an issue. Faculty can turn all evidence over to Student Conduct. There are emergency procedures (e.g., interim suspension) where discretion for that is given to Stephanie Ives as Dean of Students. It is a sanction without a hearing. The conduct code process has a hearing in all cases. There is a panel of 3-5 people, with at least one faculty member. They do a good job. The standard of proof is “more likely than not.” The problem is the sanctioning. Faculty won’t know what happened. If there is threat of violence there are exceptions to FERPA that notes that.

- Preventing a student from enrolling in a certain class is not provided for in the policy.
- We do not have a policy to protect faculty from students.
- Several faculty recommended that we should take this issue to Faculty Senate.
- Susan and Cameron distributed the reference guide for helping troubled students.
- Tricia Jones suggested we look at other model systems (e.g. the UGS systems) to learn from their best practices.

7. Old Business:
None

8. New Business:
None

9. Adjournment:
It was moved, seconded and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 3:09pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tricia S. Jones
Faculty Senate Secretary