Faculty Senate Steering Committee  
October 16, 2012  
Minutes

Present: Joan Shapiro (Pres), Mark Rahdert (Vice Pres.), Tricia Jones (Secy.), Paul LaFollette (Past-Pres.), Klara S. Alperstein (Dent.), Cheri Carter (SSW), Kurosh Darvish (Engr), Forrest Huffman (FSBM), Michael Jackson (STHM), Michael Jacobs (Pharm), Chip Jungreis (TUSM), Stephanie Knopp (Tyl), Jim Korsh (CST), Steve Newman (Fac. Herald), Catherine Schifter (Educ), Joseph Schwartz (CLA), Jeffrey Solow (BCMD), Karen Turner (SMC), Doug Wager (TFMA), Cheryl Mack (Coord.)

Absent: Deborah Howe (SED), Michael Sachs (CHP), David Sonenshein (Law), David Waldstreicher (Fac. Herald)

1. Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 1:01pm.

2. Approval of Minutes:
The minutes of October 2nd were reviewed. Two changes were suggested. (1) “Ann Nadol” should be changed to “Anne Nadol.” (2) On p. 3 of the minutes the statement, “He also notes that at some point in the search process for President the faculty should have some chance to meet with candidates” should be changed to “He also notes that at some point in the search process for Provost the faculty should have some chance to meet with candidates.” With these changes it was moved and seconded to accept the minutes and the minutes were unanimously approved.

3. Guests:
Frank Friedman (CST), member of the Task Force on the Freeh Report, visited FSSC to discuss the Temple University Institutional Integrity Report. He gave an overview of the committee process and recommendations and an update of where the process stands. He reported that he is not sure what is going on after the committee completed its work. The purpose of the committee was to look at Temple from the perspective of the Freeh report and make sure TU was “clean” in terms of policy and procedures; to insure proper treatment of minors with regard to Temple related activities. A second major goal was to consider how we convey to others what we do to support minors; to make more visible those who are responsible for monitoring and protecting minors. Parents and community members should know how seriously Temple takes this. Now a concern is not stopping at this point. How do we scale this up to apply not just to minors but to all situations where there might be abuse, misconduct, etc.? How do we take a look at the entire culture to make sure we are clean? He said that, in his opinion, it is pretty clear, looking at the Freeh report, that the problems started at the top in Penn State and recommended readers look at Chapter 10 in the Freeh report. The chapter applies to most if not all HEIs including Temple.

Catherine Schifter (COE) mentioned that background checks are required for all folks in COE who work with children and thought it was a great idea, even though slightly frustrating. Frank agreed that top administration was concerned that we do what we need to do to guarantee maximum protection. Paul LaFollette (CST) mentioned that when all is done he hopes we will all be informed of what the policies are and that we are clearly told where we can find this information. Frank agreed that infrastructural support, information provision, and oversight were critical concerns. Catherine Schifter mentioned that if the university has this as a requirement it may expedite faculty’s ability to get these clearances.

Chip Jungreis (TUSM) mentioned that inappropriate behavior is bad no matter when it happens and who it comes from. We need a broader message that if something is inappropriate we need to have a small set of core numbers that are all-purpose for reporting things of concern. Frank agreed that the idea of a “go-to” person or office is essential. Frank suggested that this contact information should be available on the front home page of the university web site.
Doug Wager (TFMA) mentioned that teachers in the School District of Philadelphia [SDP] know what to do when things like this occur. We need a similar system. Cheryl Mack, Faculty Senate staff, asked whether there was a student ombuds system in place. Paul LaFollette suggested we should consider having one university person who is point-of-contact. Tricia Jones (COE and Faculty Senate Secretary) suggested a 311 system like the City of Philadelphia has developed. Frank mentioned that the committee took the need to open up these issues seriously and discussed specifically the need for an Office of Institutional Integrity. The campus community needs to be reminded that this is an important issue. Training is an important part of this.

Eleanor Myers (School of Law and Faculty Athletic representative) reported that the committee reviewed the Cleary Act reports from the last several years. Cleary Act statistics are reported if they are credible reports; and they reviewed the process for getting those reports into crime statistics that get published. Not all reports go on the crime log if someone does not deem a report credible. They added requirement that auditors look at reports that don’t make it to the log (at least a random sample). They also recommended that more people make those judgments. Only one person does that now.

One possibility is to go to the HEART office (Health Education and Awareness Resource Team). This is the office that is charged with handling this report. A number of people on the Task Force argued to broaden the scope of the task force report. The current report document says “should consider” having an Integrity Office and having that office develop a protocol for handling these issues.

Both Frank and Eleanor indicated that are concerned about the lag time between end of committee work and when the new President comes on. The Board indicated that they were considering a focus on transparency in the spring. There was general discussion about how important it is to move this issue forward in a timely manner.

Joe Schwartz (CLA) expressed his opinion that the Office of Integrity is a good idea; we need a more centralized response. But, he also indicated that dissemination has to be through department chairs who distribute this to teaching staff every semester.

Michael Jackson (STHM), who is a consultant to SDP, mentioned that they inform employees of safety and reporting protocols by mandated in-service for all SDP employees. Doug Wager said a large percentage of our work force that is adjunct and the proportion of the student body they deal with makes it even more difficult.

Tricia Jones asked if there were best practices at other universities that we could review and suggested the Faculty Senate could sponsor a colloquium. Joan Shapiro (COE and Faculty Senate President) and Paul LaFollette thought about inviting Frank and Eleanor to a Representative or University Faculty Senate meeting. Karen Turner (SMC) reinforced the idea of the chairs disseminating information.

Eleanor mentioned that there should be a centralized place that reviews programs in the university that require clearances and have background training. She also mentioned that the enforcement of mandated clearances is spotty. One recommendation is to have a review of those policies and protocols. We need to review the act that governs this. She returned to the “best practices question” and reported that the committee put together a Blackboard web site with critical information and best practices. Penn State had wonderful site where they were posting this. Their thought was that if there is an office established the best practices/content information would be forwarded to them.

Frank Friedman added that it would be helpful if the Faculty Senate prioritized the recommendations from the University Integrity Report and issued a statement of how important it is for us to address these recommendations.
Paul LaFollette asked “Do you see this Office of Institutional Integrity including intellectual integrity, research integrity, etc. – having a broader responsibility?” Eleanor indicated that TUHS has a unified compliance office that covers many of these things, but that the committee was not talking about the broader sense of integrity. But, if you have a single point of contact this office could field other issues and redirect them to the appropriate source. There was a clarification that a point of contact is not necessarily the place of action. A single point for reporting sexual assault allows for looking at paper trails and multiple reports; it builds knowledge and credibility. Stephanie Knopp (Tyler) stated that as a department chair she is concerned about this in terms of liability as well.

Frank said that Temple should get the message out to parents that we take this seriously. Paul LaFollette stated it is liberating to have seriously delineated policies that can be enforced. Eleanor mentioned there is a virtue in clarity but a tension with making things too stringent.

The guest conversations ended with questions about next steps – What should we be doing with recommendations? Should we prioritize recommendations? President Richard Englert’s memo to the faculty specifically mentioned following up. Should we as FSSC be asking what follow-up and when? There was a general discussion about having FSSC identify top priority issues. Frank mentioned that the committee grappled with false reports. He implores us to look on page 3 to see who was on the committee. It opened his eyes to the need of non-faculty represented on the committee. They are needed.

4. Vice-President’s Report
Mark Rahdert (Law, Faculty Senate Vice-President) reported on the progress for CATA and nominations for the Provost Search Committee. We have already received nominations for the search committee and we will refer those to CATA. We do need NTT nominees for the committee. We also need members of FSSC willing to serve. Karen Turner (SMC) asked if the deadline for submissions is Friday. Mark reminded FSSC that, for CATA, we also need members. CATA is still short a couple of members. He reviewed that we have 4 committee candidates to consider for appointment to committees today. The four faculty were unanimously approved for appointment to senate committees:

1. David Elesh (CLA), Library Committee.
2. Robert Shuman (Tyler/Arch), Library Committee.
3. Parsaoran Hutapea (Engr), CATA.
4. Shannon Miller (CLA), Committee on Status of Women.

Mark also mentioned that we still need faculty nominations for UTPAC, RPPC, and the University Sabbatical Committee.

5. President’s Report
Joan Shapiro, (COE) Faculty Senate President, welcomed new FSSC member, Klara Alperstein, (Dentistry). Joan asked Michael Jackson (STHM) to bring us up to date on the Fresh Brunch. Michael reported that they are still waiting on nominations from 6 schools or colleges and waiting on a letter from 1 college. He reminded us that the deadline is tomorrow and will be extended to Friday. Jim Korsh (CST) mentioned they are in the process of coming up with a nominee. But next year we have to decide on the process we want followed by the schools and colleges and specify it.

The following colleges or schools have not sent in their award winners:
- School of Environmental Design
- College of Health Professions
- School of Media and Communications
- College of Science and Technology
- School of Social Work
- School of Dentistry has indicated the awardee but we still need their letter of support.
The brunch will be held in the MBA Commons, 7th Floor Alter Hall, 11am October 30th. Please ask the FSSC members to make sure they come.

Joan asked for advice on invited presenters for the next Representative Senate Meeting, Thursday, November 8th. The general discussion supported inviting Diane Maleson, Susan Smith and Cameron Etezady to recap their FSSC presentations made earlier this semester. Joan wants to make sure she tries to support the “2 week presentation notice” rule that was discussed by Greg Urwin (CLA) at the last Representative Senate meeting.

Joan also reported on the celebration at the Chairman of the Board’s dinner. Paul LaFollette was honored by the Board of Trustees for doing a great job on the President’s Search Committee. Chip Jungreis suggested we invite the trustees into meetings and the classrooms. Mark Rahdert commented that we have another chance to make this same impression in the Provost’s search committee. Joan and Paul are meeting with Patrick O’Connor on Thursday, October 18th. Joan asked for suggestions of topics they might raise at this meeting. The following ideas were generated:
- provost’s search
- reviews of deans/administrators
- no endowment/institutional development
(put together a list of events that we could invite entire board to)
- importance of teaching as well as research
- obsession with rankings
- institutional advancement and fund-raising—what is our plan??
- invite board member chairing facilities and advancement; bring them on campus

Joan also indicated that Senate is thinking of honoring people retiring who have served in the senate.

6. New Business:
Karen Turner mentioned the Institute for Survey Research and suggested that FSSC should spread the word about this valuable service.

7. Old Business:
Tricia Jones asked whether we would have time to address the committee looking into faculty governance pursuant to the mention of this in Provost Englert’s White Paper document from Spring 2012. Joan Shapiro noted that that has been on her list to attend to but we definitely need to move forward with it and promised to try and include it in the next meeting.

8. Adjournment:
It was moved, seconded and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 3:03pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tricia S. Jones,
Faculty Senate Secretary