Faculty Senate Steering Committee
October 23, 2012
Minutes

Present: Joan Shapiro (Pres), Mark Rahdert (Vice Pres.), Tricia Jones (Secy.), Paul LaFollette (Past-Pres.), Cheri Carter (SSW), Kourosh Darvish (Engr), Deborah Howe (SED), Forrest Huffman (FSBM), Michael Jackson (STHM), Michael Jacobs (Pharm), Stephanie Knopp (Tyl), Jim Korsh (CST), Steve Newman (Fac. Herald), Michael Sachs (CHP), Catherine Schifter (Educ), Joseph Schwartz (CLA), Jeffrey Solow (BCMD), David Sonenshein (Law), Karen Turner (SMC), Doug Wager (TFMA), David Waldstreicher (Fac. Herald), Cheryl Mack (Coord.)

Absent: Klara S. Alperstein (Dent.), Chip Jungreis (TUSM)

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

2. Minutes Approved:
The minutes from the FSSC meeting of 10/16/2012 were moved, seconded and unanimously approved without changes.

3. President’s Report:
Joan Shapiro, President of the Faculty Senate gave her report. She began by discussing the possible guests for the Representative Faculty Senate Meeting on November 8, 2012. She noted that several guests who have already presented to the FSSC are very interested in presenting in early winter 2013 but are working on projects that are better presented in January than in the upcoming meeting. She suggested that we use the November 8th meeting to:
- invite faculty to share ideas for Provost search
- invite faculty to think about issues President Theobald should address from faculty perspective when he takes office

The FSSC members agreed with these ideas and it was mentioned that this use of the November 8th meeting would be responsive to previously expressed need to have more faculty discussion in RFS and would provide an opportunity to contact faculty in colleges to get more input through their representative senators at the meeting.

Joan also reported on her recent conversations with President-Elect Theobald. In their discussions it has been mentioned that there will probably be a new Vice-President for Marketing position; that this will be separated out from the current position that combines these duties with Institutional Advancement. President-Elect Theobald believes this will give more emphasis to marketing efforts.

Joan also mentioned that Doug Priest, an administrator from Indiana University, will be visiting Temple University November 5th and 6th to share information about Responsibility Centered Management (RCM). There was an ensuing discussion about problems with RCM
(unwanted charges for services, excessive charge for services, no taxation without representation). Several FSSC members noted their concerns about the process that a unit is responsible for tax on its revenue stream. Some also noted the entrepreneurial side is that revenue generation is supported. A question was raised whether we have heard from the faculty senate at Indiana University [IU] about how this has affected IU. Paul LaFollette, past President of the Faculty Senate, mentioned that he talked with the previous chairman of the IU collegiate assembly and they talked about RCM. The IU faculty member was enthusiastic about how it was working there. Paul also reported that the Presidential Search Committee discussed the issues of RCM extensively with the new president. It was further suggested that we use the November 8th Representative Faculty Senate meeting to have faculty generate questions about RCM that they would like answered.

4. **Vice-President’s Report:**
   Mark Rahdert, Vice-President for the Faculty Senate, reported on the progress with committee elections and appointments. The CATA committee has convened and has a chair. There are 28 nominations (including nominations for 6 NTTs) for the Provost search committee. The list of nominations is very diverse in terms of colleges and schools represented, gender and race, and level of faculty rank. CATA will meet on Wednesday and send their recommendations for nominations on Friday. He asked CATA to let us know who was nominated.

   Mark indicated that he is planning to put out requests for candidates for RPPC, UTPAC and Sabbatical committees. He encouraged FSSC members to review rules for members of these committees on the faculty senate web site. He noted that there has been a request for more representatives from social sciences and humanities on RPPC.

   The EPPC chair is retiring, and Mark asked if we can make plans to prepare for that by having FSSC fill that position by appointment. The general response was positive. It was also suggested that we inform the committee members of our intention to make an appointment before January so that the committee can elect a new chair in January.

5. **President Englert Guest Presentation:**
   President Englert visited the FSSC to inform us of the decision by Temple University administration to file a brief with the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board [PLRB] to request review of the department chair role and ask for an independent judgment about whether they belong in or outside of the bargaining unit. PLRB uses an objective process. This will probably take many months – 6-18 months. Technically this review process is called unit clarification under the law. He shared that he had met earlier with Art Hochner and TAUP representatives to discuss this with them. He explained that the TAUP contract started in 1973 with AAUP. At that time chairs were defined as part of the bargaining unit and have been ever since. However, it is the view of the administration that the role of department chairs has changed; they are closer to managers and supervisors than faculty by definition of their roles. And, he explained that with more decentralization there is the more budgetary control to chairs which exacerbates these trends.
Several members of the FSSC reacted. One member noted that this decision to file sends a message; that the chair change is symbolic. Chairs have always been seen as a faculty representative, a faculty advocate. If the PLRB rules in favor of the Temple administration petition this clearly changes that. And, regardless of the ruling, simply filing the petition marks a change in how the administration sees that role. If department chairs are not the faculty advocates in the reporting structure, who is? Who can be? Another member stated that the faculty have known the administration has wanted to do this for a long time. Why now? Dick’s response – why not now?

One member noted that PLRB is a public proceeding and asked whether filings will be transparent and available to faculty? One noted that this decision would make the chair more in the Associate/Assistant Dean situation that could make the current Associate Dean/Chair structure redundant.

There was a general discussion of the need for the administration to look more carefully at the implications of this decision for various units in the university. It was noted that there are a wide variety of chair models with various levels of support or release. All chairs are not equal in this university and a blanket ruling without sensitivity to how it will affect various units could do more harm than good. One member wants to be assured that university is doing a thorough study of what situations of chairs across the university are before taking this action.

6. **Guests on Student Discipline, Stephanie Ives, Dean of Students and Andrea Seiss, Associate Dean of Students:**

These two administrators came to FSSC to explain the policy and services associated with student discipline processes. Stephanie Ives began explaining that they operationalize policy and services. We need to know who they are so we can reach out to them. She said there are basic questions they help faculty deal with.

1. **Prevention:** How do you get a student to calm down right now? What do you do with the problem student?

2. **Intervention aspect:** What helps you manage that level of disruption? This would be the judicial part of it?

She referred to the Safety Nest document that was disseminated after Susan Smith’s visit to FSSC. This document is linked to the Teaching and Learning Center and comes from the Health Education office. She also mentioned the Civility Guide, which is available on the Counseling Services web site. It addresses how you can deal with a student who is disruptive. How can faculty use appropriate de-escalation strategies?

They then began to review in detail the Student Conduct Code that has over 20 violations in conduct codes. Their office can handle informal faculty consultations. A formal referral to the conduct office can be as simple as an e-mail in terms of who was involved and who may have witnessed the incident. An Administrative hearing may happen. When a complaint is made the Conduct administrator meets with the student and the student may be sanctioned. In some cases there are Board hearings (2 faculty run the hearings); these are reserved for more serious incidents. They listen to evidence and make a decision.
The FSSC members asked questions to clarify the process and the policies. Among those questions were: (1) How long does it take to go through this process? (2) What happens to protect the faculty member while this review process is ongoing? (3) Does Temple have clear policy in terms of serious behaviors (what some systems refer to as zero tolerance behaviors) that automatically invoke student removal until the case is reviewed?

The responses from Stephanie Ives to these questions indicated that there is a possibility of an interim suspension but only under conditions where there is a threat to the students or community or significant disruption. She indicated that only carrying weapons on campus was considered a zero tolerance behavior. Otherwise, her office deals with any offense on a case-by-case basis and faculty are not given special protection under these processes which are developed for focus on student behavior.

This sparked a general conversation about the concern of FSSC members that there are many faculty – especially adjuncts, NTTs, women and faculty of color, and certainly faculty who are in more than one of those categories – who are very concerned about lack of protection and are sometimes afraid to report these incidents for fear of retaliation. The FSSC members presented incidents they were aware of that support the perception that there is no real protection for faculty should a seriously disruptive or dangerous incident happen. Some members added that this is particularly true when you consider teaching that happens after 5pm when there are few resources or protections available and very few people to call for help. Situations are repetitive and faculty feel unprotected when those students come back into classes and are told that they have to do something else with that student. Stephanie Ives indicated that if faculty felt afraid to report or handle these incidents that the faculty should look to themselves and not her office for solution.

Some FSSC members suggested that perhaps there were opportunities for creative thinking and asked the guests whether they might join in some creative problem-solving efforts. FSSC members discussed the possibility of extending and clarifying the zero-tolerance behavior identification (much like that used in most educational institutions), considering interim suspensions for a particular class (thereby giving the impacted faculty member relief without affecting the rest of the student’s courses that semester), and talking with Temple police about protection possibilities for after-hours teaching situations. The FSSC also suggested that perhaps we should convene a subcommittee to delve more deeply into these issues and inquired whether these administrators may be willing to talk with the subcommittee. Stephanie and Andrea indicated they would be willing to meet with such a subcommittee if it were convened.

7. Adjournment:
   It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 3:10pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tricia S. Jones
Faculty Senate Secretary