Faculty Senate Steering Committee
Meeting Minutes
April 16 2013

Attendance:
Present: Joan Shapiro (Pres.), Mark Rahdert (Vice Pres.), Tricia Jones (Secy.), Paul LaFollette (Past-Pres.), Kenneth Boberick (DENT), 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), Michael Sachs (CHP), Catherine Schifter (Educ), Jeffrey Solow (BCMD), Howard Spodek (CLA), Karen M. Turner (SMC), Cheryl Mack (Coord.)

Absent: Cheri Carter (SSW), Deborah Howe (SED), David Sonenshein (Law), Doug Wager (TFMA)

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

2. Approval of Minutes:
It was moved, seconded and unanimously approved to accept the minutes of the April 9, 2013 FSSC meeting with minor changes.

3. President’s Report:
President of the Faculty Senate, Joan Shapiro, gave a brief report. She told FSSC that she would be sending out an invitation from President Theobald for members to attend a luncheon with Michelle Lai (April 29, noon -1:30 to a meeting of Smith Consulting group) to talk about plans for buildings and the future of physical campus. Attendees will be given lunch at the Diamond Club. They want every college or school to be represented. The President is calling this the Master Plan.

Cheryl Mack, Faculty Senate staff, reported that she sent out a revised FSSC and Senate meetings schedule for 2013-2014 and invited members to get back to her with conflicts next week.

4. Vice-President’s Report:
Mark Rahdert, VP of the Faculty Senate has some brief items for meetings.
- Mark indicated that Anna Peak has requested to serve on the Faculty Herald committee. It was moved, seconded and unanimously approved to appoint Anna to this position.

- Mark reminded FSSC members that he has asked members to send him their thoughts on the 5 top agenda items for next year.

- Mark also mentioned updates on Bylaws expiration. Several FSSC members indicated that their colleges have bylaws that have expired and they are uncertain what that means. Some of those
colleges have revised bylaws and sent them forward to administration or University Counsel but have not heard back.

Joan Shapiro indicated that she has sent the package of information concerning Guidelines for Collegial Assemblies and bylaws to President Theobald but not has heard back yet.

5. **Guests from TUGSA**

Two student officers from the Temple University Graduate Student Association visited to discuss the issue of partial appointments and the position of the TUGSA union. They explained that partial appointments affect graduate students in terms of economics (benefits and wages, tuition remission), academic ability, and time to degree. Half-time appointment is teaching one class rather than two; quarter time is grading or proctoring. FSSC comments and questions are indicated below with responses in brackets [ ].

Mark Rahdert (LAW) asked whether this was a university wide issue and what they thought were the justifications? [Some colleges are doing more than others; more likely for TAs than RAs. They think the goal is to be benevolent – give more students something. These are decentralized decisions—lines given to departments and departments making decisions how to split them.]

Michael Sachs (CHPSW): Maybe RCM will affect lines given and use of this practice? [Lines already given out by colleges.]

Steve Newman (CLA): This is probably related to the Gradjunct rule – can’t teach unless on a TA line. If the gradjunct rule is revoked how will that affect this situation? What do you want this body to do? [We’d like a letter of support; we believe that departments should allow in those they can fund.]

Michael Jackson (STHM): What about the graduate extern program? These students are getting compensation, but they are not covered by TUGSA. [Somewhere between 13 and 20% are on partial appointments.]

Tricia Jones (COE): Perhaps one size doesn't fit all – the “partial” policy makes good sense in some colleges. [Perhaps, we haven’t really attended to that]. Have you collected any data from graduate students in terms of how they feel about this policy? [No. Getting that data is difficult.]

Steve Newman: Any letter should reflect differences among colleges. In CLA there has been an attempt to discourage TAs as section leaders and encourage them as graders. The needs of graduate students need to be kept in mind.
[We have sent a letter to President Theobald, but have not received a response yet. We haven’t talked to Provost Dai.]

5. **Preliminary and Interim Report from the Task Force on Faculty Governance:**

Tricia Jones, chair of the task force, talked with FSSC about the preliminary work that the task force has accomplished. The interim report of the task force is attached to these minutes. Tricia encouraged FSSC members to send feedback about any of the thoughts they have about the
various committees and indicated that the task force will be attempting to contact committee chairs for interviews and to gather existing committee reports.

6. Call to Adjourn:
It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved to adjourn at 3:02pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tricia S. Jones
Faculty Senate Secretary

Interim Report
Task Force on Shared Governance
Faculty Senate Steering Committee
Submitted April 16, 2013

Members: Tricia Jones (Chair), Deborah Howe, Stephanie Knopp, Jim Korsh and Paul LaFollette

The Task Force was charged with tasks including but not limited to the following:
• Summarize the work that the Senate has conducted in the past two years to review and improve shared governance (e.g., revisions to Senate by-laws, development of principles for collegiate assembly by-laws, support of the revisions of tenure and promotion guidelines, creation of service awards, etc.)
• Review current shared governance processes and policies
• Suggest optimal shared governance processes in the new structures resulting from the restructuring decisions in 2011-2012
• Review current Senate committee structures to assess need for revision of number, size, scope and/or staffing of committees
• Communicate and foster a culture of shared governance among junior and senior faculty

Overview of Work Conducted:
The task force has met three times (March 4, April 9, April 12) to address a series of issues. The following is a brief report of their considerations.

Emphasizing Guidelines for Collegial Assemblies: In the March 4 meeting the primary focus was the issue of having the new administration consider the Guidelines for Collegial Assemblies document that was created and approved by the FSSC last spring 2012. The task force made this suggestion at the March 4 FSSC meeting and subsequent to that action the FSSC moved forward with that action and has presented that request to President Theobald.

Considering a Revision of Faculty Senate Committees: In the April 9 and April 12 meetings, the task force concentrated on looking at our current committees. They approached this through the following:
• Reviewing and classifying committees as Critical, Important, Moderately Important, Questionable.
• Considering the reduction of the number of committees by subsuming some committees under others
• Identify committees to eliminate. If so, which ones and why?
• Identify other changes you might recommend (e.g., reducing size of the committees, changing
• Setting clearer expectations/requirements for meeting or reporting for committees, etc.)

In terms of prioritizing committees, the preliminary thinking is that committees can be ranked in three tiers. We did this in order to have a sense of where to put our emphasis initially. The general sense was that we have too many committees and we need to try and be disciplined in streamlining and reducing these. The following are the rankings for standing committees:

Tier (1) Extremely Important: The consensus was that we should concentrate at least initially on review and revision of these committees to strengthen their membership and operation.
• Budget Review Committee
• EPPC
• Personnel
• RPPC
• Sabbatical
• UTPAC
• GEEC

Tier (2) Important but not Essential: The consensus was that these committees tend to be more critical for more limited functions and/or at certain times but not all. Some of these are advisory only, were once Senate committees but have morphed into bodies that are administratively controlled, or have no elected positions for faculty.
• Bargaining Units Liaison Committee (appointed only)
• CATA (advisory only)
• International Programs Committee
• Faculty Herald
• Library Committee
• Intercollegiate Athletics (Consultation only, not senate committee)
• Student Feedback Forms Committee (once Senate standing and not admin run)
• Honors Oversight Committee (need to clarify the charge)
• University Invention and Patents Committee (need to clarify charge and function under new research administration)
• University Press Board Review (unclear how this committee is more than an editorial review board)

Tier (3) Not Essential: Potential Targets for Elimination or Merger:
Committee on the Status of Faculty of Color*
Committee on the Status of Women*
*(maybe combine these and/or make them Interest Groups rather than committees since they don’t have policy making functions)*
Community Learning Network* (make Interest Group)
Lectures and Forums (Keep since it has a budget allocation and distributes money)
Faculty Oversight Committee (Inactive and ad hoc; can be used as an ad hoc committee when needed but should not be a standing committee)
Student Publication Board (unclear why this is a faculty senate committee)
University Research and Creative Awards Committee (Provost Committee; is involved in making teaching awards, etc.)
Student Award Selection Committee (eliminate – doesn’t seem to have a function since colleges give their own college/school specific student awards)

The task force also considered the **ad hoc committees** listed on the faculty senate web site and initially recommended the following:

- Quality of Faculty Life – recommendation to disband
- Faculty Handbook Committee – recommendation to disband (there was also discussion about the degree to which the faculty handbook is an administration document and that it is unclear who has authored it. And the handbook seems to be extremely out of date)
- Student-Faculty Liaison Committee – recommendation to disband

**General Thoughts:** The task force also found initially that the lists of committee members were not always complete, there was no listing of current chairs for all committees, and the reporting structures and processes were unclear. There is a need for more foundational information before specific recommendations for motions can be made to FSSC:

- For all Tier 1 and 2 committees, identify the current chairs and interview them to get a better sense of what is happening and how effective the committees are – what are the issues.
- For all Tier 1 and 2 committees clarify the full membership.
- Add ad hoc committees (like GenEd Liaison Committee) to the list of ad hocs; ask FSSC members which ones they know of that are operating and should be listed
- Talk to Diane Maleson about the Faculty Handbook situation to see about authorship, recency, etc., so we can decide whether to keep and revise the Faculty handbook committee or not