Representative Senate Meeting  
March 17, 2010  
Minutes

1. **Call to Order:**  
The meeting began at 1:50 p.m.

2. **Guest: Provost Lisa Staiano-Coico**

Provost Lisa began by providing us with some updates. They were:

- The Middle States review was uniformly positive, although there is no official information at the present time;
- The Fox School of Business review received a wonderful response;
- Admissions are very positive for the Fall. Deposits are up by 9%, undergraduate transfers are up, and diversity is excellent with a 1,600 waiting list. There is no question that we will make a class of 4,100.
- Provost Lisa thanked Terry Halbert (Bus.) for the wonderful job she did as Director of General Education. There is a need, however, to appoint someone else to the position before Dr. Halbert goes on leave. The plan is to appoint someone by the beginning of May. The Search Committee will be chaired by Peter Jones, Senior Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, and there will be four faculty members: two nominated from the FSSC; one from the General Education Executive Committee (GEEC); one Area Coordinator; one Dean (preferably from a college that has a number of General Education courses); and one university administrator who is knowledgeable about teaching. The schedule is:
  - Publicize the position beginning next week;
  - Initiate joint announcements by Karen Turner and Provost Lisa;
  - Talk to colleagues who might be interested;
  - Need Faculty Senate Search Committee members’ names by March 30th;
  - Review candidates, once selected, with staff and students as well as faculty;
  - End the search process by April 29th and appoint a person by May;
  - Ask representative senate to recommend qualified candidates listing their strengths only;
  - Look for tenured, preferably a full professor internally, who has had experience teaching General Education classes and works well with undergraduates;
  - Find someone who can deal with controversial decisions and will not need to carry out research for promotion.

Provost Lisa welcomed questions from the floor.

- Art Hochner (Bus.) said that two colleges seem to have some conflicts with General Education. In the two colleges, the deans do not allow tenure track faculty to teach General Education. If tenured professors want to teach General Education, they must do so as overload. He asked: Will there be faculty on the committee who are non-tenured? In response, Provost Lisa was concerned about Art Hochner’s comments and asked that he contact her off-line. She has no problem with non-tenure track faculty serving on the search committee.
- Art Hochner also wanted to know when the University Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee would be meeting. Provost Lisa said on April 9th. The committee is waiting for
the Faculty Senate nominees for the committee to be chosen. This will be in place by April 5th.

- Frank Friedman (CST) commended the Provost for her attitude and enthusiasm towards General Education. However, he was not certain that this positive attitude transferred down to the deans. Frequently, deans have fixed resources and know where they want to place those monies. In response, Provost Lisa thought that the new budget model might help. She added that resources are given to deans for General Education courses.

Provost Lisa also mentioned that the new Senior Vice Provost for Research Administration and Graduate Education had been chosen. The name has not been made official but this individual was a strong candidate who will come on board on May 3rd.

3. Approval of the Minutes:
The Revised Minutes from the Representative Senate Meeting of February 16, 2010, were approved as submitted.

4. President’s Report: Karen M. Turner

President Turner asked that anyone willing to serve on the General Education Director Search Committee should send a paragraph, about why she or he would like to be a member as well as a Curriculum Vitae or a link to the CV by Tuesday, March 23rd, to Senate2@temple.edu

5. Vice President’s Report: Paul S. LaFollette

Vice President LaFollette said it was the easiest year to find candidates for committees. However, he still needs a couple of volunteers for the Educational Programs and Policies (EPPC) Committee. By next Wed., March 24th, he asked that interested faculty send a statement of interest and Curriculum Vitae to Cheryl Mack.

6. Shared Governance

President Turner began the discussion of shared governance by using a power point presentation. She presented the AFT and AAUP statements on this concept, and then she turned to the Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws. After this, she discussed some shared governance achievements from 2006, here at Temple, and the initiatives coming out of the 2009 FSSC Retreat with Provost Lisa. Finally, she mentioned a few shared governance challenges. Some terms of importance, she highlighted in yellow.

What follows is what was shown:

*Shared governance is the set of practices under which college faculty and staff participate in significant decisions concerning the operation of their institutions.*

(AFT/ "Shared Governance in Colleges and Universities")

*Faculty should have primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.*

(AAUP/ Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities)
I. FACULTY SENATE CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE II – POWERS

1. The Faculty Senate, both the University Senate and the Representative Senate, shall act as a body representative of the faculties of Temple University. Its concerns shall include all matters of University interest, which apply or may apply to more than one school. Its powers (more fully defined in Article III of the bylaws) shall be (a) consultation, (b) review, (c) ratification and (d) recommendation. In all cases where the exercise of one or more of these powers applies, the Senate and its committees shall be understood to be acting as advisor to the administration and the Board of Trustees.

3. The Faculty Senate shall have the responsibility and right, by the exercise of one or more of its powers, to advise the administration and the Board of Trustees on all matters of University policy, on all matters affecting the relations of the faculty of the University, and on all other matters of policy and administrative decision – making in which the faculty claims a reasonable advisement either through consultation or review and either at the initiation of the administration or at its own recognizance. The Senate, through the process of recommendation, may initiate advice to the administration and Board of Trustees on any matter of policy, decision and program.

II. FACULTY SENATE BYLAWS

ARTICLE III – DEFINITIONS

The following terms as used in the Constitution and the bylaws shall be defined as follows:

1. Consultation – The right to influence decisions before they are made by advising those legally responsible for making the decisions or with their executive agents.

2. Ratification – The act of affirming or rejecting a specific policy, decision, offer of appointment, and/or programs offered by the administration for advice by the Senate or one of its committees.

3. Recommendation – For purposes of the Faculty Senate, the recommending function shall be understood to be the initiation of advice on matters of University interest by the Senate to the administration and the Board of Trustees.

4. Review – The consideration of an existing policy, decision, and/or program for the purpose of the Senate’s advising on its retention, change, or disapproval.

Shared Governance Achievements (2006-present)

- President Hart’s inaugural address opened the possibilities of shared governance by creating more of a value-driven rather than goal-driven university
- Lisa Listens is a very effective monthly feedback process at Faculty Senate Meetings
- Academic Strategic Compass planning process included faculty involvement on many levels
- Videoconferencing to Ambler and HSC
- Available audio recordings of monthly senate meetings
- Ongoing Faculty Senate input in the 20/20 Plan
- Faculty Handbook revisions underway by faculty/admin committee
Fall 2009 Provost/FSSC Retreat Initiatives:

- A Conversation with Deans and FSSC – May 2010
- Five year bylaw reviews in schools/colleges
- Faculty governance survey
- New faculty orientation - shared governance a priority discussion item
- Dysfunctional Policies follow-up – anonymous comments submitted through The Faculty Herald
- Ongoing discussion on merit distribution and faculty notification process
- Fall 2010 University Service Awards Brunch
- Shared governance articles in the Faculty Herald developed/written by the President of the Faculty Senate and Provost
- Creation of a Faculty Leadership Institute
- Identify days and times when Faculty Senate can meet with fewer conflicts
- Discussions to involve “service mentors” in Schools and Colleges similar to the existing teaching and research mentors.

Shared Governance Challenges

- Institutionalizing accomplishments such as annual retreats with Provost staff and Deans
- Developing strategies for energizing faculty shared governance at the school and college level
- Encouraging more openness and exchange between the faculty and the Board of Trustees
- Empowering faculty to take the initiative to raise issues and concerns, and to make proposals, in a constructive fashion that does not interfere with our strengthening consultative relationships

After this presentation, President Turner and Vice-President LaFollette asked for comments from the Representative Faculty Senate related to shared governance. Faculty said the following:

- Art Hochner (Bus.) stated that shared governance was a very important topic. He was pleased to see the AFT statement, which he drafted, in Karen Turner’s presentation. He spoke of the Collegial Assembly Bylaws imposed in 2002, and the empowerment of the deans to run everything. He would like to see administrators as servants of faculty but it seems to be the other way around. Deans appeared to be taking on more and more decision-making. He pointed out that curriculum issues are very important for faculty participation and there should be a stronger say of faculty in academic staffing appointments at the central administration level. He went on to say that the increase of Non-Tenure Track Faculty needs to be addressed. He pointed out that adjuncts are approximately 1,300 in number, only slightly less than full-time faculty. He is especially concerned that Temple resources seem not to be going to the academic areas.

- Luke Kahlich (BCMD) expressed the concern that we can put up definitions over and over and agree to them, but as long as there are entities, such as deans, who can interpret and in fact redefine them, then they are not really effective.

Karen Turner (Pres.) asked: How can we create effective bylaw changes? How can we pass bylaws regarding collegial assemblies that are not run by deans? Why must deans approve bylaws? She mentioned that the university counsel is creating a new template that might be of interest once completed.
David Waldstreicher (Fac. Herald) stressed that open meetings are important. Deans should not run collegial assemblies. He mentioned that faculty members tend to be afraid to raise the issue.

Joan Shapiro (Secy.) stated that in the College of Education, the faculty had changed the bylaws twice since 2002. She said that her collegial assemblies were faculty-led and they managed the change processes. The new bylaws took into account the split in the college between those who did social science research and those who focused more on the humanities. In the bylaws, both forms were mentioned as important areas of scholarship and research.

Frank Friedman (CST) was concerned particularly as he has a good dean with different priorities from some of the faculty members. He felt that the varied priorities need to be discussed and that the review process needs intervention. Karen Turner thought that the new template might be helpful in this college.

Orin Chein (CST) worried about colleges where the faculty members were forced to accept standard bylaws. In some cases, the faculty had not moved quickly enough. He believes that if faculty members take initiative now, new bylaws might go through this time.

Paul LaFollette (V. Pres.) spoke of the good work that has been done by the Senate committees. He believed that with the ear of the Provost and President, it is partly the faculty’s job in the colleges and departments to make the appropriate changes. He pointed out that this administration is faculty-friendly, and he felt that there should be a greater sense of urgency to move towards shared governance.

Art Hochner (Bus.) was concerned that deans had far too much power. He would really like to see the new template and see if it will stimulate discussion on this topic of shared governance.

Bill Woodward (Law) does not see a way of measuring if the rhetoric is successful. He too would like to see a bylaw template that models shared governance. He asks: Is faculty participation increasing or decreasing?

Sue Dickey (CHPSW), at Ambler, mentioned that she is in her 30th year at Temple and in the past eight years, she has noticed a decline in shared governance.

Stephanie Knopp (Tyl.) said that Tyler had a different kind of governance structure. In her college, a dean does not act as a chair of the collegial assembly, and Tyler had new bylaws approved.

Roberts Sloan (SCT) asked: What are faculty initiatives that are warmly accepted? What is shared governance?

Orin Chein (CST) agreed with Bill Woodward in the decline of participation of faculty in governance. He hypothesized that perhaps it is due to the decline in tenure track faculty. Additionally, he thought that perhaps it is due to the fact that service is not appreciated.

Karen Turner (Pres.) said that when the new template is ready, she will bring it back to the Representative Faculty Senate.

7. **Unfinished Business:**

There was none.
8. New Business:

President Turner said that today was the final call for officers to be put on the Senate slate. She went over the nomination process:

- On January 26, 2010, Paul LaFollette sent an email asking for a call for nominations;
- On February 3, 2010, an email was sent to all collegial chairs with copies of the nominating forms;
- On March 1, 2010, the slate was then announced through an email. Faculty members were asked to put forth other nominees by today at noon or add them at this Representative Faculty Senate meeting.
- Following procedures, Karen Turner asked for nominations from the floor. Hearing none, she announced the following slate of officers:
  
  President: Marina Angel, Law (Fac. Petition);
  Paul LaFollette (Nominating Committee)
  
  Vice President: Joan Shapiro, Educ. (Nominating Committee)
  
  Secretary: Roberta Sloan, SCT (Nominating Committee)
  
- President Turner stated that the election would be announced at the end of March.

9. Adjournment:

The meeting ended at 3:05 p.m.

Joan P. Shapiro
Secretary