Faculty Senate Steering Committee Meeting  
April 5, 2011  
Minutes

**Present:**  
Paul S. LaFollette (Pres.), Joan Shapiro (V. Pres.), Joan Delalic (Engr.), Margaret Devinney (CLA), Deborah Howe (SED), Michael Jackson (STHM), Tricia S. Jones (Educ.), Charles Jungreis (Med.), Stephanie Knopp (Tyler), Jim Korsh (CST), Laurie MacPhail (Dent.), Douglas Wager (SCT), Cheryl Mack (Coord.)

**Absent:**  
Nora Alter (SCT) on leave, Adam Davey (CHPSW), Don Harris (Law), Luke Kahlich (BCMD), Mark C. Rahdert (Law) on leave, Charles Ruchalski (Pharm.), Jay Sinha (FSBM), Roberta Sloan (Sec'y), Karen Turner (Past President) on leave, David Waldstreicher (Fac. Herald).

**Call to Order:**  
The meeting was called to order at 1:05 pm.

**Approval of Minutes:**  
Approval of the minutes of the meeting on 28 March was postponed until the next meeting (12 April), when Secretary Roberta Sloan returns.

**President’s Report – Paul LaFollette:**  
President LaFollette reported that he and Senator Jim Korsh met with Vice President and Provost Richard Englert and Dean of the Fox School of Business Moshe Porat to discuss FSSC questions about the bylaws template.

He reported that there had not been seriously contentious issues, but Dean Porat’s primary objection to the FSSC suggestions concerning faculty governance, hinged on his view that when faculty are left to conduct business, they are slow and merely a few can impede progress. He wants to be able to appoint people who are good but perhaps not likely to run for office. In response, a Senator observed that this is indicative of dictatorial leadership.

LaFollette noted that VP Englert still wants all bylaws to be determined by the individual college, not by its collegial committee. LaFollette referred to the emphasis in the template on role of deans, and referred to our previous discussions that bylaws should be tied to the college, not a dean. In addition, Englert wants a single document for each school or college (i.e., not separate constitution and bylaws documents).

Senator Korsh noted that faculty should be able to make decisions without undue influence from administrators. And in response to a question concerning particular objections, LaFollette said that other specific objections had not been raised; and the focus issue was our idea that the assembly should be run by faculty.

Senator Jungreis brought up the fact that things are different in the Medical School, where assembly issues are exclusively academic. LaFollette explained that most assemblies also deal with strategic planning, merit, etc.

A lively discussion followed, which yielded the following issues and remarks:

- Among administrators, there seems to be no trust of faculty;
- The administration should provide specific reasons why the FSSC suggestions are impossible, as they claim. Is it that they are convinced by their original documents?
- Schools, especially those who have recently reviewed and revised, would not have to change them.
- There is only one dean on the administrative committee dealing with the Bylaws issues, and he is known to be most negative to the FSSC view.
We should invite deans to voice opinions, so we would get a broader understanding of their thinking. And if there is no agreement, we should flesh out what we have and send it out to all faculty members.

We should keep in mind that a college’s bylaws do not have to be approved by the dean.

President LaFollette had met again on 30 March with Vice President/Provost Englert about the proposed budget task force that FSSC had suggested: two members each from administration, faculty, budget committee, and TAUP. Englert approved, with one exception: he objected to TAUP appointing members to this committee because of contractual agreements—going outside usual communication agreements—these members would have to sign non-disclosure agreements.

Vice President Shapiro pointed out that many faculty belong to TAUP; therefore the task force will have representatives who are in the union.

LaFollette will get back to Englert about flexibility in representation and will continue working on this according to the rulings of University Counsel.

It was agreed that the main issue is enabling the task force so it can begin its work asap.

President LaFollette, who attended the budget rally yesterday, has decided to get in touch with presidents of other affected schools to propose working together. To be prepared for this, Vice President Shapiro urged us to keep in touch even after the term ends.

A discussion of comparative situations in Pennsylvania followed.

**Vice President’s Report – Joan Shapiro:**

Vice President Shapiro congratulated all election winners; she had written to non-winners, thanking them for running and encouraging them to join other committees, especially those that are appointed.

Senator Wager reported that he had been unable to access the list of vacant committees on the internet. He had encouraged colleagues to volunteer and they had reported not being able to find the information. Coordinator Mack explained: For the new Senate website, computer services had not transferred the information from old website; therefore, it is currently incomplete. She is working with students to complete the job. She will also check with Betsy Leebron-Tutelman about our last meeting of the year possibly being a lunch.

**Review of the University Senate Bylaws**

LaFollette proposed we proceed article by article and deal with questions as they arise.

Korsh noted the universal change in terminology to Representative Senate and Faculty Senate from Representative Faculty Senate and University Faculty Senate. This simplification provides clarity.

LaFollette: The new version of Article II tries to clear up process dealing to vacancies. Korsh explained that the changes in dates made it possible for all officers and committees to be in place by 1 July. Committees can elect chairs, etc. by 1 July. We had previously used this schedule, but it slid off course through the years. Therefore, this just returns to a more efficient procedure to get representatives and the Steering Committee in place by 1 July.

Article III: no changes.

Article IV.3: ”Committees” Instead of listing all standing committees in the bylaws, list them on web page, since they change often.

Any administrator who has faculty status may vote in university senate, but are not allowed to vote in the Representative Senate. LaFollette noted that the change in RPPC is due to the Graduate School’s no longer having a Dean.

In a brief discussion concerning the ability to remove non-performing members on committees, Korsh explained that the usual practice had been for the secretary to call the individual involved, note the lack of attendance, and ask if a replacement should be appointed.

Article 4.12. Senator Jungreis asked to change last phrase to “until the end of the TERM”
Senator Howe noted that making NTTs eligible for most committees is a notable change.

LaFollette will circulate this current document and bring it to the floor of the next Senate meeting. Shapiro and Devinney will proofread and Cheryl will add page numbers

Senator Jones, coordinator for the FSSC-Deans retreat, voiced concern that time is getting short and issues for the retreat have not yet been clarified, and that May 4 could be budget crisis time. Jones asked for advice, since they were to meet with Vice President Diane Maleson and Provost Englert after this FSSC meeting.

The discussion turned to whether we should postpone until Fall, or do we want to discuss before next year’s budgets are set.

LaFollette noted that this is a continuation of a projected series begun last year, so we should not postpone and lose momentum. We could discuss ways we can be helpful in the budget process, and not lose momentum; and can hear what they have to say.

Wager added that the relationship of deans to collegial assembly (as in bylaws) could be more consequential than ever if put to good use in a crisis oriented environment; and Shapiro added that this is an opportunity to talk through how budget decisions can include faculty input.

The meeting would last approximately three hours and include a maximum of 14 deans. Provost Englert is interested in learning the issues to be discussed and possible additional invitees (e.g., Collegial Assembly chairs).

Korsh suggested a possible 10-minute report by each, after which we might ask about interactions with their collegial assemblies.

Wager suggested going further and asking the deans how they consult, or are planning to consult with their collegial assemblies.—this provides them the opportunity to talk about their interests as well as discuss collaboration directly.

Shapiro: maybe a few questions before the meeting about cutting, etc.

Jones: perhaps a round-table discussion with a moderator and pre-issued questions. In the case of discussion, we need an outside moderator (who could be a Budget Committee member).

The discussion turned to the confusing and ultimately destructive budget for Summer School classes and programs. Consideration was given to limiting the meeting with the deans to Summer School issues.

Other suggestions for Jones at the planning meeting included:

- Talk about summer school issues concerning profitability (Senator MacPhail noted that Medicine and Dentistry have no separate summer school programs).
- Creative and entrepreneurial ways faculty can affect budget. Get beyond the regular structure. Pursue money-making ideas.
- Expand summer school to idiosyncratic and non-traditional courses, as well as allowing alumni to come back at half-tuition.
- Get specific information on summer school formulas: do colleges have different formulas? How can we be involved and helpful? The process must be more transparent.
- Focus on creative and entrepreneurial ways to deal with the budget. The deans must feel they are getting something out of this.

Question: Do we know how the deans currently feel about summer school?

**Adjournment**
The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Marge Devinney