Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 1:50 pm.

Approval of Minutes:
The minutes of March 16th Representative Senate Meeting were approved as written. There is some question as to whether or not these minutes should have been approved at this meeting since this was a University Senate Meeting rather than a Representative Senate Meeting.

President’s Report – Paul LaFollette:
President LaFollette said that he would make his remarks short because of the many issues facing the University Senate. He mentioned the online survey that has been distributed regarding the gender and GLBTQ climate on campus and urged the faculty members to fill out the questionnaire.

Vice President’s Report – Joan Shapiro:
Vice-President Shapiro reiterated her plea for faculty to volunteer for committee vacancies and thanked those who had volunteered, been appointed and were elected.

Vice-President and Provost, Richard Englert’s Report:
Vice President and Provost Englert said that he has already met with the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and that many of his remarks would be a reiteration of items he presented at that meeting the previous Tuesday.

He explained Temple’s financial situation as it stands now as a result of the governor’s recommendation, and said that although, no doubt, the situation will be improved after the legislative vote, Temple will still be in rather dire financial straights. In anticipation of this, he has made the following recommendations:

1. Freezing of non-union salaries within the university.
2. Asking TAUP and other unions to help.
3. Institute a hiring freeze with these exceptions: those faculty searches already underway, grant positions, positions which affect student success (such as advising), and positions directly related to revenue generation. There will be a process freeze – so that any additional administrative hires would need the Provost’s and President’s approval.
4. Provost Englert plans to work with the FSSC to develop travel restriction guidelines.
5. The University will be taking a look at benefits packages and seeing if there are reductions possible.
6. He said that he wanted to delay all five dean searches. He said he will continue this dialogue. His rationale was “How can we bring someone in when we cannot answer questions about resources?”
7. Provost Englert said that he will look at administrative structure and organization across the university. There will be perusal of every unit to see what efficiencies can be instituted.
8. He continued that the university will look for partners outside the university to enhance revenues or limit expenditures.
9. He plans to work with Faculty Senate Budget Review Committee and FSSC regarding the Huron Group report and discuss what may or may not work within the university.

Provost Englert said that he will be visiting the FSSC meeting next Tuesday to continue “discussion,” on these items, and that the bottom line is that over the next few weeks there will be a lot of discussion within the context of what the state might do in terms of appropriations.
Unlike previous presentations by VP and Provost Englert, characterized by “Dialogue with Dick,” Englert did not invite questions or comments and departed immediately after his presentation.

After Provost’s Englert’s departure, Faculty Senate Secretary Roberta Sloan stated that although we have constantly heard “one size does not fit all,” any decision to delay ALL dean searches certainly contradicts this repeated mantra. She added that in the case of the SCT dean’s search, four excellent candidates had already been brought on campus, interviewed, and faculty input was solicited. Of these four candidates, two are African American women, one is an Asian man and one is a Caucasian man. She continued that when one looks at the Council of Deans, where there are only two women, and one of them is African American, out of a total of seventeen, it would be reprehensible to stop the SCT dean selection process, if only diversity were taken into consideration. She also mentioned that if a search is stopped AFTER four very viable candidates visit campus, this will greatly blemish the reputation of Temple University nationally.

**President’s Report Continued:**

President LaFollette announced that the steering committee has agreed that balloting on the Faculty Senate Bylaws will be done through electronic voting. Later in the session, it was agreed that the voting period will be ten days.

President LaFollette called upon Professor Marina Angel who was accompanied by Professor Jane Evans to the stage in order to make a presentation on their proposed amendments to the amendments already distributed regarding the Faculty Senate Bylaws.

Professor Angel verbally explained her suggestions which were fully explicated on a yellow sheet memorandum which was available to all those attending the meeting, and fully expressed her views on each of the amendments proposed.

Professor Jane Evans said that after discussion with various faculty members, she will now not object to the specific amendment that will allow non-tenured faculty members to have voting privileges as senators as soon as they begin their work at Temple. After Professor Evan’s comments, Professor Angel said that she would agree to withdraw her objection to that particular amendment.

Carla Davis Cunningham, representing the librarians presented a rationale for allowing librarians to be full members of the Faculty Senate, and her rationale for this request. This, too, was distributed on hard copy to the senators attending the meeting.

Vice President Joan Shapiro said that she strongly supported the idea of librarians becoming full members of the Faculty Senate.

President LaFollette invited Professor Laura Levitt to speak to the University Senate.

Professor Levitt explained her background and what her duties at Temple have been for the last fifteen years including her participation on interdisciplinary programs including Women’s Studies and Jewish Studies. There are currently five interdisciplinary programs. She said that she and the other director of the existing interdisciplinary programs were called into College of Liberal Arts Dean Teresa Soufas’ office and told that the interdisciplinary programs were to be folded into existing departments and that the Directors will no longer be needed.

Professor Levitt said that faculty were not privy to any concrete plans about this, and that all the directors were shocked. Apparently the CLA Executive Committee was not consulted about this decision and received the announcement AFTER the directors were told. Additionally, the departments into which the interdisciplinary programs are to be folded were neither told nor consulted.

The interdisciplinary programs and affected departments include:

- Asian Studies folding into the Department of Critical Languages
- American Studies into the Department of English
- Women’s Studies and the LGBT minor into the Department of Sociology
Jewish Studies into the Department of Religion (ironically a department that has a secular Jewish Studies Certificate)
Latin American Studies into the Department of History

Professor Levitt related that the students in these programs are devastated, upset and angry. Many of the faculty and directors feel the same way. All of these programs have had very positive program reviews with reviewers recommending their continuation and support.

Professor Scott Gratson (SCT) stated that “it is particularly concerning that of the five interdisciplinary programs being affected by Dean Soufas’ decision, four represent minority groups.”

Professor Levitt stated that the folding of these programs into departments will have little monetary advantage, and if asked, the directors of the programs would have been very willing to work with Dean Soufas to reduce these costs. Professor Levitt concluded by asking for the support of Faculty Senate for the retaining the Interdisciplinary Programs as independent entities.

Professor Art Hochner pointed out that this kind of change potentially violates the TAUP contract and at the very least shows a distinct lack of shared governance. He believes that this raises very serious questions.

Professor Angel presented a motion “that the Faculty Senate state that it deplores the lack of consultation by the administration to fold interdisciplinary programs into existing departments and that the Faculty Senate disagrees with this decision.” The motion was seconded and a discussion ensued.

Senator Jim Korsh asked if any of the bylaws of the college had been violated. Apparently Dean Soufas asserted that nothing in the curriculum will change.

There was a comment that curricular changes cannot be divided from the structure of the programs. The following questions emerged:
1. What is going to happen to the integrity of these programs?
2. Who is going to advise the students?
3. Who will take leadership in developing the interdisciplinary offerings?
4. How will the health of these programs be assessed?
5. How will these programs continue to cross schools, cross colleges and maintain their interdisciplinarity without oversight and leadership?
6. Who will be responsible for recruitment?
7. Who will answer queries?
8. Who will run the steering committee for Interdisciplinary Programs?

Although the Interdisciplinary Program Directors were told that nothing is changing, this decision means changes at every turn.

Professor Tony Ranere said this was a hasty terrible decision and feels that it should be reversed. He suggested that the Faculty Senate needs to “push back hard” on this issue.

Professor Terry Halbert feels that we need to make a strong statement. She mentioned that something similar happened in the Fox School of Business. She asked “How can these wonderful programs survive under this new plan since they each need someone to oversee the programs?”

Since normally a motion needs a second reading before it can be passed, President LaFollette asked for a vote on whether the motion could be considered on first reading. This is possible if a 2/3 majority of those senators present vote that the motion can be voted upon at the first reading.

The decision to consider the motion and vote upon it without a second reading passed with considerably more than a 2/3 majority.

It was suggested that the motion should be stronger. Professor Angel accepted a friendly amendment to strengthen the original motion.
The motion:

Resolved: that the Faculty Senate state that it deplores the lack of consultation by the administration to fold interdisciplinary programs into existing departments, that the Faculty Senate disagrees with this decision, and that the decision should be immediately reversed.

Passed unanimously.

Professor Angel made a motion that not all administrators be allowed to vote in faculty elections. There was lively discussion.

The motion:

Resolved: that the word “Dean” in Article III Section 3 of our current constitution be taken to mean the actual Deans of our schools and colleges, but does not include any other people whose title contains the word dean such as vice deans, associate deans, and assistant deans; and that the words “Vice President” in the same Section shall apply only to the organizationally highest ranked Vice President in any unit. The list of eligible voters will be adjusted to reflect these meanings.

This motion passed unanimously.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Roberta Sloan, Ph.D.
Faculty Senate Secretary