

**REVISED Representative Faculty Senate Meeting
February 18, 2014
Minutes**

Attendance:

Representative senators and officers: 43

Ex-officios: 0

Faculty, administrators, and guests: 6

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 1:47 PM

Approval of Minutes:

The minutes from the November 7, 2013 meeting were approved as distributed.

The minutes from the January 27, 2014 meeting were approved as distributed.

President's Report – President Rahdert:

Jim Creedon has asked the FSSC to name a few faculty members to serve on an *ad hoc* committee for the purpose of reviewing Temple's weather closing policies.

The FSSC named faculty members Matt Miller, Fabienne Darling-Wolf, and Michael Jackson.

The committee will also include administrators and students.

Ken Kaiser has created a system of budget conference committees to meet with various budget units. Those meetings are underway. Each conference committee includes two faculty members. The committees hear the proposal from the unit, ask questions about it, and then rate the proposal on a matrix of different criteria. One criterion for schools and colleges is whether and how faculty members have been engaged in considering the budget proposal. Most of the faculty members on these conference committees have come from the Senate Budget Review Committee.

Dean review committees have been announced for all three deans under review. All three have significant faculty representation. They are beginning to do their work.

The FSSC met with representatives of TU Student Government and discussed some of their interests. These include:

- Access to information about courses. They would like to expand beyond the eSFF materials now available to them and would like to be able easily to find things like syllabi and course materials for courses they are considering. The FSSC has suggested similar ideas. The students are working with Peter Jones' office to see what can be done along these lines.
- Developing an honor code that would address academic integrity. They have requested Peter Jones create a committee of students, administrators, and faculty to explore this idea. He is creating such a committee. If you are interested in serving on that committee, let Rahdert know.
- Improving campus and building safety, and developing a more unified TUAAlert system.
- Enhancing summer course offerings, in particular on-line summer courses.

The FSSC also met with Board of Trustees member Judge Theodore McKee, chairman of the Academic Affairs Subcommittee of the Board. We had a very positive discussion about how to improve relations between the faculty and the board.

The FSSC has meetings scheduled with:

- Karen Clarke, VP Strategic Marketing
- Jim Creedon, Senior VP Facilities
- Michele Masucci, Senior VP Research
- Ken Kaiser, CFO

Vice President's Report – Tricia Jones

Elections are rapidly approaching. We have five elected committees. All will need some new members. She will soon be sending out a message to the faculty detailing the needs and asking for nominations.

EPPC needs 3 new members.

Personnel needs 1 who must be tenured.

RPPC needs 2.

Honors Oversight Committee needs 2.

UTPAC needs 5 who must be tenured full professors.

These are essential committees.

We will also be putting out calls for appointed committees.

The deadline for nomination to the elected committees is Feb. 28, 2014.

We need a statement of interest and a CV.

The election will happen toward the end of March.

Nominating Committee Report – Joan Shapiro

It is the job of the past president of the Senate to chair the nominating committee. This committee consists of Karen Turner, and Michael Jackson. We want to encourage those of you who are interested in running for Senate office to do so. Attached to today's minutes is a nominating petition. If you wish to run for President, Vice President, or Secretary, please read the instructions on this petition. The information is also available on the web site. You will need six signatures of members of the University Senate. These can be electronic signatures submitted *via* email to senate2@temple.edu. The deadline is Feb. 28, 2014. The election will take place from March 31 through April 7, 2014.

Discussion

Rahdert announced that we have no visitors today, and proposes that we spend our time discussing what business the Senate should be pursuing this spring.

Some things on the FSSC's agenda are:

- The process used to reach the decision about our athletic programs. We are planning on expressing some thoughts about how this process could be made better in future cases.

- The budget and the transition to the new budgeting system. We will be collecting information about how the system will be working and is working.
- Research policies and procedures. There will be fundamental changes in the ways in which Temple grant support is managed. We will be meeting with University personnel to try to work through these changes.
- The development of the Master Plan. We want to be sure that before it is finalized, faculty have a meaningful opportunity to comment on it.
- Monitoring developments in on-line education.
- Following up with the Academic Programs Advisory Committee.
- Working with the President and Provost on the Fly in Four program.
- Discussing the role of shared governance, particularly the role of collegial assemblies in shared governance.
- Revising and strengthening the committee structure of the Faculty Senate.

These are issues on our agenda, but the FSSC would like to hear what other issues are important to the Senate membership.

Art Hochner, FSBM:

For years, we in the Senate have tried to get a copy of the budget from the administration. The document housed in the library is dense and difficult, and on paper rather than machine readable. RCM is supposed to make the budget more transparent. Is this the transparency of invisibility? We should all be able to see it.

Also, in the budget process in the colleges, the faculty should have representatives on the collegial budget committee that are chosen by the faculty, not by the dean. In at least some colleges, perhaps most, this is not happening. We should not call it “faculty participation” when all that has happened is that a dean has asked a couple faculty members who happen to agree with him or her to be on the budget committee.

We need to press on this issue. The President and the Provost should insist on this. They should also facilitate the ability of schools and colleges to revise their bylaws by removing the restriction that all bylaws changes have to be approved by the dean.

There has been a lot of discussion in this body about tenure procedures and standards. The Senate and the UTPAC should consider what needs to be done to strengthen the tenure process. It is very unfair to change the standards after a person has been hired.

Michael Sachs, CHPSW:

The FSSC does have a subcommittee which is looking into the various ways in which schools and colleges have constituted their budget review committees. Last year the Provost either recommended or required that all colleges have budget review committees. His college had its first meeting with their dean the other day, and he was surprised to learn that from his dean’s perspective, they are an advisory committee rather than a budget review committee. They would be happy to hear ideas about initiatives that faculty might want to present to tap into the Provost’s pot of money, but that the idea that the committee would actually review the college budget was not going to happen.

Steve Newman, CLA & editor, Faculty Herald:

When we have addressed President Theobald asking for a directive to deans as to how budget committees should be constituted and function, he has demurred, saying that he does not feel that it is his role to reach down into the functioning of individual colleges. We have also requested from him a list of best practices. He has said in the past that in his experience, real faculty involvement is key to the process. We could, perhaps, profitably follow up on this request for best practices before these systems become too entrenched.

James Korsh, CST

There have been a lot of serious decisions made at the University recently. Examples include the emphasis on research which has extended way beyond what it used to be, the increasing use of NTT's and adjunct faculty. All of these issues have impact on the quality of education that we deliver. Not only have we as faculty had input on these matters. We have not put forth our opinions. It is time for us to do so.

We have not gotten a response from the President about best practices for the budget review committees. We have gotten no response on the matter of collegial assembly guidelines. The Senate passed a resolution about principles for collegial assembly bylaws and we have had no real response or support from the administration. We need to keep bringing these matters up to the administration.

Jeffrey Solow, BCMD:

His college submitted revised bylaws for their collegial assembly in 2011. They have never gotten any response back from the Provost's office.

Karen Turner, SMC:

We would like to see organizational charts. Since under RCM we are paying for the administration, it would be nice to see what we are paying for.

We have been talking in the FSSC about how to engage more of our faculty in the Faculty Senate. We would love to hear ideas from those who are not part of the FSSC as to how to continue the culture of faculty leadership.

President Rahdert commented that during the several years that he has been active on FSSC, he has observed that the membership of the FSSC changes very slowly. We have a hard time finding new people.

Paul LaFollette, CST & Senate Secretary:

He expressed frustration over the past few years in attempting to engage in meaningful collaboration with the administration. Six or seven years ago there seemed to be a reasonable willingness on the part of the administration. One of the very positive things we did was when the administration and the Senate leadership worked together to establish President Hart's P&T Guidelines. This was a very open and engaging process. But, since that time, I have seen what appears to be an attempt to make us feel involved while the administration goes on its way doing what it intends to do and making us feel like we don't exist. He does not have a solution, but hopes that we can at least keep the administration aware of the fact that the wool is not pulled over our eyes, and that these pretend collaborations that have no meaning behind them, that these

decisions that get made and then brought to us after they have been made, is not something that we are prepared to accept as shared governance.

Joseph Schwartz, CLA:

If he had to choose two issues for the Senate and the University has to grapple with, I would first re-affirm the fact that governance is in crisis. Second, we have not honestly grappled with the changing nature of the American faculty. In 1988, 80% of our seats were taught by tenurable faculty. Now, it is likely closer to 50%, but we don't know. We are not given the data about which and how many of our courses are taught by contingent faculty. We need to ask whether the kinds of teaching loads imposed upon those who are teaching mathematics skills or writing skills are too large to allow the kind of excellence that our undergraduates deserve. Finally, we need to get a handle on the finances. We could make an argument that an under-endowed Temple and the decreasing support from the state, that we must be much more aggressive about saying that if the state does not finance higher education, students will get poor education. We need to take some leadership on this. Finally, our graduate students are teaching far too much.

Mary Conran, FSBM:

She is an NTT who feels that her teaching is not poor, but takes pride in her teaching, and that she is assessed on the basis of the quality of her teaching. She rejects the notion that the increase in NTT's means a decline in educational quality. She agrees that we need to hold all faculty who teach to standards, but we also need to understand the realities and the roles that our various kinds of faculty play.

Joseph Schwartz,:

He does not disagree with most of what the previous person said. The director of IH is in charge of 47 NTT's. They mostly start at \$45,000 per year. Many started at \$30,000 just a few years ago. There are too many people here who do not have a career track, who do not have security, and whose salaries may top out at \$65,000 after 20 years of service. High school teachers are debased and unappreciated, but they have more respect and better career tracks than most of our NTT's. There have been NTT's in his college who have been dismissed after 15 years of excellent teaching. We don't reward people for teaching, there is no incentive for TT faculty to do quality teaching and service. We have a crisis of pedagogical engagement and a crisis of service. Unless we increase merit for teaching and service, the crisis will continue.

Steve Newman:

As one of the few people here under 50, he wants to remind us that this is a legislative and deliberative body. If we wish to engage some of our younger faculty, we need to continue to do what we have been doing. The FSSC has for some time been asking for real dean's reviews. After working on this for several years, we finally got it. We got it in part because it is something that our new President wants. We have been pushing on budget committees, we have been pushing and we have made some progress. The same is true about online education guidelines. We need to start thinking in legislative terms, need to become bolder and do more. This could help to engage younger faculty. If our legislation has no effect, then we need to get louder.

Rahdert next asked the question, whether the Senate should, as it has in the past couple years, try to sponsor or co-sponsor a symposium this spring? If so, what would be an appropriate topic? If you have ideas mention them now or email Rahdert later.

One of the things we have talked about in the FSSC is the appropriate balance among the various levels of faculty – TT, NTT, adjunct, and graduate students.

First Speaker again:

He has sent letters to Temple asking how many courses in different categories are taught by TT, NTT, and adjunct faculty. He received a response that we are not entitled to that information under our collective bargaining agreement nor under the state's open records law. They did not answer, and they did not want to answer.

Perhaps if such a request came from the Senate there would be a better response. But generally Temple has been very reticent to share this kind of information.

He does not understand why Temple does not want to share, but the answer "we do not have to" is not a good enough answer.

Tenth Speaker:

The GenEd department has always been willing and happy to give information about GenEd teachers with the Senate.

Second Speaker again:

One of his pet peeves is that the administration has put up barriers to what some NTT's can do. Some are not allowed to do service. Others are not allowed to get credit for scholarship. We need to be discussing these issues.

Old Business:

None

New Business:

None

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 PM.

Paul S. LaFollette, Jr
Secretary