

**Faculty Senate Steering Committee**  
**Tuesday, April 29 2014**  
**Meeting Minutes**

**Attendance:**

**Present:** Mark Rahdert (Pres.), Paul LaFollette (Secy.), Joan Shapiro (Past-Pres.), Mark Anderson (Law), Li Bai (Engr), Cheri Carter (SSW), Deborah Howe (SED), Forrest Huffman (FSBM), Michael Jackson (STHM), Michael Jacobs (Pharm), Stephanie Knopp (Tyl), Jim Korsh (CST), Matthew Miller (TFMA), Steve Newman (Fac. Herald), Michael Sachs (CHP), Catherine Schifter (Educ), Joseph Schwartz (CLA), Karen M. Turner (SMC), Cheryl Mack (Coord.)

**Absent:**

Tricia Jones (Vice Pres.), Kenneth Boberick (DENT), Chip Jungreis (TUSM), Jeffrey Solow (BCMD),

**Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 PM.

**Approval of Minutes:**

The minutes were approved as distributed.

**President's Report (Rahdert):**

President Rahdert thanked Cheryl Mack and the officers, and distributed presents in recognition of their service over the past year.

He then reminded us that there are two important meetings next week, the University Senate meeting, and a report from the campus planning group. Our attendance at both of these meetings is important. We should encourage our colleagues to attend as well.

Q: Will there be something available for the faculty to read before the planning meeting?

A: Not sure but will find out.

Q: Might the meeting be cancelled if the Board does not like the report:

A: This is unlikely.

Q: Is this an official Senate meeting?

A: No.

Rahdert will be sending a letter to TUGSA inviting them to meet with us next fall.

He distributed a summary of our activities over the past year and encouraged us to share it with our colleagues. It will be a part of his report to the Senate next week.

Q: Have you been meeting with Michael Sitler alone, or with both him and the Provost.

A: I have had both types of meetings.

President Theobald prefers to communicate via email.

Rahdert informed us that the diversity data has finally been made available to us. Questions followed:

Q: How will we handle requests for more fine grained information, for instance cross referencing gender and ethnicity?

A: We will need to study these data and make a single request for more information.

A subcommittee was formed for this purpose consisting of Jackson, Knopp, Schifter, Turner, and Sachs.

Q: Where did these numbers come from? Have they been “sanitized?” Why did it take so long to obtain them?

A: We do not know.

Comment: It would be useful to have similar data for adjuncts.

Q: If there may be inaccuracies in these data, should they be disseminated at this time?

A: Rahdert does not believe this report should go beyond the FSSC and the symposium planners. He would rather make it available at the time of the symposium.

Q: Should the Herald publish this information?

A: Check with Sitler and the Provost.

At this point, coffee mugs were given to those who are leaving the FSSC, Shapiro, Newman, and Andersen

Discussion Period:

Rahdert opened a discussion by posing the question:

“How can we take the initiative next year?”

He suggested that it is important for us to respond to events, but we should also be taking a more active legislative role. He suggested that we should start the year by looking over possible activities for the whole year. He also would like to see more motions coming to the FSSC/Senate from our standing committees.

In the following discussion, the following points were raised:

- Committees used to give face to face reports to the Senate. Perhaps we should resume this.

- Intellectual property issues will become increasingly important with the rise of online courses.
- One member has already begun to see punitive actions from the administration against departments who are not sufficiently “entrepreneurial”.
- The arts related schools and colleges are losing faculty, budget, and their identities.
- We need to get ahead of the curve with respect to the composition of our faculty. Increasing use of contingent faculty is putting our undergraduate education at risk.
- We need to have a greater voice in the budgeting process.
- Perhaps we could have a Senate meeting directed at junior faculty. Consider such issues as faculty who have no relationship with their deans and chairs.
- FSSC minutes should be distributed on collegial listservs.
- We need to encourage newly hired and newly tenured faculty to attend Senate meetings.
- Think about having some social activities.
- Someone suggested that we have a celebration for the newly tenured and promoted. This might be done jointly with the Provost’s office.
- We need to revisit the role of RPPC. This should be an ideal committee to bring resolutions to the Senate.
- Perhaps the FSSC could find some way of fund raising. Temple has changed significantly since one of our members came to Temple in the early 70’s. Service and teaching are minimized now. Often the assumption seems to be that these activities will just happen on their own. We should explore further the idea of hiring tenurable faculty to teach with little scholarship. We need to talk as a faculty about what we want our culture to be.
- We now have some NTT’s who have been around for decades, yet we treat them poorly. NTT research brings honor to Temple and should be merit-worthy.
- Perhaps we should give thought to how we can approach the President and Provost to start conversations about athletics and the Hospital.
- When Englert pitched the re-organization of certain schools and colleges, he said we would re-visit it to see how well it is working. We should encourage that.
- Another member agrees that we need to review all of the changes made at that time.
- We still have no org. chart for the entire university.
- We must not forget to find out next fall about the results of the deans’ reviews.

Once again, Rahdert thanked us for doing an extraordinary job this year.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 PM

Paul S. LaFollette, Jr.  
Secretary