

University Senate Meeting - Minutes

Room 20 Gladfelter Hall

May 4, 2011

Minutes

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 1:55 pm by Paul LaFollette, President.

Approval of Minutes:

The minutes 12/9/10 and 4/14/11 of were approved as written.

Reports by the President and Vice President:

Reports were postponed until the end of this meeting, in order to allow maximum time for discussing and voting on the proposed motions on the agenda.

Discussion and Votes on Proposed Motions:

1. LaFollette began by pointing out that a motion was presented from the floor at the April 14th meeting calling for the re-interpretation of the current constitution with regard to membership. The vote taken on this motion during the April 14 meeting of the University Senate was improper. It was a motion from the floor, and we did not precede it with a 2/3 vote to permit its being considered at its first reading. Therefore, this motion was voted on again today, properly, at its second reading.

Resolved: that the word “Dean” in Article III, Section. 3 of the 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 senior vice president in any unit. The list of eligible voters will be adjusted to reflect these meanings.”

There was no discussion; there was no objection to bringing the issue to a vote; there was a preference of a show of hands rather than a secret ballot; the motion carried unanimously.

LaFollette asked anyone holding a yellow card to refrain from further voting. He observed there were no yellow-card holders present.

Having established who could vote on the new Constitution and Bylaws, debate then began on the various amendments brought forth for the proposed amendment of the Constitution.

Motion: In “old” [presently in force] Article III – Membership, Section 3: Delete the entire section mandating a Collegial Assembly at every school; and substitute: *The President of the University and the Provost shall be ex officio members of the Faculty and Representative Faculty Senates.*

In advance of discussion, there was general agreement to a vote of hands rather than a secret ballot; and a motion to that effect carried with two opposing votes.

Discussion turned to refinement and clarification of the language of the amendment to Article III, 1, above including an optional amendment offered by Marina Angel (Law) and Jane Evans (Tyl): “Add the following sentence at the end of Section 1: ‘No one with a faculty appointment who is serving in a level other than Department Chair, with the exception of ex officio members, shall be a member of the University and Representative Senates.’” Two concerns were raised: first, that we should not identify department chairs as administrators; second, that we need to structure the language so as to ensure that all faculty members are included as members. This culminated in a motion to amend the amendment using new wording.

Motion: Amend the amendment to Article III, 1: Replace the wording with: *“Department chairs and academic program directors are members of the Faculty Senate and may be members of the Representative Senate. Administrators, with the exception of ex officio members, are not members of the Faculty or the University Senate.”*

This amendment was voted on and carried. After further discussion, by a vote of hands, the proposed amendment was voted on and the motion carried.

Discussion then turned to language concerning collegial assemblies in Constitution Article III. There was discussion concerning whether there is currently such a body in the Law School. Mark Rahdert noted that the Law School, in fact, has a collegial assembly, since the faculty regularly meets as the Faculty of Law and the Faculty of Law functions as a collegial assembly. The Dean usually chairs these meetings, but the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee steps in as chair when requested by the Dean.

A friendly amendment to Constitution Article III, 3 suggested that in the instances referring only to “school,” the words “school or college” should be used.

A motion to delete “proposed new” Constitution Article III, 2 initiated discussion concerning whether all schools and colleges should be required to have an assembly, as well as the Faculty Senate’s authority to enforce such a rule.

James Korsh (CST) agreed with Rahdert’s rationale that the Law School has an appropriate assembly.

In response to the assertion that “every school should have/ must have a Collegial Assembly” [and currently some do not], LaFollette noted that the Constitution reads “shall.”

Vasiliki Limberis (CLA) asked if the Senate actually had the power to enforce this; LaFollette noted that it did not, but it is tradition.

Deborah Howe noted that the School of Environmental Design had no assembly yet, and therefore needs Article III, 3.

A vote was taken and the motion to delete Constitution Article III, 2 failed, with only 19 affirmative votes.

The **Motion:** In Constitution Article II—Powers, substitute new Section 6 for “old” Section 5. By a show of hands, the motion carried with two opposing votes.

LaFollette read the proposed amendment concerning membership of librarians: He noted that the effect is to make all professional librarians members of the Senate and allow them to elect 2 senators in addition to what they have.

A discussion of how many voting members this would add to the Senate was resolved when Carla Davis Cunningham (Libraries) explained that the Collegial Assembly of the librarians in question includes those from Science, Ambler, and Paley, but not Law and Medicine, who are not represented in that collegial assembly. Therefore, instead of adding a potential 60-70 as claimed, the number would be more like 45-50.

Art Hochner (FSBM) encouraged the motion to support the librarians. Some of his reasons were that other universities also grant this privilege; also, Temple’s librarians have advanced professional degrees, peer review, and teaching functions.

Angel cautioned against going from 2 non-voting members to so many. She suggested a substitute motion: only 6 voting librarians.

Michael Eisman (CLA) rejected this idea, reasoning that the decision should rest solely on whether librarians are qualified for membership or not.

Angel presented a substitute motion: Limit the number of librarians to 6 voting members in the Senate, with a distribution of 3 from Paley, 2 from next biggest unit and 1 from combined units.

In response to a discussion question on why the limit, Angel sustained her assertion that librarians are not faculty.

Rahdert responded that eligibility should be based on an individual’s professional status, and anyone who meets standards should be able to vote. The privilege to vote should be extended to all the members of the professional group, not just a subset.

During the discussion comparing duties and expectations of regular faculty and librarians, Cunningham explained that service for librarians can include research. She clarified why the Temple professional librarians want to be represented in the Faculty Senate: In terms of commitment to the university and the educational mission of the institution, they want to be able to participate fully.

Billie Gastic (Educ) observed that her comment that NTT faculty currently may vote after 3 years although they are not required to do research, and frequently do not publish, was not a criticism, but rather an attempt to establish a rationale for librarians’ inclusion.

The **Motion:** Limit membership of professional librarians in the Representative Senate to six members was voted on by a show of hands and failed.

LaFollette then returned to the original proposed amendment to Constitution Article III, 3: All professional librarians are to be voting members of the Senate, and they can elect two librarians to the Representative Senate.

In response to a question on the librarians' process for electing Representative Senators, Cunningham noted that they already elect two from their Collegial Assembly.

Motion: All professional librarians are to be voting members of the Senate, and may elect two librarians to the Representative Senate.

The motion was voted on by show of hands and carried, with five opposing votes.

The following Motions concerning Librarians' inclusion in Faculty Senate carried:

- Add the phrase "*and every professional librarian with a full-time appointment in the University Libraries*" to the list of members of the Senate in Article III, Section 1.
- In Article III Section 3, add the sentence "*The University Librarians shall elect two members.*"
- Delete Article III Section 4 (i.e., "Professional librarians may select two of their members. . . .")

Angel reminded that the voting list should now include all librarians in time for email voting. LaFollette affirmed that an electronic ballot on amendments as they have been voted on today will be prepared and sent to all, including librarians.

The proposed changes to the Constitution and Bylaws were approved.

In Constitution Article VI – Meetings, Section 1:

- **Motion:** 1) Change the first sentence to "*The Faculty Senate shall hold at least one meeting in the last month of each semester for the purpose of reviewing the **actions** of the Representative Faculty Senate and for the conduct of such business as may come before it.*" 2) Delete the second sentence.

The motion carried by a show of hands.

In Bylaws **Article V – Meetings, Section 1**

- **Motion:** Change the second sentence to "*The December and May meetings shall be meetings of the Faculty Senate.*"

The motion carried by a show of hands.

New Business:

Discussion focused on issues related to administrative financial decisions as they relate to faculty.

Referring to a memorandum sent from the Steering Committee to President Hart, in response to the discussion of the FSSC motion ["Resolved: that the FSSC strongly urges that all searches for faculty be suspended, except for those few positions that are truly essential" (5/3/2011)], Angel asked why did the FSSC agree with the administration on hiring freeze on faculty, when there is a lot of cutting still possible. Dieter Forster agreed, and others cautioned that in light of Temple University's historic academic mission, we should strongly propose a careful continuation of the hiring of TT, NTT, and full-time faculty.

The following resolution was moved and seconded. “Resolved: that the Faculty Senate very strongly recommends that tenure-track and non-tenure-track hiring should continue.” The motion was voted on by show of hands and carried with six no votes.

Korsh, a member of FSSC, noted that the amount of new hiring is a \$10-20M long-range commitment. So FSSC allowed for programmatic needs for specific slots. On a long term basis, we should know what that will be. Another factor in this reasoning was to avoid a tuition increase. Angel considered this premature, since we haven’t seen the expense of building projects and budget cuts. Further comments included:

- We should keep hiring, since we don’t know the real budget.
- The long term idea is wrong—NTTs can be gotten rid of easily. We must reject the resolution.
- The administrative response about construction would be that building comes from bond money—but after completion, maintenance costs impact funds available for personnel. However, surveys show students choose to attend based on how a university looks.
- No administrative level has announced where they are cutting. The language should also reflect that they should also cut.

Thoughts from FSSC members included:

- Charles Jungreis: One rationale is to scrutinize hires, not prevent them. The intention was not to hire anyone— especially crucial personnel.
- Deborah Howe: Every week the FSSC confers with officials about the budget, and all are deeply concerned both short and long term, and about over-hiring. Many contracts have been signed and will go forward. We think it will create more options in the future.
- Rahdert: Scrutinizing faculty hires should occur as a matter of course. The FSSC motion does not call for scrutiny but proposes a freeze, and this gives too much traction to administration. General hiring freezes cause future instability by producing experience and subject matter gaps in the faculty.

As a final comment, Frank Friedman suggested: Deans have been given targets. Let them decide how they will meet targets based on best interest of their schools.

Because of time constraints, reports by the President and Vice President were postponed.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:40

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret Devinney
Interim Secretary