

Faculty Senate Report and Recommendations on Faculty Governance Issues. Revised. 2.6.22

I. Introduction

Temple University mission to **educate a vibrant student body and create new knowledge through innovative teaching, research and other creative endeavors** is only possible because of the vital role that our faculty play in the Temple enterprise. As an urban, Research 1, public institution, through research, teaching, service, community activism and intellectual output, faculty represent a valuable sector of Temple University. As thought-leaders in our respective fields, Temple faculty enhance the social, cultural, physical and economic well-being of our students, staff, community, state, country and the world.

Students are drawn to a university because of its brand and its faculty. Faculty help enhance the output and quality of life for the students, our community, and the university by encouraging intellectual rigor, critical thinking, creativity and the creation of new knowledge. Faculty Senate leadership has operated as the elected representatives of the Faculty since 1969. Then, like today, the Faculty Senate seeks to partner with university administrators to help support faculty initiatives, interests and concerns that impact and affect Academic programs and policies.

We are proud to represent all faculty and librarians across all Temple academic units and campuses. We celebrate our unique role in supporting the University's mission through faculty centered deliberation surrounding the critical programs and policies driving our work. Our committees provide important feedback shaping administrative decisions that support the essence of the Temple mission and vision. We welcome this discourse and believe it is the essential element of change for shared governance structures.

We also acknowledge the unique role the 5 bargaining units have in supporting faculty who are members of their units. We appreciate the work of the bargaining units in securing the best conditions possible for faculty as this contributes to our ability to engage in open dialogue about our shared academic mission.

II. Historical Background and Framework

The Faculty Senate, which represents 3,172 faculty members in 17 schools and colleges along with librarians in six libraries across main and health science campuses, directly influences and advocates on behalf of faculty, students, and the community.

(<https://www.collegefactual.com/colleges/temple-university/academic-life/faculty-composition/#secComposition>). In addition to serving as a vehicle for sharing information, the Faculty Senate promotes best practices for teaching, research, diversity, equity, inclusion and faculty development. It is also a site for faculty voice into many aspects of the University's operations and is central to shared faculty governance on our campuses. Through regular communication with university leadership, faculty membership on senate and key multi-level committees, along with regular engagement with administrators, the Faculty Senate leadership

encourages meaningful communication and transparency between faculty and the various components of the Temple University enterprise.

Shared Faculty Governance in General

According to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) shared faculty governance simply means “meaningful faculty participation in institutional governance”, policies and procedures. According to Hans-Joerg Tiede, director of research for the AAUP and author of a 2021 report on shared faculty governance, hallmarks of faculty governance include: representation on presidential searches, appointments of chief academic officers, participation in the evaluation of administrators (including the participation of faculty in the review of provosts, deans and department chairs), and representation as voting members on governing boards are recognized indicators of shared faculty governance. (Flaherty, Inside Higher Ed, October 14, 2021). Additionally, the AAUP 2021 survey of 396 professors pointed to those universities that have substantial numbers of tenured faculty, participation opportunities for contingent faculty, clear and effective Faculty Handbooks and institutionalized support for *academic freedom* in both public and private institutions as additional markers of “Best Practices” in support of shared faculty governance. (Ibid. Inside Higher Ed. Faculty Governance: What the Data Say)

Shared Faculty Governance at Temple

The Temple University Faculty Senate is central to shared faculty governance. In addition to bi-yearly University Faculty Senate meetings, open to the entire university community, the Senate provides opportunities for transparency and the necessary updates on ongoing initiatives and activities. Monthly Representative Faculty Senate meetings keep school and college representatives apprised of ongoing issues and concerns, provide a site for dialogue between faculty and administrators and bi-monthly Faculty Senate Steering Committee meetings provide oversight of Faculty Senate Committees and their agenda. Faculty, across ranks, are encouraged to get involved, join committees, and take on leadership roles, with the goal of creating self-sustaining leadership pipelines. The Faculty Senate promotes faculty participation in governance by encouraging and maintaining membership on a host of Faculty Senate Committees. Some of the Faculty Senate committees include:

Research Policies and Procedures Committee (RPPC)

Educational Policies and Procedures Committee (EPPC)

Assessment of Instruction,

The Library Advisory Committee.

The Faculty of Color Committee,

Disability Concerns,

The Faculty Senate Committee on the Status of Women

And even the new Committee on Adjunct Constituency Concerns. (CACC), along with a host of others.

In recent years, attendance at Faculty Senate meeting at all levels has risen exponentially. Faculty membership on Faculty Senate committees has also increased, suggesting that the Senate is growing its influence and engagement with more faculty across the university.

Of course, more can always be done. Faculty governance at Temple faces challenges. In our recommendations section of this document, we outline what additional steps can be taken.

III. The President's Charge

Temple President, Dr. Jason Wingard has charged the Faculty Senate Steering Committee with identifying campus-wide faculty issues and concerns with respect to shared governance; in addition to highlighting opportunities to enhance university platforms for shared faculty governance.

IV. The Goal of this Report

The goal of this report is to identify ways the Faculty Senate Steering Committee (FSSC) could further develop a mechanism increasing faculty engagement with strategic planning and decision-making. To do so, we consulted with faculty from across the university, ultimately generating a number of findings and recommendations.

A. Faculty Consultation

As a result of the President's charge, the Senate Steering Committee created the Ad Hoc Shared Faculty Governance Committee ("SFGC") on January 18, 2022. The SFGC met on January 25, 2022 and began circulating a google document focusing on governance issues. Committee members then solicited input from various collegial assemblies on suggestions for increased opportunities for shared faculty governance.

The Senate Steering Committee met with a group of collegial assembly chairs or chair designees from 11 of the 17 schools and colleges on February 1, 2022, to discuss shared governance and collegial assemblies in each of their units. As faculty senate president, Professor Kimmika Williams-Witherspoon interviewed two additional collegial assembly representatives who could not attend the FSSC meeting (one by telephone and the other by email) to discuss faculty input and shared governance in their units. Five schools did not reply to our invitation or send representatives.

Schools and colleges represented included:

- Klein College of Media and Communication (KMC)
- Tyler School of Architecture, Art and Design (TYL)
- Fox School of Business (FSB)
- College of Liberal Arts (CLA)
- Kornberg School of Dentistry KSoD
- Boyer College of Music and Dance (BCMD)
- School of Social Work (SSW)
- Sports, Tourism and Hospitality Management (STHM)
- Theater, Film and Media Arts (TFMA)

College of Engineering (COE)
College of Education and Human Development (CEHD)

SFGC members collected additional anecdotal narratives from faculty from across the university.

B. Findings

Our consultation with broad sectors of the faculty led to a number of findings.

First, our faculty remains committed to the Temple University mission of educating a vibrant student body and creating new knowledge through innovative teaching, research and other creative endeavors. Our colleagues reminded us that Temple faculty contribute to the “pillars of excellence” at this institution. While we support the intent and application of *shared Faculty governance*, in order to forge a productive relationship with our new president and provost, we recognize that being part of the process is an important step if we are to meaningfully *actualize* shared governance.

Second, it is essential for faculty to *have a seat at the table*. With faculty representatives on all senior level committees and task forces that have the potential to impact academic programs ensures a more inclusive examination of the issues and concerns. *Meaningful representation* precludes tokenism and therefore, faculty representation should include *more than one* faculty member recommended through the Committee on Administrative and Trustee Appointments (CATA) or Faculty Senate. That kind of meaningful participation opportunities will always yield robust faculty contributions, a more integrated university culture and a more inclusive work environment.

Third, we have learned that not all of the schools and colleges have working *Collegial Assemblies* and, in some cases, draconian boiler plate bylaws imposed on schools and colleges in past administrations have eroded the functionality of other collegial assemblies as faculty-run school bodies to encourage shared governance on the school and college level.

Structurally, a well-run collegial assembly in each of our schools and colleges would provide the mechanism for the most meaningful engagement with the full range of our faculty.

Faculty senate representatives elected by their collegial assembly also provide regular opportunities for the dissemination of information both ways—identifying issues and concerns from faculty in each of the 17 schools and colleges and communicating that information to faculty senate leadership.

In recent years, we have watched attendance at Representative Faculty Senate meetings rise in record numbers and with that significant rise in engagement, we have also seen increased membership and activity on Faculty Senate committees. Increased Faculty membership on Faculty Senate committees also indicates that the Faculty Senate continues to grow its influence and engagement with an even larger swath of faculty across the university. But more can be done. In our recommendations section of this document, we outline what steps can be taken.

Fourth, Diversity, equity and inclusion is still an ongoing problem here at Temple University. This is evident in the composition of our student body, faculty, staff and administrators. While Temple has recently admitted one of the most diverse student bodies in years, ensuring success for diverse students also points to an increased need to hire and retain diverse faculty. The Faculty Senate Committee on Disability Concerns, The Committee on the Status of Faculty of Color (FOC) and the Committee on the Status of Women are just a few of the Senate platforms that continue to monitor and address those concerns centering equity and inclusion, by advocating for those affinity groups.

Of course, with more support, training and integration in university search committees, mentorship programs and professional development opportunities, Faculty Senate Committees could do even more. Several concerned faculty met with Provost Gregory N. Mandel in January 2022 to advocate for the University to better tap into the ready expertise of our renowned faculty.

That contingent of faculty that recently met with the provost, suggests that “Administrators should properly use faculty expertise in curricular and other matters facing Temple, from policies around pandemics to attempts to address racism, anti-Semitism, misogyny, homophobia, and other forms of violence and inequity, though this is not, of course, an exhaustive list of topics where consultation with faculty experts would be beneficial.”

Fifth, transparency and shared decision-making remain primary faculty concerns. The Faculty Senate continues to operate as a forum to address issues and concerns that impact Academic Programs, policies, procedures, and the university culture. As a central influencer and locus for the dissemination of information, the Faculty Senate maintains a well-trafficked web presence, an independent Faculty news organ, monthly representative meetings, bi-weekly Faculty Senate leadership meetings, published meeting minutes (that are archived with the Charles Library) and 28 standing committees as vehicles for the dissemination of information and open dialogue.

Transparency and shared faculty governance should also be a real priority for this administration. In our listening sessions, faculty continued to identify opportunities for more transparency and more shared decision-making which might include:

- Developing an Initiative Status dashboard or regular report-out from the administration. Increased transparency in the timely reporting-out of Survey Results that periodically canvas faculty and students (example: The Strategic Planning Value Survey; RCM survey results.)
- As Health and Wellness issues continue to be complicated by the pandemic, regular updates from the Dean of Students and those Health and Wellness offices in that portfolio
- Incentivizing Team-teaching opportunities to break down silos, despite RCM challenges.
- In collaboration with Faculty Senate and the administration, developing leadership-training pipelines for Faculty and graduate students.
- Identifying the metrics used in Dean’s Reviews.
- More transparency in Dean’s and Chair reviews

V. Recommendations

A. Collegial Assemblies

As originally adopted by the Faculty Senate and approved by the Board of Trustees in 1969, Article III of the Faculty Senate Constitution stipulates: *“Each school of the University shall have its own Collegial Assembly with its own presiding officer, executive and standing committees, with regular meetings and such rules and procedures as it may deem necessary. Each Collegial Assembly shall determine its own membership provided that all University Senators shall be members thereof.”*

The Guiding Principles document (of 2012) further asserts that *“Collegial Assemblies can then be essential components of shared governance at Temple University, performing essential functions in establishing, maintaining, and implementing the quality and academic integrity of programs, curricula, and scholarship at the school or college level.”*

The Faculty Senate has always believed that on the college and school level, collegial assemblies provide the most basic opportunity for shared faculty governance and that shared faculty governance at the school and college level can have the most impact on faculty engagement. Confirmed and verified in The Guiding Principles for Collegial Assembly Bylaws of 2012, (attached to this document) it reads: *“To accomplish these objectives, the faculty of each college or school must develop Collegial Assembly Bylaws tailored to meet its unique characteristics.”*

Addressing the erosion and lack of consistency with regard to school and college collegial assemblies is the impact-point that would yield the largest return with regard to bolstering shared faculty governance on our campus but it can *only* happen with messaging from the President’s office and the Provost, encouraging and incentivizing Dean’s to partner with faculty to help work enhance shared faculty governance in their school or college.

We recommend that schools and colleges be required to review and update Bylaws that reflect the intent of the Faculty Senate Constitution of *faculty—run collegial assemblies* for greater shared faculty governance, and that each collegial assembly develop bylaws therein.

In this way, (again as stipulated in the Guiding Principles document) *“the Collegial Assembly must be able to conduct business in an atmosphere free from coercion, while fostering collaborative decision making.”* With that in mind, this suggested review of school and college bylaws and collegial assemblies should also include:

1. [a review of a budget and finance committee] “given access to detailed fiscal information and truly consulted on fiscal matters
2. a curriculum committee that has a substantive say in any curricular changes in the college, including the initiation, modification, and discontinuation of degree programs, questions around intellectual property, online instruction, and the impact of workload on instruction (As pointed out by an ad hoc group of faculty, there is a provision for the formation of workload committees in the TAUP contract.)
3. a well-functioning promotion and tenure committee that complies fully with the TAUP contract, the Law School’s Bargaining Unit guidelines, and any other relevant bylaws;

this includes any committee or subcommittee required for the proper evaluation of non-tenure-track faculty, both full-time and part-time

4. a well-functioning merit committee, as per (3).”

B. Transparency

The Senate would like to continue to improve communications and engagement with the university community at large through regular participation and consultation with the Faculty Senate. To do so, **we recommend that:**

1. The university develop an Initiative-Status Dashboard or regular Report-Out mechanism which would share results that might include information on data collection, what we’ve learned and Next Steps.
2. The university share the metrics used and, how components are weighted, in Dean’s Reviews and Chair Reviews. (While faculty understand that Dean’s Reviews, Chair Reviews and Program reviews often include confidential data, by sharing the metrics used, faculty will at least be more readily aware of the components to be assessed.)

(One potential innovation to the current Decanal Review structure, as suggested by a smaller contingency of faculty that met with the provost, might include a “3rd year formative evaluative review for new Deans prior to the formal 5th year review (much as we conduct for junior faculty). Such a review could serve as useful feedback to your team and, [as well, to the deans themselves.] Faculty leading such a review team might be given stipends or a course release to conduct the review. They may or may not be members of the College they are reviewing, but their teams would be composed of faculty within the college who could identify key informants.”)

3. The university and the senate work together to develop a regular schedule of reports on Student/Faculty mental health and wellness outcomes.
4. Some of the structural changes to better serve strategic advisement, communication, and governance is *presence*. **We recommend that the university**, include faculty senate representation on all strategic, top-level committees and task force that address issues and concerns that potentially impact academic programs, policies and/or quality of faculty engagement.
5. That the Board of Trustees and the university develop a plan for one or two Faculty to serve as voting members of the Board of Trustees and/or provide opportunities to engage with BOT members in the formation of a committee that includes both faculty and board membership. (*See addendum to Board of Trustee Meeting, May 13, 1969)
6. That the Board of Trustees and the university Identify and/or create more opportunities for faculty engagement with BOT committees, beyond admittance into the meetings during public sessions.

C. Faculty Affairs

7. That the university develop leadership training opportunities for Faculty—that would include pipelines for leadership for all faculty, including women and faculty members from underrepresented groups.
8. That the Senate and the university co-sponsor faculty development opportunities.
9. That the university create an administrative position in the president’s portfolio as “a safe, off-the-record resource for faculty and administrators to explore options to address workplace-related concerns from a professional who is confidential, impartial, independent and informal.” (see UNC Charlotte as a model. (<https://ombuds.charlotte.edu/>))

The Faculty Senate continues to advocate for an Ombudsperson separate from the Office of Faculty Affairs, versed in academic freedom, who could advocate for faculty concerns within senior administration. It has also been suggested that there should be a joint Faculty Affairs Committee at the University level that would collectively address issues and concerns relative to the social, cultural and academic well-being of faculty.

VI. Conclusion

This report outlines how the Faculty Senate and its leadership continues to advocate for faculty and shared faculty governance. This document also identifies key areas of engagement where shared faculty governance here at Temple might be enhanced and explains why messaging from both the President’s office and Provost, incentivizing Deans to partner with faculty to revitalize collegial assemblies would be central to improving shared faculty governance at this institution.

As we look to a new era in Temple University’s history, the Faculty Senate is hopeful that we can continue to serve and advance Temple University’s academic value proposition and continue to engage with faculty from our 17 schools and colleges through regular committee membership, along with our Representative and University Senate meetings. We look forward to continuing to collaborate with administration in meaningful ways, recognizing that *shared faculty governance* contributes to a more inclusive cultural climate and quality of life for our whole community.

Respectfully Submitted:
Faculty Senate

Notes:
Guiding Principles. 2021

Flaherty, Colleen. What the Data Say. Inside Higher Ed. October 14, 2021.
<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2021/10/14/more-data-faculty-role-shared-governance>

<https://www.collegefactual.com/colleges/temple-university/academic-life/faculty-composition/#secComposition>

Addendum:

Guiding Principles

Guiding Principles for Collegial Assembly Bylaws

The Faculty Senate Steering Committee believes that two fundamental tenets should underlie the way Collegial Assemblies are constituted and function:

First, as originally adopted by the Faculty Senate and approved by the Board of Trustees in 1969, “Each school of the University shall have its own Collegial Assembly with its own presiding officer, executive and standing committees, with regular meetings and such rules and procedures as it may deem necessary. Each Collegial Assembly shall determine its own membership provided that all University Senators shall be members thereof.”

Second, Collegial Assemblies should fulfill a role in a college analogous to that of the Faculty Senate in the university and mirror its autonomy.

Collegial Assemblies can then be essential components of shared governance at Temple University, performing essential functions in establishing, maintaining, and implementing the quality and academic integrity of programs, curricula, and scholarship at the school or college level. They should also ensure the quality, integrity, productivity, and morale of faculty and other personnel engaged in the teaching and scholarly missions of the University. They should reflect and embody the academic and ethical norms, methods, and processes of the academic and/or professional disciplines they represent. They can also follow the democratic traditions of faculty governance to which Temple University is committed. Each Collegial Assembly should guarantee that faculty can speak with an independent voice.

For these purposes, the Collegial Assembly must be able to conduct business in an atmosphere free from coercion, while fostering collaborative decision making. Its deliberative processes should not be subject to domination or control by administrators. While a Dean has ultimate responsibility for deciding what actions to take, the Dean should seek recommendations from the Collegial Assembly on major decisions and matters affecting the school or college, so that there is open and constructive communication between administration and faculty through the Collegial Assembly. It is equally important that the Collegial Assembly provide means by which faculty may independently initiate recommendations, raise concerns, and deliberate matters related to the school or college.

To accomplish these objectives, the faculty of each college or school must develop Collegial Assembly Bylaws tailored to meet its unique characteristics. The University Faculty Senate Steering Committee has identified the following principles, which we believe should guide this process:

1. The Collegial Assembly is a creation of, and responsible to, the faculty.
 - Each school and college faculty should determine its own Collegial Assembly and committee structure and create its own Bylaws consistent with the Faculty Senate Constitution and Bylaws, Faculty Handbook, and collective bargaining agreements.
 - The Senate Constitution requires that all representative senators and the Faculty Senate steering committee representative be elected by Collegial Assemblies. There should be a means for these representatives to report on Faculty Senate matters and a means for facilitating college participation in university faculty governance. There should also be elected alternates to these positions.

2. All Collegial Assemblies should have a steering (or executive) committee elected by the faculty.
 - Faculty members should chair the steering committee and all standing committees. The Collegial Assembly chair would normally chair the steering committee.
 - Unless otherwise stipulated by collective bargaining agreements, officers and members of all committees should be elected by the faculty.
 - There should be a means by which members of the assembly may call a meeting.
 - Solicitation of nominees for elected committee members should come from and be controlled by faculty. If non-faculty committee members are mandated for any committee, the nomination and selection of these members should be clearly articulated and should privilege faculty input.
 - The terms and conditions of committee membership and service should be stipulated in the Bylaws.

3. Collegial Assembly meetings should be open to receive motions, resolutions, or recommendations from its committees or individual faculty members. Such matters should be subject to full deliberation by the members of the Collegial Assembly, and to final determination by a vote of its members. The results of such a vote should be recorded in minutes of the Collegial Assembly meetings and communicated to the faculty and Dean.

4. Ordinarily, Collegial Assembly Bylaws should ensure that faculty members can meet to discuss issues without the presence of administrators. Collegial Assemblies should be able to seek and receive information from administrators in appropriate circumstances, and attendance of such individuals as guests at Collegial Assembly meetings may be desirable for specific matters.

5. Matters that are within the purview of any Collegial Assembly committees should ordinarily be directed by the Dean and/or Chair of the Collegial Assembly to such committees for consideration. Where the Dean has established administrative committees, cabinets, or other executive leadership groups, those committees and groups should coordinate their work with the relevant committees of the Collegial Assembly. The Collegial Assembly steering committee should provide oversight to ensure that proper coordination takes place.