

Faculty Senate Steering Committee Meeting
Tuesday, October 8, 2019, 1:00 pm
Conference Room 3B, Conwell Hall
Meeting Minutes

Present: Present: Rafael Porrata-Doria (Pres., Law), Kimmika Williams-Witherspoon (V. Pres., TFMA), Lisa Ferretti (Secretary, SSW), Shohreh Amini (CST), Betsy Barber (STHM), Teresa Gill Cirillo (FSB), Sue Dickey (CPH), Paul LaFollette (Fac. Herald, CST), Salim Merali (Pharm), Vallorie Peridier (CST), Mark Rahdert (Law), Carmen Sapienza (LKSM), Jeffrey Solow (BCMD), Cheryl Mack (Coord.)

Absent: Quaiser Abdullah (KMC), Rob Fauber (CLA), Austin Leong (KSoD), Sharyn O'Mara (ART & Architecture)

1. Call to Order

The President called the meeting to order at 1:13 PM.

2. Approval of September 24, 2019 Minutes

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes. The minutes were approved by a unanimous vote.

3. President's Report

Item 1: The President discussed the background and context to the proposed *Medical School Proposed Resolution* (Resolution). The proposal seeks to clarify the status within the Faculty Senate of full-time faculty working across organizational divisions within LKSOM. A point of order was raised to have the Resolution brought to the full Faculty Senate. A motion was made to accept the Resolution as amended. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved. The motion will be brought to a vote of the full Faculty Senate.

Item 2: The President discussed the context of a survey instituted by the Research Programs and Policies Committee (RPPC). An unofficial version of the results of the survey was distributed to members of the FSSC for discussion (see attached).

Discussion:

FSSC members noted several concerns both about this particular survey and the practice or our participation in survey processes going forward. It was unclear whether or not the RPPC reviewed by the FSSC is an official report out of the RPPC's survey as it was not supplied to the FSSC but rather found located on a canvas site for the CPH Collegial Assembly. Methodology, sample size and other critiques of the RPPC report were noted by several members of the group. The FSSC's involvement in the formation of the survey was limited and advisory only to the RPPC. This raised an equal concern as to whether or not surveys of

any kind that are brought to the FSSC for review will need a more rigorous review against a standard set of criterion.

The President committed to follow-up on this item and will report back to the FSSC. The President will request that the RPPC make a presentation and oral report to the FSSC and full Faculty Senate on their findings from this recent survey. A small committee will be formed to set criteria for future requests/reviews of surveys of the faculty.

Further concerns were raised related to the disposition of Faculty Committees that are non-responsive to the FSSC. It may require a change in the by-laws but there might be a need to implement some additional guidelines related to the work of our committees. A suggestion was made that a document that outlines the charge and process of FS committees be updated and distributed each year.

It was also suggested that minutes or a report from each Faculty Committee should be made to the FS or FSSC at least once per year. It was also noted that the FSSC does have access to some meeting minutes. The President noted that follow-up was necessary and a report and recommendations for next steps will provided to the FSSC.

Item 3: The President reported on possible topics for discussion by the FSSC as suggested by R. Fauber. Suggested topics included:

- The desirability and feasibility of changing the language of the title "Non-tenure track" to something that NTTs might find less pejorative and more collegial
- Report re the NTT – changing the name might not be recognized at other universities so there might be longer term implications for NTT. The issue here is that the current term defines you as not being defined as what you are not.
- It has come to light that the Provost's Office is hiring a marketing firm to search and report on the social media history of candidates for tenure-track hires. Is the faculty aware of this, and does the Senate want to take a position on this?
- Is there a further update on the release of E-SFF survey results by the Provost's office?
- Does the Faculty Senate have an interest in encouraging/lobbying for more green initiatives on campus?

Item 4: Bargaining Units Liaison Committee Report: Committee Chair Solow reported that his main charge is to fill vacancies on the committee which he has been working to do. To date Committee composition is as follows:

FS Representatives include P. LaFollette (CIS and Faculty Herald Editor) and S. Dickey (CPH-Nursing) and one TBN; TAUP Representatives include J. Solow (BCMD and Chair), J. Bailey (Education) and B. Newman (CPH-SSW); H. Wells (Law); Medicine (TBN) and J. Albandar (Dentistry).

The role of the Committee is to be a communication conduit among the various faculty bargaining units ensuring representation of their views regarding subjects that concern faculty throughout the University.

Liaison Committee vacancies will be added to the agenda for next Representative Senate Meeting.

A motion was made to approve the members who volunteered to serve. The motion was seconded and followed by a unanimous vote. The vote was followed by a brief discussion about the title of Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTs), its origins at Temple, the need to consider the impact of changing the title on those seeking employment outside of Temple and the pejorative nature of the terminology generally.

Item 5: Herald Advisory Committee Report: Committee Chair Cirillo reported content and accessibility of the Herald were the focus of the Committee's most recent meeting. This included a discussion related to formatting, length of issues, platform, distribution and accessibility.

The President added that there is an issue of the Herald expected December 1st and writing assignments/authors were already committed to the issue.

The Editor (P. LaFollette – CIS) thanked the Chair for assistance in moving the Herald forward. The Editor also noted that a license for software to support the editorial process is needed. After a discussion of the need for software and/or hardware needed for distribution it was suggested that an IT professional would need to be contacted to better understand our options. It was also noted that the FS website is also desperately in need of renovation.

4. Vice President's Report

Item 1: The following nominees were reviewed and approved via the FSSC listserv as of Friday, October 4, 2019:

- John Allgood (STHM), Faculty Senate-Lectures and Forums Committee
- Christine Cleaver (STHM), Faculty Senate Status of Women of Color
- Amy Giddings (STHM), Faculty Senate Educational Programs and Policies Committee
- Ira Rosen (STHM), Faculty Senate Budget Review Committee
- Elizabeth (Lizzy) Taylor (STHM), Faculty Senate Status of Women of Color

Item 2: A motion was made to change the size of the Faculty Senate Committee on the Status of Faculty of Color from 12 to 8. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

Item 3: The Faculty Senate on the Status of Women wants to know if Emerita can be appointed to the committee. A discussion with the FSSC concluded that this is permitted.

Item 4: The Assessment of Instruction Committee met last week and the FSSC Representative reported a concern that there was information scheduled to be distributed to the Council of Deans.

A question was raised as to whether or not this is an FSSC committee and a review concluded that it appears in 2002 this was established as an FSSC committee.

There was a full discussion of this issue and the general issues related to the auspices of committees and the role of the Faculty Senate in oversight of our committees and in particular committees that are jointly managed with the University. It was decided that the President would consult with the Provost on this issue.

5. Old Business

Note: The Pink Owl is back. It was noted that appropriate thanks should be communicated to the University Administration.

6. New Business

7. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. The President adjourned the meeting at 2:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted: Lisa A Ferretti, Secretary, Faculty Senate

LEWIS KATZ SCHOOL OF MEDICINE PROPOSED RESOLUTION

The Faculty Senate recognizes that all faculty whose teaching or research at the Lewis Katz School of Medicine and provision of clinical care at Temple Faculty Practice Plan (TFPP), when combined, total a full-time equivalent, have full-time faculty status and therefore are properly considered members of Temple University's Faculty Senate even if dually employed by Temple and TFPP or its successor(s).

The Research Programs and Policies committee of the Faculty Senate ensures an active faculty role in the formulation and evaluation of research policies. The Committee is charged with promoting faculty research and scholarly activities and advising university administration and the Faculty Senate on research policies. The committee is also called upon to assist in the dissemination of policies and guidelines ensuring implementation is consistent and clearly communicated to the broader university research community.

The committee recently completed a university-wide survey of tenure track and non-tenure track faculty to gather feedback about what is working well and what needs to be improved in order to better support faculty with research endeavors. The results of the survey are as follows:

Survey Summary:

1. Distribution and goal

- The goal of the survey was to solicit items to set the agenda for the Faculty Senate Research Programs and Policy committee.
- All full-time faculty
- TU “official” listing – approval sought and secured as required by the Faculty Senate
- By email link
- Entirely voluntary

2. Respondents

- N= 189
- Distribution by areas (defined by the university survey committee) ○ Medical/health/biological areas (62, 32.8%) 22 self-identified as Katz ○ Arts and humanities (51, 27.0%) ○ Law and social science (39, 20.6%).
- Time at Temple ○ 15 or more years (62, 32.8%) ○ 10 – 14 years (46, 24.3) and ○ – 1 years (44, 23.3).

3. Position (self-identified): NTTs 16 (8.5%)

4. Attitudes about conducting research at Temple ○ Positive (71, 37.6%) ○ Neutral (50, 25.9%) ○ Negative (69, 36.5%)

5. From comments made:

- Some evidenced limited knowledge of Temple, the IRB process, or both; role of NTTs; role of the university in research (Some complained about no statistical analysis office, editing services, or both).
- Specific issues listed included:

- Direct research support from the university beyond start-up funds (25, 13.2%)
- Better functioning bureaucracy (undefined) (10, 5.3%)
- IRB office and process (17, 9.0%)

6. Other interesting findings:

- The more recently hired the individual was, the greater the probability of misunderstanding Temple. Indeed, of those reporting being at Temple 0 – 4 years, 20% made factual errors.
- When asked to identify any changes that are needed, IRB was identified irrespective of how long the individuals had been at temple. Respondents complained about inconsistency among the IRB personnel, the time delays, and the whole process itself.
- When asked about changes the respondent would suggest, more Temple money for projects was identified. On a percentage basis, a better functioning bureaucracy, especially the university research office was a close second.