Representative Senate Meeting
Tuesday, October 9, 2012
Minutes

Attendance:
Representative Senators and Officers: 44
Ex-officio: 1
Faculty, Administrators and Guests: 9
Total Attendance: 52

1. Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order by Joan Shapiro, President of the Faculty Senate at 1:46pm.

2. Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the September 10, 2012 Representative Senate meeting were moved, seconded and approved with two additions. (1) Greg Urwin’s name should be changed from “Irwin” to “Urwin.” (2) The last sentence in Greg Urwin’s comments in that meeting should be changed from “The President acknowledged this and agreed” to “The President said he would acknowledge this.”

3. Tribute to Professor Mark Haller:
Michael Sachs (CHPSW) made comments about Mark Haller who recently passed. He remembered Mark for his leadership in the Senate and particularly his service as chair of the Handbook Committee. Paul LaFollette, past-president of Faculty Senate shared his fond experiences of Mark’s work on Senate Committees, especially the Personnel Committee. There will be a memorial service for Professor Haller on November 7th in Gladfelter Hall.

4. Dialogue with Provost Dai:
Provost Dai addressed the faculty senate and reported on several important issues.
- He confirmed that President Englert will announce the search for the Provost position; that it has been agreed that this will be an internal search.
- He remarked that this is a challenging time. For the second year in a row we are seeing a decrease in undergraduate student enrollment. Provost Dai noted that without additional money added to undergraduate financial aid funds it would have been worse. Temple has experienced a 7% decline in undergraduate student enrollment which mirrors the national average.
- Provost Dai opened the floor for faculty comments, questions and concerns. He provided thoughtful responses to the faculty comments. Those exchanges are summarized below.
  
  Jennifer Cromley (COE) noted concerns about general support for research.

Provost Dai responded that we do need better research support services. He gave a brief overview of recent history in terms of research support. President Hart elevated research office to senior Vice Presidential level and Larry Lemanski was hired to fill that position. He was charged with reaching out to foundations and government for pork barrel projects. However, that model of increasing funding depends on active industrial support for higher education research. Provost Dai noted that there is decreasing industrial support for research in US and this has been a major loss of opportunity. When pork barrels dried up nothing followed and there was a change in philosophy – that the key to increasing our external funding and our research rating was to hire faculty with
research and funding potential and support current faculty doing research. When Larry Lemanski left the position, President Hart asked (then Dean of CST) Dai to head a task force about research support. His read of the current funding situation is that Temple should continue to hire research-oriented faculty and work to bolster infrastructures and resources to support their research activities.

-Greg Urwin (History, CLA) noted that in the 9/10/2012 representative faculty senate meeting President Englert talked about benefits of Big East membership. Urwin referenced a UConn ad in the 9/7/2012 issue of Chronicle of Higher Ed that suggests to Professor Urwin that Temple may not be as well resourced as some of the other Big East institutions.

-Provost Dai answered that he agrees this is a time where we need to find resources to strengthen faculty and the institution. In the last 3 months the Provost’s office has led new initiatives. He discussed each initiative briefly. (1) He reported on the scholarship and financial aid packages that are increasingly attracting top undergraduates. Temple is now offering full tuition through merit scholarship offerings. For students with higher than a 1400 SAT score Temple offers a full scholarship plus additional financial incentives to attract more merit scholars. (2) The Provost’s office is working with each college to approve search for 73 new tenure track faculty. There is $15 million in the start-up fund. This is probably unprecedented at Temple. 71 of our colleagues chose to take early retirement last year. State funding cuts starting in 2009 meant that Temple has lost $113 million in state funding since then. That impacted our ability to go full force in faculty searches. The Board of Trustees has bought into the idea that to build research we have to build support investment for faculty searches.

-Jim Korsh (CST) has trouble believing that undergraduates choose a university based on knowledge of the research at the university. Seems there are other things we could emphasize – like small class sizes, teaching quality, etc.

-Provost Dai agrees that to many students their first choice is based on choosing a campus and campus life options, and then they look at possible major. So research may not have a direct impact on student enrollment. But a better research profile for Temple might have indirect impact in terms of university rankings. Provost Dai noted that another factor is to graduate students that find jobs. For example, CST has its own job fair. Vanguard hired 22 CST graduates on the spot because they were looking for IT savvy students – like CST graduates. Companies want to hire people who can solve problems.

-Joe Schwartz (CLA) asked whether it is true that in the last 30 years we have been relatively weak in the hard sciences. He suggested that we used to invest on start-up projects and venues. Are we doing better with that? Can we do this without a larger endowment?

-Provost Dai responded that he believes Temple can grow if we take the right investment and strategy. In 2007 Temple’s College of Science and Technology had 6.7 million average sponsored research spending. 4 years later we were up to 17 million – a 140% increase in CST. With relatively small resources they made this happen. Provost Dai argued that we used money smartly. 35 years ago Temple ranked 67th in the US in research funding. Now we are at 178th. He told an example of a faculty member some time ago who lost a prestigious laboratory grant because the university under President Liacouras would not match costs. In 6 years as department chair he fended off at least a dozen raids on Temple faculty. We should be proud when our faculty are coveted by other institutions. We need to find reasonable ways to support our faculty.

Joan Shapiro thanked Provost Dai for his valuable comments and encouraged faculty to contact the Provost if they had additional issues or comments.

5. Vice President’s Report: 
Mark Rahdert, Vice-President of the Faculty Senate, gave his report. He covered three items. (1) He commented on the recent Faculty Senate Elections to committees. He thanked all the candidates who stood for committee service. And he thanked all faculty who voted. (2) He noted that we still need candidates for other elected committees. There will be a second election later in November. On the RPPC we have 3 vacancies, 1 elected and 2 appointed positions. On EPPC there is 1 elected position open. UTPAC has 2 vacancies limited to full
professors with tenure. And, he reported that we need 3 new members on CATA. We especially need women and persons of color. CATA is about to be activated for the internal provost search. CATA recruits and vets faculty to be recommended for that committee.

6. President’s Report:
Joan Shapiro, President of the Faculty Senate, made a brief report in order to protect time for Vice-Provost Peter Joes’ presentation. She mentioned the resolution that Greg Urwin had commented on, asking presenters to send summaries of their comments two weeks in advance of their presentation to the senate. She indicated that she appreciate the importance of having time in the senate meetings to allow faculty discussion and noted that in some cases it is difficult to expect guests to always adhere to the resolution – especially when they are reporting very recent events that are of interest to the faculty. However, she indicated that she will try to let folks know in advance what people will say

She reminded faculty of the FRESH Brunch for Outstanding Faculty Service Awards and gave thanks to Michael Jackson and Cheryl Mack for their work on this important event. She noted that October 17th is the deadline for schools, colleges or divisions to identify honorees. Honorees for this year and last year will be lauded at event on October 30th in Alter Hall.

Joan Shapiro thanked David Waldstreicher, Editor of the Faculty Herald, for his hard work and consistently excellent efforts on the Herald.

7. Guest Presentation, Peter Jones, SVP:
Peter Jones gave a presentation on critical issues for undergraduate education at Temple. The thrust of his report was on issues of access and retention and some of the innovative approaches Temple is taking.
- He began with his discussion of access to university and clarified that access means both getting into and getting successfully through the university. Academic policies react to students usually only when they get into trouble – e.g. academic probation. Then action (like academic probation) is often too late and intervention is not as valuable as it could be. Support centers like the writing center and math center wait for students to self-diagnose need. He argued that we need more proactive responses and better ways to identify students in trouble. He noted that Temple is moving to those actions.
- He reported that Temple loses 15% of our students in their first year. 85% retention rate not bad for a large urban university, but we can do better. We lose another 15% in sophomore year. Our 4 year graduation rate is 37% and our 6 graduation rate is 67%. Average student debt at graduation is $31,000. These are key statistics.
- There are two things we are doing to be more proactive. (1) We are using a risk based model; analyzing characteristics of drop outs that predicts who is likely to drop out. Many risk factors are not academic. Looking at the top decile of at-risk students he reported that 34% of the top decile will leave Temple during the first year. The second decile has a 30% drop out rate. We are starting to invest in increasing the size of academic advising and developing a more professional group of academic advisers. We were losing a lot of the best advisers because there was no career option for them. The risk model was put into place 4 years ago and it was voluntary. All advisers in all units agreed. They were given list of students in top 1 or 2 deciles and they became high list case load. The advisers met with at-risk students at least 5 times a semester. Across the board, we are one of few universities that have seen an increase in freshman retention (1 of 9 large publics with increased retention – 85 to 89% in last three years). Each percentage point increase in retention is worth 2 million to the university. About 180 students are now making it into their second year that would have dropped out before. Temple is now developing same model for sophomore retention and junior transfer retention. He emphasized that this is a huge institutional culture change. We are definitely moving to more focused and strategic and proactive form of intervention. Some might even call it intrusive or aggressive advising.

(2) The second area of attention and innovation is time to graduation. He argued that we need to make sure students graduate in 4 years if possible. It used to be students coming to Temple did not have a map saying what they needed to take each semester to graduate. We now have that for every single major – an 8 semester grid. Our
next step is to create a program called critical paths – CST is taking the lead -- for each major that lays out for each of the first seven semesters critical markers that would indicate a student is not on track for a 4 year graduation. Every student should be tracked. We need to know who is off path and why they are off path. The adviser needs to respond as quickly as possible. We don’t want to be punitive. CST is only college doing this right now but the goal is to expand this to all other colleges and schools this year. He meets with students and parents every semester and their fear is often will the student get lost here. And the feedback to this on-path idea is very positive. We want to retain more students and get more students to graduate in 4 years. This is also really important for students who exhaust financial aid because of too long a time to graduation.

Two years ago Temple introduced a new ladder for academic advising. We replaced a one-size-fits all approach and moved to a 5-tier system for academic advising. These levels assure that we have good people coming into advising profession and they have a clear career path ahead of them. It is resulting in a decreasing attrition rate for advisers. We are down to a 5% attrition rate for advisors this last year.

The next big step is for us to have faculty working more closely with academic advising. We have to build collegiality between academic advising and faculty. This is not only within the college. We have 75% of our students changing majors during their time here. Many of these changes are across colleges and we need to build these relationships so professionals and faculty can span the boundaries so we can be building support for the students changing majors across colleges.

He told one anecdote about a 5th year student about to be dismissed. The student came in as pre-med and then changed major. Did OK but was never really invested. The parents spent $155,000 over five years. This becomes a situation of hardship that faculty and advisers can work together to prevent.

Chip Jungreis (TUSM) asked about a student having difficulty after 1st semester. Peter responded that they are on academic warning but that doesn’t stop them from options. We are now trying to flag them quickly and get them in touch with advisers.

Tricia Jones (COE) asked which risk factors were not academic and how these can be addressed. She also commented that given the number of adjuncts and NTTs teaching students in their first year we need to think about how to identify and support these faculty to be involved in the efforts that Peter Jones is discussing.

Michael Jackson (STHM) said that trying to get response from advisers is not always easy. We have 20 academic advising units.

Peter concurred that the current advising units are largely independent. Some units report to Peter. Most don’t. Some students got dismissed for less than 1/10th of a GPA score. They looked at all students in similar situation and looked at bringing them back, aggressive advising, and following them to see if they could get at least 4 C+ grades. If yes, they invited them back. We have done this for 2 semesters – purely voluntary. About 45 students were affected; they were offered a chance to come back. 33 accepted.

David Waldstreicher (CLA) asked how do you see the role of faculty advising majors (and presumably upper classmen). He is struck by how little advising is done by faculty. And he notes there is little in terms of course release or support. Faculty are also not receiving training or support for this advising work either. We need much better faculty training, information and preparation.

-Peter Jones agreed there are multiple advising models in higher education. Imagine two triangles – professional academic adviser needs in freshman and sophomore years. The other inverted triangle applies as students move into their majors. As students move into junior year they should be thinking about how they develop themselves for their academic career. Model assumes there is a natural handoff from advisers from one triangle to the other. That is not the case.
Mark Rahdert, standing in for Joan Shapiro, thanked Peter Jones for his excellent presentation.

8. **Adjournment:**
   It was moved, seconded and unanimously supported to adjourn the meeting at 3:21pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tricia S. Jones
Faculty Senate Secretary