Representative Senate Meeting  
November 8, 2012  
Minutes  

Attendance:  
Representative senators and officers: 41  
Ex-officio: 1  
Faculty administrators and guests: 8  
Total attendance: 50  

1. **Call to Order:** 
The meeting was called to order at 1:48pm. The minutes from the October 9, 2012 Representative Faculty Senate Meeting were moved, seconded and unanimously approved.  

2. **President’s Report:**  
Joan Shapiro, President of the Faculty Senate gave a brief report. She reminded faculty that there was a wonderful Fresh Brunch to honor Outstanding Service from Faculty in each of the schools and colleges. She acknowledged the leadership and effort of Michael Jackson and Cheryl Mack in making this happen and the generosity of Provost Dai in supporting these awards and the brunch. She indicated that this is the second annual service awards brunch and it is important that we continue this recognition process. Joan also mentioned the message that recently was distributed on the Faculty Senate listserv inquiring about faculty planning on retiring in January 2013 who have been officer, committee chair, etc. for faculty senate. We wish to honor those retirees at the December 7th meeting. Joan also mentioned that at the December 7, 2012 University Faculty Senate meeting we will have Frank Friedman and Eleanor Myers reporting on the Institutional Task Force on the Freeth Report. She emphasized that this is a very important report and urged senators to encourage their faculty colleagues to attend.  

3. **Dialogue with Dai:**  
Provost Dai once again thanked the senators for their work and discussed a number of issues:  
-The New President is coming January 1st. He is a leader in building responsibility centered budget systems. This will be a centerpiece of Theobald’s policies. In preparation for this, the Provost’s office and Anthony Wagner, CFO, has started the process. They have formed a committee with Faculty Senate representatives and are going to look at the current budget model at Temple and what would be an ideal responsibility centered budget model and how we best transition from the current budget model to RCB. There has been no substantial discussion yet. Today he would like to have conversation with faculty about what we would like to know.  
- Provost Dai started with explanation of RCB. Now TU revenue comes from tuition (a little less than 60%), state allocations (140 mil, 12%), and research (restricted monies $130 mil). Programs (operated by administrative or academic units) are mostly fee for service. There is a total $1.2 billion budget for Temple University, not including TUHS. Temple has appropriated a certain amount to the provost’s office for academic services. The Provost distributes to colleges and service units -- more a centralized model. In RCB (which Penn adopted about 20 years ago), each college is a budget unit (meaning that revenue goes to a college from research, tuition, fee for service/auxiliary programs and colleges then pay a tax to a central pool to maintain critical services). The central pool is usually housed in provost office). Deans are responsible for their budget. At Penn the Dean actually reports directly to the Board of Trustees on budget issues.
Provost Dai raised the question, “Why do we want to do this?” With RCB TU will become more motivated to get new revenues and be more fiscally responsible. His experience at Penn also suggested that RCB brings risks and can create unhealthy competition. Everyone wants to keep credit hours within their college. But we can definitely use changes to get more motivated. One example he gave concerned how to increase tuition paying graduate students in some programs. Right now our policy for acceptance into MA programs has grade point restrictions (e.g., 3.0 or higher) that chills people. International students have difficulty dealing with the unfriendly web application process where they get caught in a do-loop. Turnaround time on application for grad students is too long (2-5 months). In comparison, Drexel’s application timeline is 2 weeks. More than 30% of MA degree applications are incomplete but nobody bothers to check with students. He gave an example of MS in IT at CST and how his office gave 30K start up funds. He said that he hopes this will be the beginning of many discussions on RCB and asked for questions.

- Art Hochner (FSBM) commented there was a proposal to have RCB in 1996 and it was rejected by administrative decision and one of the issues then was that this model penalizes the colleges that have to have smaller class sizes. Some colleges do not have the same ability to generate endowments or get research or attract hundred of students. He is concerned about shared governance that RCB will be a force to split governance and faculty focus will have to be on building up their colleges.

- The Provost responded that we are partially college based RCB already. A critical question is how we give a cash value or a cash charge to services like the library or student affairs. We have to determine best answers to these questions. One technique is to benchmark by comparing to peer institutions. We then have a form of tax on colleges.

He indicated that he does worry about impact on individual colleges. We are now operating on a model that is historic – how it was done rather than how it should be done. We have just inherited the budget models. They may not make much sense now. He commented that RCB also raises the issues of charges for physical space. He’s worried that colleges like CST will be assessed heavy charges for space and facilities and they have no choice over this.

- Jo-Anna Moore (Tyler): We have counted on Provost as chief academic officer to protect the central academic charge. RCB focuses on cash value only and she is concerned about that idea. Maybe we should not looking for a Provost at all. Sounds like we need more finance experts. The entire purpose of a university education is challenged by RCB.

- The Provost noted the philosophical nature of this question. He agrees we need to take a view that we may not be operating optimally. We need to revisit these models. Do we build faculty that may attract more students and pay more for those faculty, or go a different way? In his conversation with the Trustees he learned they assume the Provost acts as a channel to the faculty to help support these issues.

- (unidentified faculty) History: What is the structure and process through which the discussion and decisions will be made? Is the structure posted somewhere and who do we go to talk with them if we want to?

- The Provost responded that we have a steering committee with representatives from the financial office, provost’s office, deans’ council, and faculty. Terry Halbert represents the faculty senate. The first phase is a study to look at each college’s revenues and expenditures. Second, we will look at other universities using RCB (like Indiana University or Penn) to see how they are doing it. Then we will have deliberation and planning. The Steering Committee will probably have a mechanism to have input. It will be published and available. You can also reach out to Terry.
-Greg Urwin (CLA): We need to retain the idea of what a good research university looks like. We need to have a sense of our values and not let RCB sway us too much. We need to have Deans who are entrepreneurial. And we have Deans who do not know how to raise money.

-the Provost commented that whichever system is in place we need to have good people in place. RCB requires excellent deans who have vision. This is very important.

4. **Vice-President’s Report:**
Mark Rahdert, Vice President of the Faculty Senate gave his report.

-Faculty committees: He reported the status of the Provost’s search committee; a memo from President Englert encouraged submission of over 30 candidates to CATA who vetted all and made recommendations according to criteria specified by President. That process went very smoothly. There were many submissions from NTTs as well as TTs.

-Another set of committee elections is coming up. We have vacancies in EPPC, RPPC, UTPAC, and Sabbatical Committee. November 26th – is the week of scheduled election. If you are interested in being a candidate, please send statement of interest and CV to senate2@temple.edu. Some committees have restrictions on eligibility so please review those on the committee listings on the Senate web site.

-We also have needs for some of the appointed committees. Mark mentioned it is difficult to be specific because we have had delays on the web site.

5. **Discussion of Criteria for Provost:**
There was an open discussion in the Representative Faculty Senate meeting of November 8, 2012 about what qualities a new provost should possess. The following is a bullet point summary of the faculty comments.

- Champion of academic achievement and faculty governance
- Supportive of the importance of strong collegial assemblies and the guidelines for assemblies developed by the Faculty Senate
- Values the faculty who serve primarily as undergraduate teachers; a provost who would not make these faculty second class citizens
- Willing to find ways to tenure teachers hired as NTTs; work toward tenure of clinical educator and NTT positions
- With the strength and resolve to help deans understand that they need to help encourage independent faculty voice rather than generating consensus through fear and intimidation
- Clear and forward-thinking about the need for correction mechanisms (especially for changes like Responsibility Centered Budgeting); able to set expectation that there will be checkpoints and benchmarking and that administrators need to assume these reviews will value a strong faculty voice
- Invested and supportive of community engagement and community based learning programs
- Experienced and enthusiastic about support for university wide and interdisciplinary programs (especially in light of the RCB impacts on those programs); willing to make sure these efforts are protected under an RCB system
- A leader who encourages institutional reflection and learning/adopts a learning organization orientation
- Possesses a broad vision of the university; does not think primarily or only in terms of their previous home college or functional area
- Encourages thinking systemically and actively explores how things affect other parts of the system than their department or college
• An excellent communicator – giving the faculty the information we need; like budget information – open and above board and committed to open discourse and information sharing with faculty
• Understands the need for more staffing infrastructure support. A provost who can talk to people from complicated disciplines working in the field – like helping professions

6. **Discussion: What Issues Should the New President Address?**
   There was an open discussion on what issues the new President should address. The comments included the following.
   - faculty governance is critical. We need collegial assemblies that operate according to guidelines.
   - we need endowment and we have not been successful in raising one. A President’s most critical role is to attract new sources of funding and endowment to the university
   - faculty governance; the new President needs to develop a positive relationship with TAUP.

7. **Move to Adjourn:**
   It was moved, seconded and unanimously approved that the meeting be adjourned at 3:15pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tricia S. Jones,
Faculty Senate Secretary