Faculty Senate Steering Committee
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, November 13, 2012

Present: Joan Shapiro (Pres), Mark Rahdert (Vice Pres.), Tricia Jones (Secy.), Paul LaFollette (Past-Pres.), Cheri Carter (SSW), Kurosh Darvish (Engr), Deborah Howe (SED), Forrest Huffman (FSBM), Michael Jackson (STHM), Michael Jacobs (Pharm), Chip Jungreis (TUSM), Jim Korsh (CST), Steve Newman (Fac. Herald), Michael Sachs (CHP), Catherine Schifter (Educ), Joseph Schwartz (CLA), Jeffrey Solow (BCMD), Karen Turner (SMC), David Waldstreicher (Fac. Herald), Cheryl Mack (Coord.)

Absent: Klara S. Alperstein (Dent.), Stephanie Knopp (Tyl), David Sonenshein (Law), Doug Wager (TFMA)

1. Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 1:05pm.

2. Approval of Minutes:
The FSSC meeting minutes from the November 6, 2012 meeting were discussed. Some small edits were recommended (see attached revisions of minutes with track changes). It was moved, seconded and unanimously approved to accept the minutes of 11/6/2012 with these changes.

3. President’s Report:
Joan Shapiro, President of the Faculty Senate, began her report by noting that FSSC should give a huge “thank you” to Michael Jackson and Cheryl Mack for their hard work on the Fresh Brunch. The event was a wonderful success and Michael and Cheryl’s hard work really made a difference. Joan also thanked all the FSSC members who were able to make the Brunch. She reminded the FSSC that there would not be an FSSC meeting on November 20th due to the University calendar changes for Thanksgiving week.

4. Vice President’s Report:
Mark Rahdert, Vice President of the Faculty Senate, gave updates on committees. He reported that the Provost’s search committee has been formed and announced. He also reported that the Provost’s office has initiated a call for reconstitution of the Dean’s search committees for Dean’s searches postponed last spring. He noted that this means the faculty senate needs to encourage faculty members to serve on those committees as external committee members (faculty from outside the college). CATA is involved with nominations for School of Media and Communications dean search committee.

Mark gave updates that the announcement for next senate committee election has been distributed via listserv. We need RPPC, UTPAC, Sabbatical, and EPPC positions filled. He asked FSSC to please encourage your colleagues to consider serving. We need full faculty representation. He reported that Joan received and shared a request from Vicki McGarvey for an additional faculty member for the University Sustainability task force. They have requested someone from CST or Engineering. Cheryl Mack, Faculty Senate Staff, reminded FSSC that we
need materials from folks by November 19th because we need to post them on web site and the
election is the next week.

5. Guest: Julie Phillips, Associate Director of GenEd:
Julie Phillips came to discuss a situation that had arisen concerning the GenEd program review
process. The general program review process had been reported in the November 6th FSSC
meeting. She noted that the Provost has asked that there be an advisory council responsible for
responding to the external team’s review of the program. This led to a series of questions and
concerns from FSSC members.

The initial comments concerned the function and role of GEEC. Julie said she talked with Peter
Jones, Senior Vice-Provost, clarifying that GEEC is a faculty senate committee appointed for
oversight and they assumed it would provide oversight on the program review. Peter responded
that GEEC is not responsible for the big picture of GenEd in the university. Julie indicated she
talked with Jodi Levine-Laufgraben about this but that Jodi indicated she had not had a chance to
talk with the Provost about the reasoning for this advisory group. Jodi said that GenEd was in a
different place at the university because it is a university wide program.

FSSC members raised several questions and concerns:
-Was rationale provided by Provost Dai or Peter Jones? Julie reported “no.” It was suggested that
we need to ask for that rationale.
-Is there precedent for this – not in core but in IH (which did not have a GEEC counterpart)?
Julie reported that as far as she has been able to discern, similar initiatives were not asked to
provide advisory boards to oversee results of their program review.
-There’s a liaison subcommittee between FSSC and GEEC/GenEd – why can’t we use that group
to provide oversight? There was a suggestion that this subcommittee be brought to the attention
of the Provost and that we recommend this committee be involved.
-How large is the suggested advisory committee? Julie told FSSC that they gave 8 names when
asked. She and Istvan were asked to give names of people involved in GenEd and those who
were not.
-Why doesn’t GEEC meet the need? There was discussion about the breadth and range of GEEC
representation. GEEC has 13 members, not all of whom are faculty. 3 are students and 10 are
faculty, with no more than 2 members from any one college. GEEC members serve 3 year terms
and terms are staggered. When asked about how GEEC members are appointed, Julie clarified
that GenEd solicits names and nominated individuals are asked to forward a statement of interest
and a CV. They are voted on by FSSC. The charge of GEEC says that one of its functions is to
review the GenEd program at the 5 year point. But it was suggested that GEEC may be seen as
non-independent because Istvan, the Director of GenEd, chairs the GEEC committee. Still, FSSC
members felt strongly that the suggested advisory committee seriously undermines the faculty
senate role in committee and review processes. FSSC was reminded that GEEC was formed by
faculty Senate and approved by faculty senate and approved by the Board. We have a big
problem if this committee is going to be circumvented. And, it is likely that changes to the
GEEC have to go through the board.
Additional suggestions included:
- We should raise concerns about faculty governance with Provost (already raised them with Peter); we see this as a trend.
- We want to advocate for a more transparent process (want to share the report and the review).
- We should emphasize the notion that this change is not following program review protocols.
- Joan Shapiro should draft a memo to the Provost summarizing our concerns. Joan agreed and indicated she would send this to Julie as well.
- We should have a GenEd special senate meeting sometime this year to discuss this as well as other GenEd issues.
- We should ask that there please not be any announcements about this committee until we have had a chance to do more diligence on this.

6. Old Business:
In the November 6, FSSC meeting it was moved and approved to form a committee to review faculty concerns about student misconduct issues. Karen Turner (SMC), indicated that we volunteered her for a job as chair of this committee and she wants to have FSSC clarify the charge for the committee. The charge was clarified as:
- to come up with recommendations for changes in the current student conduct review process
- to best educate members of the university community
It was also suggested that we have someone from Disability Resource Center be on the committee.

7. Guest: David Unruh, Sr. VP, Institutional Advancement (2:00 p.m.)
David Unruh began by saying he has a background from a liberal arts college having majored in history and economics. He’s been at Temple for 3 years. His role in Institutional Advancement is to engage alumni. There are 300,000 total alumni. He directs soliciting of philanthropic contributions, mainly alumni relations, marketing and institutional positioning. He has been responsible for the Temple Made Campaign which will be shifting to represent research and academic mission and away from the initial focus on athletics.

He reported that it used to be fundraising strength was decentralized (in colleges) but this meant we couldn’t support them with shared services. In mature philanthropic organizations the large gifts really arc across disciplines and entities. We have restructured to facilitate that. We have also added strength to our college teams. We averaged 50 million dollars a year in new gifts and commitments. $100-150 million per year in philanthropic support is the projected capacity.

He also reported that we are increasing alumni participation, which are critical. Public universities have lower participation rates [PR] than privates. With projected decreasing support from commonwealth we need to have more PR (8% to 15%). This is the bigger mountain to climb.

He also noted that the $100 mil scholarship initiative is in his portfolio. We are less expensive but our students need lots of financial assistance. Goal over 5 years is 100 mil /50 mil in endowment. And, he is working to support faculty – endowed chairs.
He suggested that we should trumpet faculty and staff giving (staff support for IA is increasing and this will help them work with faculty to outreach to more fundraising opportunities).

There was a very active question and (answer) session. Among the questions and responses were:
- How will the coming RCB affect this work in institutional advancement [IA]? (We already operate with a shared costs model, so this will probably not change the model at all.)
- Where are data available on how specific colleges are doing? (Data is robust, they track efforts by college and unit; every college has a goal and fund-raising metrics. He could make that available to us.)
- How do we compare with other universities? (When you look at urban universities we have a similar profile. Median for public universities is 10%. We do very well at graduate level. The TUMS gives 2x more than Penn. Law school too. Where we hurt is at the UG level. No resonance with tight cohort. Less affinity to class rank – time to graduation is too long. From a total dollar amount and new gifts and pledges we do lag).
- Can we expand Temple Made to include Temple contributions to the region? For example, 30,000 teachers, 15,000 doctors . . . etc. (He indicated this was a great idea and he would definitely follow-up on it).
- There are lots of resources in advising positions, but little training or rewards or recognition in faculty advising activity. Do we have data that more faculty advising involvement increases alumni support? (There is not empirical but lots of anecdotal information).
- Do we have data on giving by gender, race, or ethnicity? (No).
- On Jan 1st the endowment baseline is increasing? Is this true? (Endowing a scholarship at the department level is going up to $100,000? They looked at endowment minima and real income they spun off. The challenge is that there is no return on investment; they are left with lots of small endowments that can’t be packaged or used -- millions each year we could not use or spend.)
- What % of Temple faculty give? (He doesn’t know, but he will get that information for FSSC. He guessed that about 30% give. He noted that the response at Temple is a much greater percentage than other institutions.)
- How big is the IA staff? (There are about 175 in his staff across the university in all functional areas -- marketing, college folks, etc).

8. New Business:
There was no new business.

9. Adjournment:
It was moved, seconded and approved unanimously that we adjourn at 3:10pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tricia S. Jones, Faculty Senate Secretary