Faculty Senate Steering Committee  
Tuesday, March 5, 2013  
Meeting Minutes

Present: Joan Shapiro (Pres.), Mark Rahdert (Vice Pres.), Tricia Jones (Secy.), Paul LaFollette (Past-Pres.), Kenneth Boberick (DENT), Kurosh Darvish (Engr), Deborah Howe (SED) [teleconference], Michael Jackson (STHM), Michael Jacobs (Pharm), Stephanie Knopp (Tyl), Jim Korsh (CST), Steve Newman (Fac. Herald), Michael Sachs (CHP), Catherine Schifter (Educ), Jeffrey Solow (BCMD), Howard Spodek (CLA), Doug Wager (TFMA), Cheryl Mack (Coord.)

Absent: Cheri Carter (SSW), Forrest Huffman (FSBM), Chip Jungreis (TUSM), David Sonenshein (Law), Karen M. Turner (SMC)

1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 1:04pm.

2. Approval of Minutes: The minutes from the February 26th FSSC meeting were moved, seconded and approved with a vote of 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstaining.

3. Vice President’s Report: Mark Rahdert, Vice-President of Faculty Senate gave his report. Two candidates for committees were discussed.

Mukherjee, Srimati (CLA) was presented as a candidate for the Committee for International Programs. The appointment was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved.

Elizabeth Sweet (CLA) was presented as a candidate to the Status of Faculty of Color Committee. Her appointment was moved, seconded and unanimously approved.

Cheryl Mack, Faculty Senate Coordinator, indicated that candidates for election and appointed committees have provided necessary documents for the upcoming election and decisions. If there are additional candidates it is important to remind them that people standing for committee election have a deadline of notification of Friday, March 8th. Materials (statements of interest and CVs) need to be sent by March 8th.

4. President’s Report: Joan Shapiro, Faculty Senate President, welcomed new FSSC member, Kenneth Boberick, of the dental school.

5. New Business: President Shapiro requested that we attend to two issues of new business.

Letter re: Faculty Advisory Budget Committees: She asked the FSSC to consider the letter that had been drafted concerning the formation of advisory faculty budget committees. The letter was addressed to President Theobald. The letter was distributed through the FSSC listserv and commented upon by faculty. Based on these comments, Joan had prepared and distributed a version of the letter that included suggestions for revision in boldface (Copy of letter attached). A second issue that had been raised in the FSSC listserv discussion was the question of
signatories to the letter – whether the letter should be signed by the Faculty Senate President, members of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, or all willing members of the FSSC.

Michael Sachs initially made the motion to: “accept the changes to the letter as indicated in boldface and have the letter come from Executive Committee of the Senate and all members of the committee who wish to have their names on the letter.” The motion was seconded. Discussion followed.

A friendly amendment was made to separate the motion into two motions. Michael acceded to the friendly amendment and the revision resulted in two motions:

**Motion #1:** “To accept the revisions to the letter as indicated in boldface.” The motion was seconded, discussed and unanimously approved.

**Motion #2:** “Have the letter come from Executive Committee of the Senate and all members of the committee who wish to have their names on the letter.”

There was considerable discussion on this motion. After some time there was a Call of the Question which passed by a vote of 15 in favor, 0 opposed and 1 abstention.

Thus followed the vote on Motion #2 which was 12 in favor, 1 opposed and 3 abstaining. Motion #2 was approved.

**Letter re: Guidelines for Collegiate Assemblies:** Jim Korsh (CST) spoke on behalf of the FSSC Task Force on Shared Faculty Governance reporting that the task force had met on March 4th and had agreed unanimously to bring a draft of a letter intended for President Theobald to the FSSC for consideration. The letter was a request to the President that he support the Guidelines for Collegiate Assemblies document that had been created and approved by FSSC in spring 2012. The draft letter distributed to FSSC via the listserv was a revision of a letter written in April 2012 and intended for President Hart. The letter was not sent to President Hart due to budget, reorganization and leadership issues at the time.

Jim Korsh made a Motion “to send the letter (as presented to the FSSC in the listserv) forward to the President.” (see attached letter). The motion was seconded.

There was a robust discussion. The general sense of the discussion was that the letter may focus too much on President Adamany’s policies and may be too strongly worded. It was also suggested that it would be helpful to find if there was a clear policy statement about Collegiate Assemblies prior to President Adamany. The interest in locating such a policy concerned whether, prior to President Adamany’s policy, previous policies also required review of Collegiate Assembly by-laws by General Counsel and Deans. There was also discussion about the urgency to have a decision.

Joan Shapiro reported that President Theobald will be visiting the FSSC April 2nd. There was discussion whether we should wait to broach this topic with him at that meeting.
There was a Motion to Postpone Consideration until the next FSSC meeting on March 19th. The motion was seconded and passed with 2 voting in favor, 1 opposed and 3 abstaining.

6. Guests: Rafael Porrata-Doria (Chair of University Budget Review Committee) and Ken Thurman (COE and Member of the University Budget Review Committee and Chair of the College of Education Collegiate Assembly):
Rafael began his report to the FSSC with some good budget news:
-It does not appear we will have serious budget cuts this year from the state. Ken Kaiser has reported that in their visits with Harrisburg they are hearing a message of strong support for state-related institutions. We have been told there is a possibility that the legislature may even try to restore some funding to Temple, but that is improbable. The Governor’s budget message indicated that he will leave appropriations for state-supported universities flat. He will not cut them, but will also not recommend restoring funding cut in previous years.
-Rafael further reported that Ken Kaiser has said he does not see the restoration as possible due to sequestration and the governor’s crisis with public pensions in the state. He thinks we’re dealing with, at best, a flat university allocation and no tuition increase.
-However, in another piece of good news, Rafael reported that we may have a smaller “gap” penalty this year. In the past we have had a $30-35 million gap that has been treated as standard and to be absorbed as a matter of course. But, university finance folks now project that the gap is going to be closer to $25 million this coming budget year.
-And in one final bit of good news, Rafael reported that it is anticipated we will have a budget approved considerably before July 1, 2013.

The remainder of the report from Rafael was focused on the work the UBRC has been doing concerning the new budgeting system that will be introduced (RCB). He was basing his comments generally on a PowerPoint presentation from Anthony Wagner, CFO of Temple. Rafael reported that he would share this PPT with FSSC. In his summary he made the following points on record:

- The general impression with the decentralized budgeting is that the devil is in the details.

-Every budget unit is going to be “on its own.” Each school or college is free to spend its money however it wants. One question is “what is recognized as income?” Then each school or college will pay all of its expenses including indirect expenses and will pay a tax to the central university to support auxiliary. There will also be cross support between various schools and colleges.

-Colleges that have problems generating income will get more from the state appropriations. Tony Wagner indicated that this is not a completely market driven mercantilist model. This does put onus on some schools that have traditionally had budget shortfalls met by central university.

-There are two critical people in each school/college – the college financial officer and the faculty advisory committee for budget. A lot of the discussion and ideas are going to be coming from that group. We need a critical faculty involvement on budgeting process.
The FSSC had a series of questions including:
- Do faculty get to weigh in with expenditures in the college?
- What does 20% +/– taxes – what does this cover?
- What is the unit of analysis – what happens at the department level?
- Will financial data come from central administration?
- Who will select members of the committees?
- What will be checks and balances in this system?
- How do benefits factor in to this?

There was considerable discussion about the role of the faculty advisory committee and their importance in RCM given the information presented.

Paul LaFollette (CST) requested to have this comment on record. He stated, “what you are describing is a situation that can only work where you have collegial assemblies that are controlled by the faculty and not the Deans.”

7. New Business Continued: Steve Newman (CLA, Editor, Faculty Herald) mentioned that Peter Jones has inquired whether the Faculty Herald can publish some of the SFF data that Peter presented to FSSC this spring. Steve was asking the FSSC members for an initial reaction to this, noting that we would not have sufficient time to decide this at this point.

Although there was little time for discussion, remaining FSSC members commented that we should consider:
- Could this data be used to hurt the university? If so – no.
- If information is published, it has to be presented with more context.
- We don’t have longitudinal data.

It was noted that we would be continuing discussion about this issue if possible at a future meeting.

8. Adjournment: It was moved and seconded and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 3:12pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tricia S. Jones
Faculty Senate Secretary