Faculty Senate Steering Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
March 26, 2013

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], Forrest Huffman (FSBM), Michael Jackson (STHM), Michael Jacobs (Pharm), Chip Jungreis (TUSM), Stephanie Knopp (Tyl), Jim Korsh (CST), Steve Newman (Fac. Herald), Michael Sachs (CHP), Jeffrey Solow (BCMD), Karen M. Turner (SMC), Cheryl Mack (Coord.)

Absent: Cheri Carter (SSW), Catherine Schifter (Educ), David Sonenshein (Law), Howard Spodek (CLA), Doug Wager (TFMA)

1. Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 1:01pm.

2. Approval of Minutes:
The minutes from the March 19, 2013 meeting of the FSSC were moved, seconded and unanimously approved with some small edits provided to Cheryl Mack, faculty senate staff person.

3. Vice President’s Report:
Vice President of the Faculty Senate, Mark Rahdert, thanked Cheryl Mack for her excellent work on the election process. He reminded members that the election is active online. But, he pointed out that some committees will still need appointments since there were not a sufficient number of candidates running for election for all committees.

4. President’s Report:
Joan Shapiro, President of the Faculty Senate, gave a brief report on the responses she had received to the questionnaire concerning the status of the collegial assemblies. She indicated that she would be writing a summary of these responses and sending that as a separate document to members of the FSSC. The report generated several questions and comments.

Several members indicated that it is clear that there is a diversity of formats and operating processes for collegial assemblies. Some expressed the view that this is positive – “one size doesn’t fit all”. Others felt more cautious about interpreting the differences positively.

Jim Korsh (CST) indicated that he was skeptical because of what people say; he would hate to see us discuss this and make it public because the real issue is whether faculty have a chance to make the CAs they want.

Steve Newman (CLA) stated that he was more pleased with results than anticipated. However, he also expressed it is difficult to know how much this is a gauge that CAs are effectively functioning.
There were general suggestions that future information gathering on this attend to:

-- following the bylaws approval process and who is overseeing that
-- investigating perceptions of level of coercion in the CA process; not sure we have real freedom even if we have CAs meeting
-- need to focus on budget committee and how critical faculty governance is in those

The discussion of budget committees was raised. The FSSC has discussed in detail in the past how important these budget advisory faculty committees are under decentralized budgeting.

Mark Rahdert (Law) indicated we need to impress on President Theobald when we meet with him that the Deans have held budget information very close to the vest. It is critical to have his help in advising Deans to involve faculty in these decisions and provide them with full budget information. He also expressed our need to prepare and train faculty to have a better understanding of budgetary concerns.

Tricia Jones (COE) stated that faculty involvement in new market budget initiatives is critical. We should look at additional structures to support this (CA chairs meeting with us; new body that has one rep from each collegial budget committee together).

Paul LaFollette (CST) indicated support for Trish’s ideas. He shared that President Theobald talked about getting folks together across universities to talk about experiences with DBM. This may mean that he’d think the suggestions for linking across colleges and budget committees are a good idea.

Joan Shapiro then raised the important issue of the dissemination of SFF data to students. She summarized Peter Jones’ presentation to the Representative Faculty Senate last week. Steve Newman (CLA) shared a summary of his conversation with Peter Jones after the meeting.

Steve Newman (CLA) indicated that TSG did a petition to President and Provost asking for some of SFFs given to students. He was concerned with how this was recommended without Faculty Senate approval. Perhaps there is a need to clarify with Peter that the SFF committee is not a faculty senate committee. We don’t monitor the appointments to that committee. There used to be 2 committees, and they have been quietly subsumed into one.

Several members noted that it is important that the President and Provost can be told more privately (perhaps by Joan) that we are dissatisfied with the process that was used. It was also suggested that we entertain options for a partial implementation of the dissemination strategy and that we work to help develop support for multiple measures of teaching effectiveness for this process.

5. Guests: Michelle O’Connor and Justin Miller, Student Athletics

Michelle O’Connor and Justin Miller met with the FSSC to give them an overview of the work that Student Athletics does and to discuss the potential for a Faculty Advisory Board for Athletic
Student Advising. They brought handouts on both topics that are attached to this document. The following is a brief summary of the discussion.

Faculty Advisory Board for Athletic Student Advising:
- We need to be on the same page with faculty and to have a regular line of communication with faculty.
- This core group would be very helpful.
- The Academic Support Center for Student Athletes provides services to 565 student athletes on 25 different sports.

There were a number of questions from FSSC members (Responses are presented in brackets [ ]):
What are graduation rates? – [Football 62-64% (6 year grad rate); basketball over 40% men’s; women’s basketball not a concern at this time]

What can we learn from your success that we can use to help non-athlete students?
[-tutoring programs
- peer mentor programs]

What does this cost? How will this be handled under RCM?
[-fewer withdrawals, more credits per semester
- under RCM part of the provost’s portfolio
- general budget about $100,000 academic year for tutors and mentors]

The discussion then moved to the suggestion for the Faculty Advisory Committee:
Ideally they want to have two members from FSSC. They are thinking of 2 year terms for faculty and initially having them staggered. And, they suggested that potential ability of faculty members to renew was a good idea.

Michael Sachs (CHPSW), Karen Turner (SMC) and Michael Jackson (STHM) all volunteered to serve on the committee.

6. Adjournment:
It was moved, seconded and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 3:11pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tricia S. Jones
Faculty Senate Secretary
Nancy & Donald Resnick Academic Support Center for Student-Athletes

Faculty Advisory Committee

Goals:

a) Provide faculty perspective and regular input on policies and procedures regarding the academic support of student-athletes;
   i. Examples – travel letters, exam proctoring, missed class policy.
b) Assist in the long term strategic planning of Resnick Center operations and services;
c) Facilitate the development of meaningful relationships with the Resnick Center, its staff, Temple faculty and various academic departments.

Requirements:

a) Availability to attend three meetings per year (fall, spring, summer) with Resnick Center Director and staff
   i. Additional meetings can be scheduled at the behest of the Faculty Advisory Committee
b) Willingness to discuss Resnick Center matters with Director and staff as needed

Faculty Advisory Committee Membership:

- Two faculty members from the Academic Affairs Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate
- Two additional faculty members
- Faculty Athletics Representative
- Director of the Resnick Academic Support Center for Student-Athletes
- President of Student-Athlete Advisory Committee
- Ex-officio member from the Office of Senior Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies
- Guests as needed

Michele O'Connor
Justin Miller
Mission: To provide superior academic, personal and professional guidance to support all Temple University student-athletes. Through core values of diversity, integrity and collaboration across the University, the Center strives to learn and succeed to their greatest academic and professional potential.

Philosophy

- Proactive, student-focused services aimed at helping students reach their academic potential
- Experienced staff that take pride in establishing relationships with coaches to ensure goals and expectations are met, while providing exceptional support for student-athletes and adding value to the program.

Staff Overview

• 11 Full Time Staff, 2 Graduate Externs
  • 1 Director
  • 7 Academic Advisors
    - Two full time advisors assigned only to football support
  • 2 Learning Specialists
  • 1 Administrative Assistant

• Largest academic support service department in the Big East Conference

• 80+ subject specific tutors
  o Over 450 appointments per week
• 15 Peer Mentors
• 8 Writing Tutors
• 3 PhD (2 school psych, 1 special ed) students/graduate externs

Fall 2012 Semester Highlights:

1. 3.0 Cumulative Student-Athlete Grade Point Average
   o First ever 3.0 in fall semester
   o Second consecutive semester of 3.0+

2. 55% of all student-athlete earned a 3.0 semester GPA or greater
   o 331 students (most on record)
   o 139 earned 3.5+

3. 14 of Temple's programs earned a team GPA of 3.0 or greater
   o Lead by Women's Gymnastics, 3.53 and Men's Tennis, 3.5

4. 14 of Temple's programs have a combined cumulative GPA of 3.0 or greater
   o Lead by Men's Gymnastics, 3.49 and Field Hockey, 3.41