Faculty Senate Steering Committee
Meeting Minutes
April 2, 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), 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), Catherine Schifter (Educ), Jeffrey Solow (BCMD), David Sonenshein (Law), Howard Spodek (CLA), Karen M. Turner (SMC), Doug Wager (TFMA), Cheryl Mack (Coord.)

Absent: Cheri Carter (SSW),

1. Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 1:02pm.

2. Approval of Minutes:
The minutes from the March 26, 2013 FSSC meeting were moved, seconded and unanimously approved.

3. President’s Report:
Joan P. Shapiro, Faculty Senate President gave a report on several important issues.
- Collegial assembly questionnaire responses were obtained from 17 people, a very robust response set. Joan reported that she sent out a summary to FSSC members that should be treated as confidential until we indicate that it can be distributed.

-Tricia Jones (COE, Faculty Senate Secretary) and Joan Shapiro met with President Theobald and Provost Dai on Thursday March 28 at 10-11am. It was a very beneficial meeting and the President and Provost were very interested in discussing the faculty senate interests on several issues. A short summary of the meeting includes:
  - There was an initial discussion focused on TUHS and the fact that there is no city hospital, which creates a difficult financial load on Temple. Joan mentioned the possibility of a consortium of hospitals.
  - There was significant discussion about the faculty advisory budget committee concepts that have been discussed in conjunction with the development of decentralized budgeting. The President agreed that there was a strong need for faculty involvement and transparency, but also a concern about confidentiality about budgetary information. Tricia discussed a need for training faculty about budget and budget issues, especially faculty on advisory committees. Joan mentioned the need to coordinate the Senate budget committee with other budget-related committees. President Theobald intends to have a central budget committee with representation from faculty. The President and Provost also discussed the sense that one size does not fit all in terms of how the faculty representation on budget committees will be determined.

-Joan Shapiro discussed the SFFs issue with the President and Provost. Although students have petitioned we suggested to them that a pilot with one or two colleges is a good start. Tricia stressed the importance of multiple measures of teaching effectiveness. Peter Jones is meeting with Mark, Trish and Joan tomorrow about this idea; there is this feeling that we will slow the process.
- An important discussion concerned the possibility of evaluation of deans. Tricia and Joan reported that there was a mention of this topic but that it was confidential. Perhaps the President will address this with the FSSC in more detail when he visits later in this meeting.

4. **Vice President’s Report:**
Mark Rahdert, Vice President of the Faculty Senate, gave a brief report.
– The election wraps up today. One person came forward for UTPAC. We still need folks for Sabbatical and EPPC.

- One person is interested in appointment to the TU Press Board. Brian Bolling (Librarian and media services/digital specialist) is seeking appointment to the Temple University Press editorial board. The TU Press reports officially to the Library. Faculty Senate recommends appointees to the TU Press and they make appointments. It was moved, seconded and unanimously approved to recommend Brian Bolling.

5. **Guest: Dr. Neil Theobald, University President**
The FSSC was very pleased and honored to have a visit from President Neil Theobald. He invited the FSSC to have an open question and answer discussion during the visit. FSSC questions and comments will be reported with the President’s responses indicated in brackets [ ].

- Michael Jackson (STHM) asked about developments on the building projects on campus. [We hired a master planner last week. There have been a series of faculty lunches in which this topic has been raised. We have departments and schools that would benefit from being moved to the same location. Broad Street is a barrier. And, we should make more of a connection between medical campus and main campus. Ambler has lots of potential. Center City street presence is important. What should we be doing down there? What about adult education? What about Harrisburg? These are some of the questions that should be considered long term planning. Faculty will be involved in these discussions mainly through the provost’s office. This is a university plan and that should be the focus].

- Karen Turner (SMC): Are we thinking about building a football stadium? [It could be. The Eagles want to increase rent substantially. Temple has 5 more years on contract with the Eagles. Everything is on the table. Any kind of decision on this is probably at least 2 years away. That discussion would need community involvement].

- Jim Korsh (CST) asked about faculty governance. You sent us a reply to our letter concerning policy on collegial assemblies. Could you amplify your response? [I am a supporter of faculty governance and collegial assemblies. But the “how” to do it best in each school is really up to the schools. Schools are very heterogeneous. The “what” is more uniform. Deans must consult with faculty on budget decisions. He and Provost Dai will consult with faculty on campus wide budget issues.

- Paul LaFollette (CST) mentioned that the interest was in having you facilitate the process in some schools to change the bylaws. Current policy indicates that deans and university counsel need to review bylaws and this needs to change in order for faculty to have true collegial assemblies. [The President mentioned that he’s leery of getting into that, but mentioned that there will be 5 year reviews started for all deans.]

- Deborah Howe (CLA) suggested that 360 reviews of deans are imperative and how we structure them is very important. That process should have the opportunity to get confidential input from a number of sources. [But you can also get anonymous comments that you can’t know how to deal with. We need to find a balance]. We are concerned that 5 year review needs a baseline review of all deans. [It is hard to do reviews all in one year. Provost Dai is working on a process. For the Deans who have been here five years or more without a review, we will have reviews done on 3 of them this year and another group next year.]
Stephanie Knopp (Tyler): We are concerned about how RCM will work. Can we have a mandate that all colleges have budget committee with faculty input? This is especially important to consider how units have representation in newly consolidated schools, etc. [The unit for RCM is where there is a Dean, so at the college level. However, clearly that may need clarification with some of the new structures. We are mandating that faculty are involved, there needs to be meaningful consultation with faculty; whether that is always a faculty committee is not clear. It may help for me to learn more about the Arts details and to look at this more].

Jim Korsh (CST): Can we go back to faculty governance. Let me present a little history. In the 1970s, collegial assemblies were started under the Faculty Senate. The CAs and bylaws were set by schools and were faculty driven. It was like that until 10 years ago; real faculty governance. Then it changed by fiat. [I would oppose that fiat that change on principle]. It completely changed the nature of CAs – they became creatures of the Deans. Faculty are upset we don’t have rights to determine how CAs will work. The purpose of the letter we sent was to ask you if you could fix it. The Board gave the President the authority to set rules for CAs – and that is still in the President’s purview. [We are definitely policy poor, lots of ad hoc decision making – I don’t know enough about it to make a decision. I don’t believe I should make a decision. We should do it school by school. If Dean’s are not meeting the needs, we should and will review them and change in some way.]

Steve Newman (CLA, Faculty Herald): The message that gets sent at the beginning of your Presidency is important. [My role is to hire the Provost who hires the Deans.]

Paul LaFollette (CST): Back to RCM – every college will be expected to have faculty input. In some colleges, the Dean may choose the faculty they want. [Deans will be reviewed next year or year after].

Doug Wager (TFMA): The relationship between dean and faculty is in more play under RCM. Faculty governance structures are critical. The Provost is the final arbiter of that relationship. [True. The Deans work for the Provost]. Faculty Senate has a set of guidelines for CAs. Does this mean that faculty can make these determinations between faculty and dean, and if that becomes dysfunctional faculty appeal to the Provost?

Joan Shapiro (COE): The launch of RCM can be very Dean-centric. There needs to be top down instruction. [The university task force on RCM, of which Doug Wager and Terry Halbert are a part, is doing this. Their work should be completed in a month or so].

Mark Rahdert (LAW): Faculty may be unfamiliar with budget issues. We need to have training for faculty. [I definitely agree. The President noted that he has overseen and researched decentralized budget models for years. And, faculty training is a excellent idea. Right now Tony Wagner is making presentations in a variety of schools and colleges.]

Karen Turner (SMC): There is great value in interdisciplinary process and connections. How does this work under RCM? [RCM can actually make it easier to do because of transparency, but we also need a spirit of collaboration. The Achilles heel for RCM is what happens if there is not appropriate collaboration. We must have commonwealth special funding and must have a very strong central curriculum committee that can prevent competition, and remove and monitor redundancies.]

Kurosh Darvish (Engr): What is your vision on research? What dollars will be put to research under RCM? Is that even a goal? What about infrastructure? Research parks? What happens to F&A in RCM? [All ICR/F&A went to school under RCM; deans and the Provost will have to agree about what comes to the center].
Chip Jungreis (TUSM): One size does not fit all. The Med School is different. Some of the discussion sounds like the faculty and Deans are adversarial, but that is not the case at the Med School. We have a huge business to run and it can’t be democratic. It’s very complex. [It has to be different in every school.]

Tricia Jones (COE): What is your view on the importance of new market development and entrepreneurial activity by faculty? [Faculty don’t have to do that if they don’t want to. But, those that do may need and should be provided with professional development on entrepreneurial activity.] What is your perspective on the importance of globalization of programs at Temple? [Decisions on globalization should be at the school level. Those efforts are fine if they don’t compete with domestic programs.]

Michael Sachs (CHP): What’s the outlook for faculty hires, distribution? [It is a great time to hire faculty on tenure tracks.]

Deborah Howe (SED): The policy on collegial assemblies that President Adamany developed and that we have referred to today is still on the books and in effect. We believe the policy can be overturned by the new President. In fact, the policy actually interferes with your principle of a college or school being able to determine its own preferred faculty governance structure and process. Could you review this policy to consider rescinding it? [The President asked that FSSC send him a copy of the policy for his review and possible action.]

Paul LaFollette (CST): Back to idea of central curriculum committee. Under RCM there will be strong motivation for colleges to offer service courses. How do you prevent that? [Students won’t sign up for bad courses. Every five years we’ll need to review decentralized model]. We need a faculty centered GenEd process. RCM may encourage deans, who make staffing decisions, to staff and increase course size for financial reasons even if it hurts quality.

Michael Jacobs (Pharm): We need a Temple Brand. [Definitely some areas require this approach -- marketing, athletics, fundraising, IT – these areas all need a strong centralization focus].

Respectfully Submitted,

Tricia S. Jones
Faculty Senate Secretary