Faculty Senate Steering Committee
Meeting Minutes
April 9, 2013

Present: Joan Shapiro (Pres), Mark Rahdert (Vice Pres.), Tricia Jones (Secy.), Paul LaFollette (Past-Pres.),
Cheri Carter (SSW), Kurosh Darvish (Engr), Deborah Howe (SED), 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), Howard Spodek (CLA), Karen M.
Turner (SMC), Cheryl Mack (Coord.)

Absent: Kenneth Boberick (DENT), Forrest Huffman (FSBM), David Sonenshein (Law), Doug Wager (TFMA)

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

2. Approval of Minutes:
It was moved, seconded and unanimously approved to accept the minutes of the April 2, 2013 FSSC meeting.
Faculty Senate Secretary, Tricia Jones, reminded FSSC members that these minutes will be sent to President
Theobald. She encouraged members to read the minutes in light of any possible changes in wording or phrasing
that they want made for statements attributed to them in the minutes. She asked members to contact her via
e-mail or in person with those changes by end of the week.

3. Vice President’s Report:
Mark Rahdert, Vice President of the Faculty Senate, gave a brief report on the status of the elections. The
elections are now over and there was only one committee that had a contested election.

Mark asked Steve Newman, chair of the nominations committee to report on the officer elections. Steve
announced that the President-Elect is Mark Rahdert; Vice-President Elect is Tricia Jones; and Secretary-Elect is
Paul LaFollette.

Mark also mentioned that there was a low turnout for the election and this has a strong symbolic value.
There was a general discussion of how we can increase the faculty interest in the senate:
• wait for Collegial Assembly guidelines possible policy change; find concrete things to show them that
  we have accomplished and use that
• think creatively about leadership succession issues
• when we have important topics we have some good turnout; consider more topic focused sessions
• have Joan send a brief letter to all faculty telling them what we do here each week
• be careful how much we use faculty listserv – too much activity makes people feel inundated

Mark then moved to the work on appointments to unfilled vacancies on committees. He reminded the
FSSC of the amended bylaws that give us the ability to make these appointments. The two committees that have
appointee possibilities are: UTPAC and Sabbatical. It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved to
appoint Frank Farley (COE) to the University Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee. And, it was moved,
seconded and unanimously approved to appoint Adam Davey (CHP) to the University Sabbatical Committee.

Mark then directed the focus to reappointment of members of committees. There were three candidates
to be reappointed to the Budget Review Committee. It was moved, seconded and unanimously approved to
reappoint Bruce Rader and Rafael Porrata-Doria to the Budget Review Committee and to reappoint Rafael
Porrata-Doria to CATA.

With the results of the elections, Mark is thinking about his upcoming role as Faculty Senate President.
He requested that FSSC members send him an e-mail listing what they think are top five issues the Faculty
Senate needs to address in 2013-2014. Please send this to him by end of the academic year.

4. President’s Report:
President Joan Shapiro gave a brief report. She reminded members that the April 11th Representative
Faculty Meeting will be a forum on Undergraduate Education and the meeting on May 8th will be a forum on
decentralized budgeting.
She thanked several people for working to pull together documents for the package to President Theobald; Steve for pulling materials together on bylaws; Mark for his document on the history of the issue; Deborah for bringing up the point to President Theobald in a previous FSSC meeting. She moved that we send these materials to President Theobald from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and that we attach the document on Guidelines for Collegial Assemblies. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

5. Guest: Tony Wagner, Executive Vice President and CFO; Katie DeAngelo (from VP Wagner’s Office)

Joan introduced Tony and Katie and thanked them for coming to share their information and thoughts about decentralized budgeting with the FSSC. The format for the conversation was a general discussion and question/answer session. In this discussion, questions and comments are presented and responses from the guests are indicated in brackets [ ]. It was also mentioned that the preferred term is “decentralized budgeting” and that there is a PowerPoint presentation and a number of materials on the CFO’s website.

Stephanie Knopp (Tyl): What constitutes a unit? How is that determined? [There are revenue centers and service centers. It is not simple to determine the best way to structure the constitution of units vis a vis decentralized budgeting (DB). Service centers are central support units that don’t make revenue on their own. There are also auxiliary units such as housing that “float on their own bottom.” Whether this gets drilled down to the department level depends on whether the school or college wants to. Usually with other institutions using DB it doesn’t go beneath the college/school level. We’re trying to realign authority and responsibility – so they are aligned in colleges.]

Karen Turner (SMC): Are there certain service units that all other units support? Is this a flat fee or based on usage of that service function? [Many places have created complex models initially and then found it important to simplify. What the literature on DB says is simplicity and predictability are more important than complexity. For example, about 20 million of security costs need to be driven out to colleges. One option is FTEs (based on people). Right now we have 6 cost drivers (e.g., FTE students, FTE employees, FTE faculty, Facilities, etc.). Indiana now uses only 3 cost drivers: direct expenditures, FTE faculty, square footage.]

Karen Turner (SMC): Who puts the monetary amount on one faculty FTE for example? [We are working with audited numbers for FY 2012. Based on those figures we develop estimates of revenues and expenditures and those cost drivers will drive that out. One of the main principles of this model is schools and colleges will keep extras.]

Jim Korsh (CST): Where are the constraints? [Auxiliaries, like telephone or food service, is one where we charge fees to colleges. Whether and how those usage and rates for auxiliary costs will be decided at university, central, etc. level still has to be determined.]

[At the university level they are looking at policy issues that cut across the university, across the boundaries of colleges. There are centrally available dollars. Those dollars get allocated to cross-boundary interdisciplinary collaboration.]

[The President and administration are very serious that every one knows there is no fiscal cliff going to happen. It is probable that the PA state allocation is appropriated out to make everyone whole. We will have incrementally improved finances by managing expenditures better. You can help yourself grow revenues through entrepreneurial activities. Colleges and schools will also compete for central funds because you have proposed something that the leadership deems a priority. Initially there may be little discernible impact or difference between colleges. Five years from now the differences between colleges may well be significant.]

Deborah Howe (SED): Can we use the example of SED being seen as part of CLA? Who will be advocates for us -- for schools like us? This model will not help us at all. Should we have differential costs charged for satellite campuses? A program like SED is on four different campuses. Will we be charged from all four? Could that be an unfair burden for programs that offer on more than one campus? [These are definitely areas where there are important concerns. These are questions that should be handled at the college level.]
Mark Rahdert (Law): How are satellite campuses handled? [Rome is not officially an auxiliary, TUJ is. TUJ pays for itself.] Will costs be driven out to those entities? [Probably. With respect to Ambler, Ft. Washington, Harrisburg, -- their costs will be lumped in with the overhead of university and allocated out.]

Steve Newman (CLA): Are any other DB institutions unionized for faculty? Has this come up in discussions? [There are several others. It is not clear what the role of the union is as we move through the development phase. But overall, shared governance must be enhanced in a model like this].

Kurosh Darvish (Engr): What about the support for research? [We are one Temple. We are not creating a model that suggests some way to stop support. The President feels that we are not going to pull the rug out from people, but that we are going to unleash this ability to grow and compete. 10-20 years of data support that there are ebbs and flows.]

Joan Shapiro (COE): How do we make certain money isn’t at the center? [The model will be as good as people who lead it].

Catherine Shifter (COE): President Theobald said we must have serious oversight. We need to be working with EPPC, etc., and other faculty committees to keep track of how budget decisions will impact academic decisions. [Yes]

Karen Turner: What does the research tell us about relationship between services and deans? Perhaps there is an inherent conflict of interest? [The literature doesn’t suggest that as a concern. But, deans will have to interact with the faculty in a different way. In this model the deans get reviewed and evaluated].

Stephanie Knopp: There is a lack of clarification of how faculty budget advisory committees might be constituted. There is a significant concern that a dean could stack the deck on the advisory committees – select only faculty who support the dean’s decisions. [Typically what you find is that these budgetary advisory committees are elected faculty members.] Isn’t development supposed to pay for themselves? [Overall across the university development brings in more than it costs.]

Tricia Jones (COE): Thank you for clarifying that the administration is committed to not allowing a fiscal cliff situation. That is very helpful to hear. But there are concerns that there may be “political cliffs” – perhaps unintended consequences that would push the university to a smaller number of colleges with very strong centralized dean authority. If so, the consequences could be a significant decrease of shared governance and faculty input since the colleges would be larger and mechanisms for faculty voice would be unclear and/or limited. We are already seeing this problem in the new Arts division. DB also seems to increase the incentive for strong competition between colleges. Smaller colleges and programs may be absorbed. And, as with tall organizational structure, there is an increased potential for a tiered faculty system where “first class”, “second class” and “third class” faculty are created and perhaps inequitably treated. We already have difficulties with those issues – especially with respect to treatment of NTTS and adjuncts. Can you comment on whether research on DB at other institutions has spoken to the impact of DB on organizational structures in these ways? Are these kinds of issues being taken into consideration as the administration discusses how DB will be implemented at Temple? [These are important questions. There definitely needs to be a system if checks and balances. It isn’t clear how much the literature has considered the potential impacts you raise.]

6. **Guest: Peter Jones, Senior Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs**

   Joan welcomed Peter and thanked him for being willing to come to FSSC to continue the conversation about online SFFs. Peter mentioned that he had a lunch conversation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and that conversation generated several ideas for how to move forward. The purpose of this discussion is to see what the FSSC thinks about some of those ideas.

   Peter started with an explanation of the reason for the four questions that had been selected for the SFFs. A factor analysis was done and indicated four dimensions; they chose the item with highest loading on each factor. As a result, the other items on each dimension are highly correlated with that highest loading item.
He explained that we will announce to students beginning with E-SFFs that if they complete all of the E-SFFs this semester will have access to data on these four questions over the previous two-year period. They can go back and see the SFFs by course, faculty member, etc.

Peter explained that this provision of SFF data to students is really data on course selection rather than faculty, although students can search via faculty member as well. The data will be searchable by department, course, or faculty member. Graduate students are grayed out. Freshman will get free access.

Peter explained that one suggestion was to consider having some absolute number of students in any class or a mandatory number of students responding in order to make the data for that section available in this system. They acknowledge that if we don’t use some minima it is problematic. However, we haven’t determined those limits yet, but it may be similar to the old rule of not administering SFFs with less than “8” enrolled.

Peter summarized the suggestions from luncheon.
1. Discuss with computer services and institutional research adding live links to course syllabus or other faculty-provided information (e.g., faculty bio or faculty web site, philosophy teaching statement or teaching portfolio). This gives the faculty member a chance to present more robust information and gives students a far more informed search.
2. Do we give access to faculty for this data set? Some faculty may want to look at other courses sections taught by others.
3. It was suggested that we have a virtual dropbox so faculty can get feedback during the semester, and faculty can make that choice whether to have it or use it.

Karen Turner: Will graduate students not have access? [Graduate students will not have access at this point. And, professional schools will not be involved either. We may want to rethink the decision about graduate student access. Right now the major problem with their access is class size.]

Deborah Howe: There may be faculty objections that some posted information may be taken by others, someone “borrowing” syllabi for example. [This may be an issue. We’ll need to consider how best to handle this. Of course, faculty posting syllabi or other information would be voluntary.]

[TSG feels that the university moves are really making students feel like they are being treated like adults.]
[Since NTTs teach more than tenure track faculty, there will be more data available for NTTs and possibly some adjuncts.]
[The current mid-semester reviews have 93% faculty support and this is wonderful. They provide very valuable information that helps us identify students who may be at-risk for dropping out. Thanks to the faculty for this great response!]

7. Call to Adjourn:
It was moved, seconded and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 3:16pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tricia S. Jones
Faculty Senate Secretary