Faculty Senate Steering Committee Meeting
April 19, 2011
Minutes

Present:
Paul S. LaFollette (Pres.), Roberta Sloan (Secy), Joan Delalic (Engr.), Laurie MacPhail (Dent.), Deborah Howe (SED), Jim Korsh (CST), Charles Jungreis (Med.), Margaret Devinney (CLA), Michael Jackson (STHM), Tricia S. Jones (Educ.), Adam Davey (CHPSW), Luke Kahlich (BCMD), Douglas Wager (SCT), Don Harris (Law), David Waldstreicher (Fac. Herald), Cheryl Mack (Coord.)

Absent:
Karen Turner (Past President) on leave, Mark C. Rahdert (Law) on leave, Nora Alter (SCT) on leave, Jay Sinha (Bus. & Man.), Joan Shapiro (V. Pres.), Stephanie Knopp (Tyler), Charles Ruchalski (Pharm.),

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

Approval of Minutes
The minutes from the last Faculty Senate Steering Meeting were approved.

President’s Report
President LaFollette has received almost no response from his last email distribution. A faculty member from the College of Liberal Arts came to see him regarding the recent move of all interdisciplinary programs within existing departments.

A senator asked for clarifications regarding the motions that were passed at the last University Senate Meeting. This was discussed. One senator pointed out that there was a technicality on the second motion that was passed at the University Senate Meeting.

Deborah Howe made a motion:

Resolved: That the Faculty Senate Steering Committee realizes that the correct procedures were not followed in passing the second motion at the University Senate Meeting on April 14th and this will be corrected by giving that motion a required second reading and vote at the May meeting.

The motion carried unanimously.

Guest: Vice President and Provost, Richard Englert and Associate Vice Provost, Jodi Levine-Loftgraben.

Upon request, VP Englert reiterated the recommendations that he presented at the last FSSC Meeting. These include:

1. Freezing non-union salaries, and asking the unions to have a similar freeze. That would be an 11 million dollar savings.
2. Instituting a hiring freeze with some exceptions including faculty searches currently authorized and underway (at present, eighty) and grant positions that are fully funded. Additionally hiring advisors would be exempt as would hiring in advancement because that entity is revenue generating. The process for exceptions would have to be approved by the cognizant vice-president and President Hart.
3. A recommendation for travel restrictions university-wide. VP Englert will work with the faculty senate and the deans about appropriate guidelines for these restrictions.
4. Reviewing the benefits packages and seeing where there can be reductions; for
instance co-pay in health benefits.
5. A delay in all five searches for deans.
6. Working with some key partners to jointly reduce expenses or increase revenues.
   Temple University Health System would be a prime example. For instance, the
   university and the hospital both have Human Resources Departments. Could these be
   combined? Other innovative partnerships that would result in savings, will be
   explored.
7. Review the cost reduction recommendations emanating from the Huron and other cost
   reduction ideas that people might have to suggest. The provost is working with the
   FSSC and the Budget Review Committee on this review.

One senator asked if the awarding of merit units was under consideration and Englert
answered “yes.” Early retirement is also being considered but the provost mentioned that this
is complex. Once the criteria are defined, everyone who meets those criteria is eligible. This
doesn’t always accomplish the purpose, but it is being examined.

Senator Sloan reiterated her remarks on the “shutting down” of the SCT Dean’s search upon
which she remarked at the last meeting.

Provost Englert said that he was calling the candidates SCT dean finalists who were brought to
campus but was very unspecific about what he is saying to them.

Englert said that the important thing is reducing spending.

One senator asked that Englert has been very clear about what the faculty should sacrifice,
but what is the administration sacrificing?

One senator wondered what the relative potential savings were in each of the areas? Englert
answered that the hiring freeze had the greatest potential savings. However, he said that in
many of the other areas, because they are such “moving targets,” it’s difficult to determine
the potential savings.

One senator asked about the eighty searches. Does the provost have an idea of the total cost
of these searches. He said that he did not. The senator who asked this question had figured
out that hiring eighty new faculty will cost about 10 million dollars. According to Englert, the
rationale for not shutting down the eighty searches is that doing so will negatively impact
academics; the core business of the university. It was felt by a senator that this should be
examined. The senator asked why the eighty searches were singled out and not other things.
Provost Englert averred that he had not thought about this.

A senator asked if criteria was developed regarding the potential of cutting programs. The
answer was “no.”

A senator asked what kinds of savings were being used to save money at satellite campuses.
Englert answered that Temple Japan is separately incorporated and the university makes
money on this. During the last analysis, it was determined that the satellite campuses bring in
more revenue than expenditures.

One senator suggested that university services and ancillary services should be examined
including mail, phone, transportation, and facilities management for waste.

A senator asked about teaching loads. Has load distribution been examined? Englert said that
because teaching is so closely allied with revenue generation, it is important to look at this.
One senator asked what we have to look forward to in FY13-14. Englert said that budget
reduction is difficult and there will be some pain, and the university needs to work its way
through it. The problem is “not knowing” what the overall policy direction of the state might be. Are we preparing ourselves for a continual down slope or a continuing one?
President LaFollette related questions that had been sent to him to be addressed to Provost Englert:

1. Who decided to hire Huron? Since it is apparent that they cannot handle their own finances, why were they chosen to make suggestions for Temple University? Englert mentioned that a risk analysis takes a long time. He feels that the Huron Group gave some good suggestions worth considering. In terms of due diligence, we need to look at the Huron Group suggestions.

2. There was a question about Tony Wagner and his credentials. Provost Englert refused to address this question.

3. In response to a question about the Ambler campus, Englert said that there was a study three years ago regarding Ambler and various suggestions were made but the “long and short of it was that nobody thought that selling Ambler made sense.” Most people feel that Ambler is a “diamond in the rough.” He feels that we need to find ways for departments across the university wish to offer courses there.

4. What plans are there to eliminate highly paid administrators and President Hart’s $70,000 bonus for 2009-2010.

5. What is the plan for the existing 20-20 plan? According to Englert, as of right now, the picture looks good for the governor releasing dollars for projects. Right now an analysis going on is taking a look at the Health Sciences campus in the same way that the main campus is being examined.

6. How much tuition revenue did Temple take in this year and how much was from undergraduates and graduates. How much was paid in fees? How much was used to support intercollegial athletics. What redundancies did Huron find in the administration? Are these going to be reduced. Has this been considered? Englert said that he did not have answers to these questions but would explore them.

7. How much grant money has been taken in this year? Englert did not know but said he would find out.

8. In addition to pay freezes for all non-unionized employees, will there also be a freeze on bonuses? Englert answered yes.

One senator mentioned that the Ambler Campus, needs to be made friendly towards those departments that would like to present classes at Ambler. Englert responded that if any departments wish to offer courses at Ambler, he would be very supportive of this effort.

One senator asked if the 5.6 million dollars allotted for food and entertainment, and the 2 million dollars allotted for outside legal fees, two expenditures that Professor Phillip Yanella found when he examined the budget, was being looking at in terms of cutting costs. Englert responded that it was being examined.

It was asked if the new dean of the medical school/head of the health sciences campus is related to a member of the Board of Trustees. Provost Englert said he doubted it, but really did not know and so will find out.

A senator asked why faculty expertise could not be used more? Englert responded that he thought this would be a good idea.

There was a suggestion that more Gen Ed be offered at Ambler.

Requests from a senator:
1. Clarification as to how a hiring freeze will impact NTT’s on one-year contracts.
2. That there be faculty input on who the Interim Deans in each college and school are rather than simply having the administration appoint Interim Deans who might be in office at least two more hears; administrators appointed with no faculty input.
3. Even if reorganization isn’t put into effect until two years from now, planning should begin now. Englert said that there needs to be wide input on this and any unit being discussed needs to know that they are being discussed.
One senator asked about certificate programs, and suggested that such programs might generate revenue. Englert responded that there is lots of room for certificate programs, degree completion programs for adults, and masters programs that pay for themselves. These types of masters programs should be handled by the colleges and schools rather than going through the graduate school. Englert personally would like to see a more focused graduate program that centers on PhD programs. This could be done more strategically this way than is currently the case.

One senator said that faculty should be brought in for brainstorming sessions on generating revenue.

Englert responded that the goal now is to see what kind of cuts can be made on the expense side before looking at the revenue side including tuition increases.

The state has been speaking about finishing everything by Memorial Day. In mid-June, the Board of Trustees will have a meeting and it is at that meeting the any tuition increases will be set.

One senator mentioned that tuition raises might be very much related to not freezing the eighty searches.

It was mentioned that a lot of faculty would enjoy teaching at Ambler but don’t know that it is a possibility.

Englert thanked everyone and mentioned the faculty reception on April 29th and asked the senators to come and bring their collegial chairs.

**New Business:**

It was suggested that faculty be included in the FSSC/Deans retreat if they have had entrepreneurial activities. This will be discussed at the Council of Deans.

A senator asked about the status of the interdisciplinary programs in CLA, and there is going to be a series of meetings about this. It seems that the CLA Collegial Assembly will meet and Dean Soufas will meet with individual groups.

A senator asked if there could be an FSSC sponsored meeting to clarify things for NTT’s. President LaFollette said he would consider this.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned 3:06 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Roberta Sloan, Ph.D.
Faculty Senate Secretary