



Online Student Evaluations: Filling in the Blanks



Steve Newman,
Associate Professor
of English

By Steve Newman
Department of English
College of Liberal Arts

Since the Fall of 2009, the Faculty Senate Student Feedback Form Committee has been piloting an online version of student evaluations. The advantages of switching to online evaluations are clear enough. It would lead to significant savings, not just of trees and money but also of the tremendous labor of those who have to assemble, transport, and process all those packets of paper. It would also be nice not to have to devote precious class time to filling out the forms. I would be thrilled, then, for Temple to make the switch . . . but only if the rate and quality of the responses for the electronic forms (e-SFFs) can be raised to a level close to those of the paper forms. There is too much at stake—in improving our teaching, and in making well-informed decisions about promotion, tenure, renewal, and merit—to adopt a system that lacks validity. Some faculty members dismiss student evaluations as a mere popularity contest and so don't see what the fuss

Newman continued on page 2

How We Got Here: A Forty-Year Perspective



**Professor of
Anthropology,
Judith G. Goode**

By Judith G. Goode
Professor of Anthropology
College of Liberal Arts

During the month of April we witnessed a flurry of collective faculty activity, and heightened concern, about shared governance at Temple. On April 7 the Faculty Herald editorial board sponsored a symposium on the future of shared governance at Temple. The keynoter was Mary Burgan, a former General Secretary of the AAUP who literally “wrote the book” on this issue: *What Ever Happened to the Faculty? Drift and Decision in Higher Education* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006). Simultaneously, faculty and students were engaged in activities related to governance issues such as state budget cuts, decisions made about specific interdisciplinary programs without faculty consultation, academic freedom in the context of controversial speakers, and debates concerning administrators' voting rights in the Faculty Senate. All this activity signaled a concern with the state of faculty governance rights. Using Burgan's analysis of the national scene, I will examine what has happened to faculty governance at Temple since the Board of Trustees approved the Faculty Senate Constitution and By-Laws in 1969. I base this on my own experience in governance which I acknowledge comes from a

Goode continued on page 3

The Flap in CLA: Merging Margins in a Budget Crunch

By Kime Lawson
Assistant Editor



Kime Lawson,
Assistant Editor

On April 7th the Office of the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts notified the five CLA interdisciplinary program directors that their studies areas will be officially merged into larger host departments, effective July 1, 2011. American Studies will be relocated to the English department, Latin American Studies will go to History, Jewish Studies will be administered by the Religion department, Asian Studies will be placed with Critical Languages, and Women's Studies will be renamed “Gender, Sexuality, and Women's Studies” as it is moved to Sociology.

When the CLA interdisciplinary programs are merged into their new host departments their status will be changed to “studies areas,” and the oversight function of each program director will be replaced by a steering committee composed of faculty with joint interdisciplinary appointments who will work together with the host department chairs. The interdisciplinary studies areas will still retain their presence in significant ways: course cross-listings, faculty joint hires, graduate certificates, and undergraduate majors

Lawson continued on page 7

On the Budget: Part II

By Philip Yannella
Professor of English
College of Liberal Arts



In an article in the February 2011 *Faculty Herald*, I wrote about my reading of the academic portions of Temple's line item budget detail for 2009-10, the last one available in Paley Library. The upshot of my article was that Temple's budget contained a considerable amount of money that could be wholly or partially cut without affecting our academic mission. My list of such items included \$5.3 million in food, travel, and entertainment; \$8.7 million in funds devoted to “other general expenses”; \$319,486 devoted to “Team Holiday Living Expenses” and \$305,700 in “Administration overload stipend” in the Intercollegiate Athletics budget; \$11 million in “Incentive Funds” for unspecified people; \$3.7 million for consultants, of which \$2 million was for legal fees (despite the existence of a large legal counsel office); \$2.2 million for “additional pay” (beyond salaries) in various non-faculty budgets; and \$30 million in “University Contingency” funds. Those items total \$61.6 million. The largest item, the \$30 million “contingency” fund, could go a long way toward paying for the fiscal cataclysm that may soon occur. No member of Temple's administration challenged my methods or my conclusions. Provost Englert did say that each of the items I highlighted needed to be understood in “context.” He was not

Yannella continued on page 5

Online Student Evaluations: Filling in the Blanks

Newman continued from page 1

is about in going to electronic forms. I strongly disagree. Although I've read my share of silly evaluations, I have also read many that have pointed intelligently to areas where I could improve, sometimes confirming what I suspected and other times identifying shortcomings I was blind to. (And, of course, the praise is always nice when it comes.)

The numbers suggest how far the e-SFFs have to go. During the pilot, the response rates for the paper sent out to the TAUP listserv, I received many forms have ranged from 72 to 80%; for the e-SFFs, from 26 to 44%. I have talked to many colleagues who use statistical analysis in their work, and while positions certainly vary about the threshold for validity, I have talked with no one who thinks 44% is sufficient, let alone 26%. This is especially true in the case where those who have not responded do not seem to have done so randomly. It seems very likely that those who opt to fill out the online evaluations are more likely motivated by strong likes or dislikes of the class—many faculty I've talked to are particularly troubled by the latter scenario. The SFF Committee has begun investigating this: Comparing over 200 sections, they have found no significant difference in the numerical evaluations for paper and electronic SFFs for identical courses taught by the same faculty members. So perhaps concerns about response rates need to be moderated, but the committee itself still views the e-SFF rates as a problem since they continue to seek ways to raise

A final piece of data: The response rates to the non-numerical/discursive questions were lower for the electronic SFFs across the curriculum: 62-34% in lower-level courses, 53-28% in upper-level courses, and 71%-34% in graduate/professional courses.

There are problems beyond what's revealed by the aggregate numbers. In response to a query I sent out to the TAUP listserv, I received many troubling reports. One colleague informed me that there were wide variations in e-SFFs from sections of the same course, with the one under 33% much more negative: "I think it's pretty unlikely that I actually taught one section so much better than the other. Much more likely is that, especially with small sections, the low response rates associated with the online format can easily produce unrepresentative responses." Another colleague received only 4 out of 16 responses: "The written comments are especially important to me; the final question on the SFFs is one of the only places at Temple University in which sexual identity and orientation is noted in terms of inclusion. A lot of my classes link to that important topic." A junior colleague received only 3 of 24 e-SFFs, which rendered the class useless as a way to improve her teaching, not to mention for promotion, tenure, and merit; another who received no written comments in her graduate or undergraduate courses and not

surprisingly expressed grave disappointment.

These responses illustrate a few additional points of concern. The lower response rates make it more likely that smaller classes will fall below the threshold of 8 required for the forms to be processed, a frustrating outcome that leads faculty to wonder why they should engage in this exercise at all. More troubling still is the decline in responses to the discursive question—both in the number and quality of the responses. This problem has been compounded by the difficulty in folding in the additional questions many departments and programs have developed, and by a glitch in the program that cut off many students' responses. I am assured by Sally Frazee of the Measurement and Research Center and a member of the SFF Committee that the latter has been fixed in time for this term's evaluations. I hypothesize, though, that even with this correction and even if students become more accustomed to the electronic forms, they will continue to produce fewer and less valuable discursive responses. Why? The nature of the electronic format makes it more likely that they will devote less time and focus to these evaluations. It is true that students could simply space out in class when they should be filling out the paper forms or interrupt themselves by checking Facebook on

Newman continued on page 6

Shared Sacrifice at Temple: Is it Time for Some of the Deanlets To Go?

By Michael A. Sirover
Professor of Pharmacology
School of Medicine

"Life imitates Art." - Oscar Wilde

Economic scarcity permeates our lives. From the rising cost of oil to the federal deficit, from the loss of home equity to state budget deficits, from the rising tide of credit card misuse to the price of apples, tomatoes and grapes, doubt and insecurity dominate our lives. Like other public and private institutions, Temple University is not immune from this uncertainty. Our eyes are focused neither on the joys of teaching, our research accomplishments nor on the pleasant surprise of a winning football team. Instead, our conversations are dominated by the specter of looming budget deficits, the upcoming report of the Huron Group and the possibility or probability of changes in our policies, practices and structural organization. Our qualms are not assuaged by the sudden plethora of conferences arranged by the administration so that faculty and staff can learn about their retirement benefits.

A basic question which arises is the mechanism through which choices may be made and then implemented over the next few years. It is for this exact reason that the Faculty Senate (with the kind help of the Provost) arranged for the recent symposium featuring Mary Burgan. The title of her presentation, "What Happens to Faculty University Governance in Hard Times?", focused on a salient question, "What role will the faculty have in the decision making process?"

In accord with the theme of that symposium, our role as faculty should not be to simply "groan and moan" but to offer constructive suggestions with respect to how Temple should proceed. For that reason, the goal of this essay is to consider a corollary of that question: "Will the sacrifices proposed be shared across the University?" As we seek to consider this question, where can we look for guidance? What lessons can be learned from our own experiences, those of our colleagues, family and friends? What clues can we glean from real life events as well as those recounted in our literature?

In the most recent retelling of an enduring legend, the movie "Robin Hood" released in 2010 and featuring Russell Crowe and Cate Blanchett, describes

the challenges faced by the town folk of Nottingham in a time of economic crisis. Their food supply depends on their agricultural success as does their ability to purchase tools and other essentials. Regrettably, they are beset by two administrative entities, one secular and one ecclesiastical. The former seized their money, the latter their grain. As exemplified by the Court of King John and the Priests at York, each seemed populous and well off. It did not appear that they experienced any of the deprivations faced by the town folk nor did their number appear to diminish during that difficult time. It appeared that shared sacrifice was not the order of the day.

As referenced in the author's series of articles and letters to the editor which have appeared graciously in the *Herald*, one of the advantages of age is that you have a sense of history, of institutional memory, and of plans, projects and approaches which have been tried before, successfully or unsuccessfully. During the author's tenure at Temple, faculty have, for many years, repeatedly voiced concern with respect to the growth of our administration. In each college or school we seem to have an Assistant Dean for this, an Associate Dean for that, and a Senior Executive Dean for something else. Hence the coining of the term "Deanlets."

The same is true for the Offices of the President and the Provost, irrespective of the individual in that position at the time. When questioned, administrative officials cite a number of reasons for this, including the increase in federal, state and local regulations as well as the inherent complexity of large educational institutions. To the author, this is a far cry from the days when Joe Baum, one of the fifteen Deans, had lunch routinely with us at the faculty table in the Cafeteria, or when Sol Sherry, another of those fifteen Deans, could be engaged informally in meaningful discussion. In contrast, as perhaps a sign of the times, the entrance to the office of our immediate past Dean, John Daly, M.D., was emblazoned with conspicuous lettering attesting to his position, worthy of that seen on a temple of a Pharaoh of old.

In accord with policy concerns, the plethora of Deanlets has a financial consequence. As noted in a recent front page article in the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, there may be an inconsistency in the alarms voiced by public university officials with respect to the current Governor's budget proposal. The scenarios they sketch are full of *Sturm und Drang*, with campuses becoming ghost towns and students deprived of the education which forms the foundation of their future. Yet, as described in the article, the salaries and total compensation received by those individuals are considerable. As stated by

Sirover continued on page 3

Shared Sacrifice at Temple: Is it Time To Let Some of the Deanlets Go?

Sirover from page 2

the Inquirer, the President of Penn State has a compensation package of about \$800,000 while here at Temple President Hart enjoys a \$700,000 package. It is unclear to this writer what are the salaries of the individuals on the President's staff or that of the Provost and his staff, as well as that of the numerous Assistant, Associate, Senior Executive Deans, etc. within each school or college. It's also unknown to this writer what was the fate of the million dollar Rittenhouse Square apartment purchased by Temple University for then President Adamany, in which he apparently lived rent free.

Accordingly, if the upcoming sacrifices are to be shared there need to be meaningful modifications of administrative portfolios: i.e., it's time for some of the Deanlets to go. Their portfolios need to be merged. Such administrative changes should be visible, perhaps discussed at special collegial assembly meetings called to consider the changes in policies, procedures and structural organization. At such a meeting, it may be useful for the current Dean of that college/school to present a Powerpoint of the administrative structure as it was and as it will now be (such Powerpoints should be on file, as every administrative structure has an organ-

izational chart to define the chain of command). The attendant cost savings should also be defined.

Of note, there have been budgetary crises in the past, and, indeed, administrative staff has been terminated. However, in those instances, the positions may have been clerical in nature. For example, during one of those times in the Medical School, each department lost one secretary position from their institutional funds. Thus, although the University could claim accurately that they had reduced our administrative staff, in reality the number of Deanlets remained constant. In NIH parlance, with apologies to Native Americans, we kept the Chiefs but removed the Indians.

This begs the question raised in the title of this article: if times are tough then should not shared sacrifice be the order of the day? If expenditures need to be reduced, should we not consider the vast administrative structure in the University and in each School or College as an area where significant funds may be saved?

It may be argued that the savings achieved by reducing the number of Deanlets would be minimal and would severely diminish the quality of our educational programs. It is hard to accept the

rationale that combining portfolios affects the latter (as compared to reduction in faculty or to increases in teaching loads). Further, most, if not all, of the Deanlets hold faculty appointments (many are tenured which is ironic concerning the Administration's restrictions on its granting and their expressed concern with respect to the continued presence and the lack of "Matrix-defined productivity" of "over the hill" tenured senior faculty).

Thus, they can return to their full-time faculty status and provide a portion of the requisite man/woman power to assume the postulated increased teaching loads. Further, such a reduction in administrative staff has considerable symbolic value. Would the town folk of Nottingham have been more willing to shoulder their burdens knowing that the Court of King John was smaller and that the Priests of York were thinner? ♦

The author is a Professor of Pharmacology at the School of Medicine, a member of the Faculty Herald Editorial Board, a Past President of the Medical Faculty Senate, a Former Secretary of the All University Faculty Senate and has the privilege of serving as the Chair of a National Cancer Institute Special Advisory Committee on Cancer Prevention.

How We Got Here: A Forty-Year Perspective

Goode continued from page 1

CLA standpoint.

Jim Hilty notes in his recent authorized history of Temple (*Temple University: 125 Years of Service to Philadelphia, the Nation and the World*, Temple University Press, 2010) that the university has had a history of economic vulnerability but continues to overcome adversity. The success or failure of shared governance has been shaped by a series of critical events, driven by this vulnerability. Since the formation of a strong Faculty Senate, critical moments have been triggered by the trajectory of government policies and market forces, but the faculty voice was not always heeded in selecting among alternative options.

I arrived at Temple during the moment of great optimism and growth, shortly after Temple became state-related. This was a period of accelerated hiring and the creation of a Faculty Senate and collegial governance practices. Core faculty rights followed AAUP principles and included a major say in faculty reproduction (hiring, tenuring, promotion), and curriculum development, but also a role in setting budget priorities, and participation in search committees for Deans and academic administrators. After the Board approved the Senate, junior faculty like me were drawn into the debates and carefully educated about the rights of faculty and the struggles to attain them. One first effort was to get Temple removed from the AAUP censure list (for violating Academic Freedom) by advocating the reinstatement of Barrows Dunham, a philosophy professor dismissed during the McCarthy era.

By the 1970s, it was apparent that the timing of state-relationship was unfortunate. Our optimistic expansion occurred on the eve of both a major global recession and the retrenchment of investment in public higher education. The baby boom, which along with the earlier GI Bill had spurred the growth of public higher education, was soon to end, creating a new pattern of competition between institutions with which Burgan begins her analysis.

At Temple, we experienced these pressures through annual budget battles; lower, unpredictable allocations; and delayed state payments that led to substantial borrowing and debt service. The appropriations bill for the three state-related universities was often held hostage until the general budget passed. Salaries began to decline vis-a-vis inflation, leading to faculty unionization under AAUP in 1974. Faculty hiring virtually ceased towards the end of the decade. At the same time, the closing of Philadel-

phia's public hospital meant that Temple Hospital served more people without medical coverage.

Concern about plummeting enrollments and inflation led to an episode of retrenching tenured faculty. In April 1982, notices of dismissal were sent to 52 tenured faculty in order to comply with the contractual eighteen months notice. Even at this moment of emergency, the elected executive committee of CLA (which included CST) was deeply involved in discussing alternatives and recommending what it saw as the best option for minimum damage. Faculty became intensely interested in monitoring the growth of the non-academic budget.

Eighteen months later, in October 1983, some of the dismissed faculty had found academic or practice jobs elsewhere in spite of a bad job market. Others were recalled, relocated in the institution or had accepted Temple buy-outs. In the end, four faculty members refused buyouts. They were known as the "final four" (in a critical comment on the athletics budget). A very large contingent of faculty, including the Senate and AAUP leadership picketed the President's office in Sullivan Hall in the days before the scheduled dismissal. After the termination, Temple was back on the AAUP censure list having just been removed in 1981 after Barrows Dunham was reinstated by the board. It took a decade of Senate work before reinstatement of the four ended censure.

At the same time, this episode led to a strike in 1986. The goal of this strike was to establish more formal procedures and evidence requirements to invoke financial exigency and to secure clear rights to institutional relocation in case of such an event. This critical moment had a long-term effect on the attitudes, morale and social relations of faculty. A second strike in 1990 created further tension between faculty and the Board of Trustees.

Yet in spite of this, faculty emerged with an esprit de corps and new networks, and the administration reached out to Senate leadership. The Senate set up two task forces, one to examine shared governance nationally and the other to examine the particular events which led to impasse at Temple. Under Provost Brownstein, major initiatives relied on widespread collaborative efforts with faculty committees to produce a core curriculum, graduate program reviews, and a blue-ribbon panel report to suggest priorities for strengthening particular graduate programs. An overall Academic Plan set priorities among university missions. Seed money became available for new inter-collegial and interdisciplinary programs, many of which addressed society's growing interest in inclusion and civil rights. While faculty debated and disagreed on many

Goode continued on page 5

Academic Policy Changes

By Chris Dennis

Associate Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies

The Undergraduate Studies Office and Banner Implementation Group have been working closely with the Faculty Senate's Educational Programs and Policies Committee (EPPC), the Council of Deans, the Undergraduate Associate Deans (UAD) and the Advising Directors Council (ADC), students, and many others to revise several key academic policies affecting Temple undergraduates. These changes have been approved by the offices of the Provost and President. Accordingly, five new or revised policies will become effective in May 2011 or later. As a faculty member working with, advising or directing students, it will be important for you to know several of the key provisions and transitional details.

These policies have been shared with students through email, coverage in *Temple Times*, *Temple News*, *Temple Today*; postings on plasma screens across campus and on websites in the Provost's portfolio and through a public service announcement on WHIP.

The Policies

1. [Academic Standing](#)
2. [Repeating Courses](#)
3. [Withdrawal from Courses](#)
4. [Leave of Absence](#)
5. [Academic Forgiveness](#)



Highlight of Changes

Academic Standing. The current policy on academic standing, initiated in 2003 and revised in 2007, is being streamlined and simplified. The new policy will do away with the distinction between initial academic dismissal and "summary dismissal," will eliminate "Conditional Status" for newly dismissed students, and will replace the deficiency point method of calculating dismissal with a chart that maps cumulative grade point averages (CGPA) to students' earned credit totals. Since students must have a minimum CGPA of 2.0 to graduate, the thresholds for dismissal are more lenient in the first and second years, but become considerably stricter as students approach the minimum number of credits for their degrees. The new academic standing policy also works with the new repeat policy to stipulate that students may be dismissed if they cannot earn satisfactory grades in university required courses such as English 802, and Intellectual Heritage/Mosaic 851 and 852 in a maximum of three attempts. (Since some students, by virtue of their placement test scores, must begin in English 701 or math 701, those courses, too, will be included in this list.) Students dismissed under the new policy may not return for four years at which time they can apply for forgiveness under University's academic forgiveness policy.

Repeating Courses. The current policy allows undergraduates to repeat courses an unlimited number of times, drops the lowest grade from CGPA calculations and factors third or more attempts into the CGPA.

The new policy restricts the number of repeat attempts to a maximum of three. A student may repeat a course the first time as an "unrestricted repeat." In order to repeat a second time (that is, attempt for a third time), he or she will need the permission of the dean of the school or college. No student will be allowed more repeat attempts, and if the student fails to receive the required satisfactory grade, he or she may be dismissed (if this is a specified, university required course such as English 802 or Mosaic I and II) or may have to change majors or degree programs, if the course is required for the school or major, only the highest grade earned will be calculated in the student's CGPA.

Withdrawal from Courses. The current policy restricts the total number of withdrawals to five, does not allow students to withdraw from the same course twice and requires withdrawals to be recorded by academic advisors. The new policy removes those restrictions; however, every withdrawal will count as a course attempt for purposes of the new repeat policy. Students

may withdraw themselves from courses up until the ninth week. It will be especially important, therefore, for faculty to work with students at midterm to help them determine their prospects for success in the course. A decision to withdraw can have serious consequences with respect to financial aid eligibility and time to degree, so students should be seeking careful advice from faculty, advisors and financial aid representatives. Some populations, such as international students and student athletes, where withdrawals might generate serious visa or eligibility issues, will not be able to withdraw themselves, but must consult with an advisor. Excused medical withdrawals (WE) will not be counted in the repeat course calculations.

Leave of Absence. The university does not currently have an undergraduate Leave of Absence (LoA) policy. Effective August 2011, for fall 2011 and future semesters, students who know they will be stopping enrollment, are strongly encouraged to apply for LoA. If approved, the student may return to the same university, school/college and major (or minor or certificate) requirements as when he or she declared themselves—and secures various other privileges, including Temple e-mail access, library access, and priority and self registration for the approved semester of return. By contrast, a student who leaves without any notice and without an approved LoA, must apply to be re-enrolled and, if allowed to return, must follow the most recent university curricular requirements in place for the semester of their return. This will allow departments, schools and colleges which have programs approved for curricular changes to project more accurately the number of students in the pipeline for curricular requirements that are being phased out. Faculty should encourage students who indicate an intention to take time away from Temple to apply for a leave of absence.

Academic Forgiveness. The current academic standing policy allows a restart for students dismissed after fall 2003 who have been away from the university for five years. Students who were never dismissed or who were dismissed before 2003 are not currently eligible. The new policy allows for students who are approved for reenrollment and who have been away for four years (eight consecutive fall or spring semesters) to apply for forgiveness. (All courses continue to appear on the academic record, but the student's CGPA and credits will be reset.) So a student who attended, say in the late 1990s, and was youthfully inattentive to their studies can return for a fresh academic start.

Transitions

In order to create a student-friendly transition from the current set of policies to the new ones, several provisions are being phased in. For the summer session 2011 and subsequent terms, for example, a student who repeats a course will have only the highest grade counted in his or her CGPA. The restrictions on course repeats, however, will only take effect in spring 2012 registration for summer and fall 2012 courses. This effectively means that a student with course repeat issues must achieve the needed grade(s) no later than the end of spring 2012. Thereafter, the repeat restrictions apply.

Moreover, because conditional status will no longer be available, students who are dismissed this semester as a result of spring 2011 grades will have a one-time opportunity for an extended academic probation for summer and fall 2011 courses to restore their CGPA. Their academic standing will next be evaluated in December 2011 using the new academic standing rules. Students currently on conditional status who have not exhausted their credit or time-limit eligibility will also be transitioned to "extended probation." By contrast, those students on conditional status who will have no further eligibility after spring 2011 grades—or dismissed students who never elected conditional status—will be dismissed and may return if they have been away for four years.

The new and revised academic policies should function in a clearer way to underscore the academic values of the university and to give students, faculty and advisors alike a set of tools to address academic problems, reinforce academic success, promote time to degree, speed curricular transitions in programs offering new courses and requirements and otherwise support undergraduate students in their academic work. ♦

On the Budget: Part II

Yannella continued from page 1

more specific than that, nor did he follow up by providing the proper “contexts.”

In this article, I will first describe the sources of Temple’s revenue, then focus on the salaries of our top administrators, the amount of tuition we collect, and the cost of undergraduate instruction.

Temple is “tuition-driven” but also has a few other sources of revenue. In December 2010, the University reported to the State that its total educational and general funds revenue in 2010-11 was about \$836 million. \$25 million of that came from indirect cost recovery from grants, \$21 million came from “other sources,” \$186 million was its state appropriation, and \$602.8 million came from tuition and fees. Recently, I asked a top-level finance officer how much tuition and fee money was actually paid; he told me that for 2010-11 the final figure was \$620.5 million, of which \$412.1 million, about two-thirds, was paid by undergraduates.

In my first article, I calculated that in 2009-10 Temple spent about \$201 million on instructional salaries and about \$89 million on non-instructional salaries in academic areas. I assume that the present non-instructional salary cost is about the same as it was a year ago.

How much of that \$89 million is paid to our top administrators? So far as I know, the only way of finding out is by examining the lists of its highest paid administrators that Temple must include in its tax returns. Known as Internal Revenue Service Form 990s, or “Return of Organization Exempt from Income Tax,” Temple’s are available on the website of the [National Center for Charitable Statistics](#) (NCCS). The NCCS and a few other organizations serve as public information sites for tax-exempt entities. They receive the returns they post directly from the IRS. Unfortunately, the most recent Temple return filed and posted is the one for 2009 (fiscal year 2008), so the information is not up-to-date.

But even the FY 2008 return gives a reader a picture of how well our top people are paid. Page 35 of that return lists the basic compensation, bonuses, incentive compensation, other compensation, deferred compensation, and nontaxable benefits of our top earners. The list includes President Hart (\$630,000), Vice President Bergman (\$319,000), Vice President Wagner (\$442,000), Vice President O’Rourke (\$413,000) Vice President and University Counsel Moore (\$447,000), former Vice President and Provost Staiano-Coico (\$483,000), and head basketball coach Francis Dunphy (\$706,000). Interested readers can also examine the salaries of our highest paid people in earlier years (see p. 18 of 2007, pp. 18-19 of 2006, pp. 46-47 of 2005, p. 34 of 2004, pp. 7 and 22 of 2003, pp. 7 and 21 of 2002, and pp. 7 and 23 of 2001). Some readers might also want to study which people received the biggest salary increases over those years and which received the best golden parachutes after resigning or being dismissed.

Our top administrators are not particularly hard-working, to judge from the report of hours worked per week on p. 51 of the 2008 tax return. They appear not to be the workaholic, hard-driving executives of corporate lore. Their standard work week was 50 hours. Vice President, University Counsel, and Secretary to the Board of Trustees George Moore worked 46 hours per week. Key members of the Board of Trustees are reported to have averaged one hour of Temple work per week.

Top administrators make high salaries, and there has been a great increase in the number of well-paid middle managers across the University. Some elite faculty members have done quite well, too. Universities are in some respects mirrors to the nation, and so it is not surprising to discover that what we might think of as Temple’s middle and lower working classes, the core instructional staff, have been left behind.

One large fundamental truth about instruction at Temple (and elsewhere, of course) is the extent to which our undergraduates are now taught by low-paid adjunct faculty, the extent to which a good deal of the basic work of the Univer-

Yannella continued on page 8

How We Got Here: A Forty-Year Perspective

Goode continued from page 3

issues, there were meaningful ways to resolve contested issues.

Fast forward to the events surrounding the selection of a successor to President Liacouras in 1999-2000. The Senate Steering Committee was notified that there would be only one representative on the presidential search committee, the Senate President. This not only diminished the number compared to past practice, but the normal selection process by CATA (the Senate’s sitting Committee on Administrative and Trustee Appointments) was bypassed. After a motion calling upon the Senate President to refuse to serve unless there were additional faculty representatives elected or chosen by CATA, she took her seat on the search committee and was subsequently impeached.

When the new university president took office in Fall 2000, he outsourced a review of the institution to a management firm and proceeded to make significant changes in policies and procedures. Close to 200 new policies were promulgated, many of which affected the central role of faculty in curriculum and faculty personnel decisions. These included a heavily prescribed design for a new general education program and changes in evaluating tenure and promotion cases which standardized evaluative metrics across disciplines. For one year, he created a new university-wide tenure and promotions group as a final evaluation level. He both selected and paid this stipends to this group without Senate consultation. The practice was stopped when the Senate

and the president negotiated a new formal committee which had some members appointed by the administration and others elected by faculty. Such hybrids are common in shared governance at Temple.

These new top down policies seemed more like those of corporate “turnaround” specialists than a collegial institution with deference given to collegial governance. Until this moment, a large proportion of Temple faculty had experienced collegial governance, although some colleges were governed by more hierarchical command structures. Two new forms of corporate outsourcing practices had been brought to Temple: management consultant studies and academic search firms. Both displaced the role of faculty, using their grounded knowledge of what they needed to do their work, in providing information for planning, generating job descriptions, and reviewing CVs in searches. Search firms also produced a new form of career mobility which encouraged high turnover and successive, often contradictory institutional reinventions by each new leader.

The particularly high turnover of academic administrators created inconsistent goals, changing incentives and mixed signals about “what counts.” For example, for a brief time, the development of applied MAs was encouraged but by the time proposals were readied by many programs, goals had again shifted. Metrics for measuring productivity changed from credit hours generated to FTEs per faculty, and back again. Ideas that were tried and dropped kept recycling as administrative staff turned over. Faculty increasingly burned out and withdrew.

At the same time, administrative offices drew more resources for their specialized personnel and increased salary levels.

Moreover, a climate of fear and anxiety ensued for many. Email facilitated direct communication between the President and junior faculty. Personal emails warned faculty about potential problems with tenure decisions regarding teaching evaluations or the quality of publication venues. Formerly, such mentoring was in the hands of department chairs and Deans who were close to the relevant fields. For the first time, the president took an active role in curriculum development and encouraged more Board of Trustees involvement in a domain in which deference had been given to faculty. In response to campus hearings related to David Horowitz’ campaign for a Student Bill of Rights, faculty were asked to include a description of grievance procedures in each class syllabus for students to use in case they felt they were being “indoctrinated.”

Faculty Senate leadership and governance bodies were strong enough to contest and modify most of these actions, but obviously administrative and faculty understandings of shared governance shared little common ground. How had this happened? The following discussion will examine the changes at Temple from the 1990s to the present. They all relate to the application of market logics to 1) the comparative ranking of different kinds of knowledge, 2) the recruitment of student-consumers from a broader geographic and class range, and 3) the lowering of labor costs through the recruitment of a smaller and more contingent labor force. The British literature on higher education refers to these processes as “audit culture,”

Goode continued on page 6

How We Got Here: A Forty-Year Perspective

Goode continued from page 5

which calls for practical results at every turn and employs increasingly stringent and technologically generated metrics of accountability, efficiency and productivity. As these changes intersected, they produced changes in the nature of both faculty work and identities, which in turn took its toll on faculty unity and added to workload and hence governance activities.

Market value became a major factor in selecting which knowledge is most socially and culturally valuable. Burgan describes this as the devaluation of intellectual work. She says, "Our [current] culture tends to think that the only work worth paying for is work that produces some tangible, often short term profit." She goes on to say that those who produce other forms of knowledge

...are simply [assumed to be] ...overpaid and under-worked. Such a devaluation of the complexity of knowledge fails to address the value of such mental activities as puzzling through difficult crises in human history, understanding the diversity of cultures, learning the languages of the rest of the world, or patiently and critically clarifying the values we should live by. Current history shows that failure to honor that work can lead to catastrophic results.

(Scott Jaschick. ["What ever Hapened to the Faculty. An Interview with Mary Burgan."](#))

In her book Burgan also notes that consumption tastes are not the result of inborn aspects of human nature, but "... rather tastes are shaped by culture

and increasingly, culture is shaped by market forces." (132)



Professor Emeritus of English at Indiana University Bloomington Mary Burgan addressing the First Faculty Symposium in Kiva Auditorium on April 7th.

At Temple, 1980s planning was turned into a blueprint for restructuring colleges for differential growth in order to follow market trends. "Bottom-line" thinking spread into calculations of academic value. In cases of retirements, vacant lines flowed to central administration to be reallocated or selectively "invested" in areas of "consumer" demands of the current moment or the potential for large-scale funding and grant overhead.

Irregular hiring practices ultimately created significant fault lines between the large cohorts of presidential faculty hired during the 1970s, the cohort hired during a short spurt in the early 1990s (abruptly ended by two successive years of labor intensive searches frozen in mid-stream), and the post-2000 cohort. Between the first two

cohorts, changes in disciplinary paradigms often produced tension. However, the differences between the second two cohorts are also problematic. The 1990 hires, recruited for their quality in a "buyer's market," were brought in during unstable economic times. They came to a Temple of low salaries and high teaching loads with a "sweat equity" culture of voluntary program building. The latter group, hired as part of an attempt to upgrade the institutional profile, received higher salaries, lower workloads and much fanfare about their roles in turning Temple around.

Even more significant fault lines exist between TTs and NTTs in departments or programs in which NTTs hold PhDs and desire careers as teacher scholars. The first NTTs were practitioners or clinicians in practice fields who have external labor markets to and from which they rotate. They maintain two identities as academicians and in practice. In the new two-tier system, NTTs teach more and are paid less than TT counterparts.

The Senate in the 1980s had realized that faculty hires without replacements could not sustain the new core requirements and made tenure track faculty replacement its number one issue. Anticipating a looming retirement bubble, the Faculty Senate qualified its passage of the core by inserting a written mandate guaranteeing that the core would be taught predominantly by tenure track faculty supporting the teacher-scholar model (teaching benefits from teachers who do research). The precise percentage of presidential faculty was a matter of considerable negotiation as the Senate strongly resisted the NTT model for the core.

This agreement broke down in a "which comes first" controversy in which the administration

Goode continued on page 8

Online Student Evaluations: Filling in the Blanks

Newman continued from page 2

their phones or laptops; conversely, it is possible that they may take advantage of the increased time offered by the online medium to write fuller responses. But my own experience and other reports from colleagues suggest that students are more likely to be distracted and less engaged when filling these out in dorm rooms, apartments, and computer labs. This is particularly troubling because the written responses are, to my mind, the more valuable part of the evaluations. As Joseph DuCette, a professor in the College of Education and a member of the SFF Committee puts it, evaluations serve both a "formative" and "summative" function. A decline in the discursive responses saps both functions, particularly the formative. Perhaps that is a price we have to pay for the savings. I'm not sure it's worth it.

Prof. DuCette also made it clear that the SFF Committee is aware of many of these problems and is looking to promising models for increasing response rates without simply coercing the students (say, by not releasing their grades unless they fill them out). Among these models: A student would gain access to data from the class as a whole only if she filled out the evaluation and a certain percentage of her classmates did as well. In my exchanges with the members of the committee, they have shared their data generously and responded thoughtfully to my questions. Yet they apparently have not yet set a clear and defensible benchmark that would justify a university-wide switch to e-SFFs; neither have they taken up the question of the quality of the open-ended responses, though they plan to. We must encourage them to address these matters effectively and to continue communicating with us, our students, and other members of the university community. If this is a pilot program rather than a *fait accompli*, there must be clear criteria that would move us to walk away from the e-SFF, however disappointing that would be. We

must also use this debate on the SFFs to build on the valuable discussions in our departments and colleges and the Teaching and Learning Center on teaching; however important student evaluations are, they must be only one dimension in evaluating and improving teaching. If we do not do all of this, we risk missing the forest for the trees. ♦



The Flap in CLA: Merging Margins in a Budget Crunch

Lawson continued from page 1

will still continue more or less normally given the budget crunch. In response to ongoing faculty concerns, the Dean and the CLA Executive Committee have formed an “ad hoc” committee that will meet with each of the interdisciplinary steering committees and department chairs next year to assess the success of the transition. The committee will then report and make recommendations to the Dean and the Executive Committee. This “ad hoc” committee consists of six members: Charles Weitz (Anthropology), Rebecca Alpert (Religion), Julia Ericksen (Sociology), Peter Logan (English and CHAT), Robin Kolodny (Political Science), and Gabriel Wettach (English).

Faculty and students have expressed their concerns about the decision in venues as formal as the Faculty Senate and as informal as Facebook. On April 14th, the Faculty Senate resolved “that the Faculty Senate state that it deplores the lack of consultation by the administration to fold interdisciplinary programs into existing departments, that the Faculty Senate disagrees with this decision, and that the decision should be immediately reversed.” Meanwhile, graduate and undergraduate students had been circulating petitions and organizing online to discuss how best they can make their opinions heard. On April 29th a crowd of forty, composed of faculty and students, met in the CHAT lounge to celebrate the uniqueness and the historical accomplishments of each affected CLA interdisciplinary program. A representative from each program lauded the hard work faculty and students had done over the past forty years in those interdisciplinary spaces. The mood of the crowd was pleasantly nostalgic, but it was obvious that most attendees were looking forward with uncertainty, frustration, and a shared sense of loss.

The passion accompanying the dissemination of this news at Temple derives from the unexpectedness of the announcement, existing budgetary anxieties humanities programs perennially face, concerns about unintended consequences of the new policy’s implementation, long-term effects on the interdisciplinary programs that already occupy arguably marginal academic spaces, and the faculty’s lack of a role in the decision-making process with the exception of faculty on CLA’s Executive Committee. As a result, many questions are still unanswered.

From a national perspective, CLA’s restructuring of interdisciplinary programs appears to be unprecedented. Some universities, such as the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill and the State University of New York Albany have begun cutting or combining majors with low numbers of enrollment (although the cuts at SUNY Albany are currently on hold). Recently proposed cuts at those schools have predominantly affected specialized foreign language programs, but the University of California Santa Cruz announced deep cuts to their Ethnic Studies program in March. Professor Emeritus of English at Indiana University Bloomington and long-time General Secretary of AAUP, Mary Burgan was kind enough to share her thoughts on this recent trend at the aforementioned universities with me over email on May 4th, writing that “the budget situations throughout higher education are bringing forth efforts to change the liberal arts identities of undergraduate education on many campuses. There is a notion among administrators that reorganizations have to be made to meet demands for job training rather than offering a broad liberal arts education that emphasizes the complexity of disciplines—the fact that areas of study frequently cross over departmental lines. Those vocationalizing efforts target language programs, but they challenge interdisciplinary programs as well.” In most of these cases, administrators are also seeking to reduce what they believe to be duplicate programs that do not attract enough majors.

CLA Dean Teresa Soufas took time on May 6th to explain to me her rationale for making this decision. Anticipating next year’s cataclysmic budget shortfall, each Dean was asked to streamline their College’s monetary efficiency by a preliminary total of five percent before next fall. Along with raising maximum CLA course enrollment caps by 2-3 students to eliminate the need for nearly 100 courses, merging interdisciplinary programs is another money-saving strategy. According to Dean Soufas, CLA could save up to \$100,000 annually by restructuring interdisciplinary program administration. This figure takes under account the allocation for each program director’s stipend, the money needed to hire another instructor to cover each director’s course release, and administrative support staff salaries that will be repurposed.

Dean Soufas, however, told me that saving money is not the greatest intended benefit of restructuring the administration of the CLA interdisciplinary programs. She anticipates that these changes will increase administrative

efficiency and also draw more majors to the interdisciplinary studies areas in the long run. With the exception of Asian Studies, CLA interdisciplinary programs tend to have less than 20 undergraduate majors per year. (To see a spreadsheet with these numbers and other Fall 2010 Temple University enrollment details, go this [link](#).) Dean Soufas pointed out that without the course releases, the jointly-appointed faculty within those programs will be spending more time in the classroom with students whom they could attract to the major. Interdisciplinary studies steering committees, ideally, should create fresh opportunities for collaboration and teamwork among faculty. Dean Soufas assured me that the “ad hoc” committee will report to her and to the Executive Committee next year after reviewing the restructuring and there will be room then to modify the interdisciplinary studies area mergers if necessary.

Many of the affiliated interdisciplinary faculty members I have spoken with have expressed a variety of concerns that the host departments may not be a vital fit for the interdisciplinary studies areas. Dean Soufas indicated that the host departments for each merged CLA interdisciplinary program were chosen because the departments shared one or more jointly-appointed faculty lines with the programs. In some cases, however, faculty still has questions about whether these marriages will work. When I spoke with Professor Robert Kaufmann, chair of the Sociology department, he said he is “committed to making this work” with the new steering committee for Gender, Sexuality, and Women’s Studies, but noted that his own work and expertise are not focused in gender or sexuality studies and he has no relationship with the Greater Philadelphia Women’s Studies Consortium that is currently directed from within the Women’s Studies program. With less committed oversight or openness in a dystopian situation, however, the disciplinary differences between other studies areas and their host departments could become walls of separation between the chairs and faculty with joint appointments, sparking intra-departmental tension over choosing chairs or new hires.

Other faculty has similar concerns about how these programmatic changes will affect the dynamism of course offerings. Assistant Professor Mark Leuchter, director of the Jewish Studies program, stated that “we want to offer students the most opportunities to learn” while he was underscoring the relationship between Jewish Studies and the Posen Foundation. The Posen Foundation offers funding for research and teaching opportunities in the areas of cultural and secular Judaism, which are specifically non-religious approaches to studying Jewishness. Both Dean Soufas and Dr. Leuchter assured me that the relationship between Temple University and the Posen Foundation will continue to be secure and stable through the administrative restructuring. But course offerings in Jewish Studies like “Jewish Secularism: From Spinoza to Seinfeld,” “Holocaust Cinema,” and “Secular Promised Lands: The Jewish Romance with Communism, Zionism, and Liberalism” do not seem like the greatest match for a department of Religion curriculum. Professor Phil Yannella also fears that course offerings in American Studies will become “more parochial” as a result of the move to the English department. Potentially facing greater budgetary peril down the road, the widespread fear is that specialized interdisciplinary courses will have to be streamlined more with the host department’s curriculum to avoid being the first ones to be cut for low enrollment.

Many of these interdisciplinary programs have also had historical significance at Temple University, accommodating methods and approaches that used to be considered marginal in traditional academic disciplines. Professor Emeritus of History and former director of Latin American Studies Philip Evanson shared with me that the “Latin American Studies Program was established in 1967 as a result of a student initiative,” that it had originally been a free-standing center before being moved to CLA in the late 1970s, and it has attracted several Fulbright Visiting Scholars from Latin America since the 1970s. At the CHAT interdisciplinary program celebration on April 29th, Visiting Assistant Professor of Jewish Studies Elliot Ratzman observed that the Jewish Studies program is unique among academic programs of its type worldwide because of its interdisciplinary linkage of Afro-Jewish studies, Secular Jewish studies, and the Feinstein Center for American Jewish History. The American Studies program has been the home to two Bode-Pearson Prize awardees, the life-time achievement award announced annually by the American Studies Association. At the same CHAT event, Asian Studies director and Professor of History Kathleen Uno

Lawson continued on page 9

On the Budget: Part II

Yannella continued from page 5

sity is now performed by poorly paid instructors. The 2009-10 budget detail indicates that in the undergraduate colleges some \$10.4 million was spent on adjuncts. That means that at the going price of about \$4,000 per course, more than 2500 courses were taught by adjuncts. The “profits” from such teaching are enormous. An in-state undergraduate student in my college, CLA, for instance, pays \$11,834 per year for tuition, or \$1,184 per course for ten 3-credit courses per year. If there are 30 students in a class, the tuition income for the University is about \$35,000, as against an adjunct instructional cost of \$4,000. A very nice return on investment!

Of course, it can be argued that there is no real profit, that the so-called profit goes to pay for administration, costly graduate instruction, the high salaries of major researchers, the complex workings of a major university, the great coaching staff, and so forth. That is all true. But why, an undergraduate student might ask, should she have to pay for such things, why should her money be funneled into things that don't matter to her, why shouldn't she just, and justly, be charged the cost of her adjunct instructor and perhaps a small part of the heating and electric bill of her classroom? That student might also ask why part of her tuition money should be used to pay the high salaries of people who, arguably, have very little to do with her education, and she might calculate, for example, that the 2008 salaries of the six people listed above (from President Hart to Coach Dunphy) total \$3.4 million, a sum which would require the total tuition paid by 287 current state resident CLA undergraduates.

Those are interesting and perhaps devastating questions. One can imagine a giant national student and taxpayer populist protest movement built on them,

for most universities now rely heavily on adjunct instruction and pay very high salaries to top people. But let me move ahead to a second fundamental truth about instruction at Temple. That is the relatively stable cost of undergraduate instruction by fulltime instructors in the undergraduate colleges.

Those instructors are represented by TAUP and how much they are paid individually and in the aggregate is annually reported to TAUP by Temple. I asked TAUP's Member Services Director, Terry Kilpatrick, to provide me with the data for the past several years, and she did: the total TAUP salaries were \$91 million in 2004, \$92.3 million in 2005, \$90.6 million in 2006, \$93 million in 2007, \$100.6 million in 2008, \$106.4 million in 2009, \$113.4 million in 2010, and \$119.6 million in 2011. By my arithmetic, the TAUP fulltime faculty payroll increased by about 31% between 2004 and the present. The increase was essentially because, to meet the pressure of higher enrollments, the number of TAUP instructors increased from 1104 in 2004 to 1345 in 2011. The average salary of a TAUP instructor increased from \$82,427 to \$88,922, a total of about 8% over those eight years.

In those same years, Temple has been steadily increasing the amount of money it collects in tuition and fees. The University collected \$414.3 million in 2004, \$441.1 million in 2005, \$473.9 million in 2006, \$520.5 million in 2007, and \$571.6 million in 2008. All of these figures come from the University's 990s (see p. 6 of the 2004 return; p. 8 of 2005, 2006, and 2007; and p. 9 of 2008). The 2010-11 tuition revenue was \$620.5, as I indicated at the end of the third paragraph above.

The following table describes the growth of tuition revenue as against the relative stability of TAUP salaries:

Year	Total tuition revenue	TAUP aggregate salaries
2004	\$414.3 million	\$91.0 million
2005	\$441.1 million	\$92.3 million
2006	\$473.9 million	\$90.6 million
2007	\$520.5 million	\$93.0 million
2008	\$571.6 million	\$100.6 million
2011	\$620.5 million	\$119.6 million

Yannella continued on page 9.

How We Got Here: A Forty-Year Perspective

Goode continued from page 6

argued that insufficient existing faculty had volunteered to teach the core while faculty leaders pointed out the failure to authorize new lines did not show good faith. In fact, many tenured faculty did teach the core, but growing graduate training programs also demanded reduced loads (for student supervision) and lower class size. Temple soon became a two-tier institution in which NTTs outnumber TTs in some programs and in which NTTs can either teach or do scholarship/research, but not both.

As Temple aspires to higher status, such NTTs (and the even more contingent part-time teachers) increasingly bear the brunt of budget crises, increases in workload and class size as research and teaching become separate and TT faculty are seen as reserved for upgrading the institution's profile in research and graduate training. Undergraduate teaching, which used to be a valuable part of the teacher-scholar model, becomes devalued and scholars turn inward to seek careers through disciplinary identities rather than through building and maintaining their institutions.

As institutions begin to intensify competition for students in what Burgan calls a “winner take all” style, they focus on tangible assets like awards, celebrity faculty, and practices directed toward raising institutional rank by targeting specific metrics. Such forms of self promotion require careful control of messages: even rules for placing logos and text as well as closely managed celebrations of success and the masking of unpleasant realities. Branding practices which rely on symbolic images,

appearance and icons, soon follow. Temple began branding slowly by marking its presence with the Temple “T,” a logo designed at Tyler. Media campaigns followed. This process deepened as Temple reinvented itself as a residential school, recruiting outside the city and state on a broader scale in terms of social class. While smart marketing moves, there are other social and cultural consequences of these actions which need to be more openly discussed. The recent appointment of a new VP for Branding and an office for the university architect demonstrates further marketing efforts requiring shifts in resource investment from academic to non-academic uses.

Burgan notes that administrators “tend to be willing to pump scarce resources into dubious technology fixes than into the obvious remedy of hiring more faculty” (38), thereby further adding to non-academic costs. Technology can be used in extraordinary ways, but not when it is uncritically overvalued. Technology appeals because of its bottom line value in potentially displacing expensive faculty, or in appealing to student consumers. But technology also has other unanticipated effects on faculty through disguised workload increases. Computers transfer work to faculty as support staff are replaced. Email extends working hours.

Another disguised workload increase comes from the use of computers to monitor the tasks of “audit culture,” through regulation and assessment. New forms of audit such as Faculty Annual Reports, the increasing complexity of

Goode continued on page 9

On the Budget: Part II

Yannella continued from page 8

Here is a quick calculation of the basic cost of undergraduate instruction in 2010-11: Fringe benefits for TAUP faculty are about 20% of base salaries, bringing the total cost of TAUP compensation to \$143.9 million. Add the \$10.4 million in adjunct salaries (adjuncts do not get any fringe benefits) and the total cost of undergraduate instruction is \$154.3 million. As I indicated at the end of the third paragraph above, undergraduates paid \$412.1 in tuition and fees in 2010-11, two thirds of the total \$620.5 collected by the University. The State appropriation on behalf, mostly, of undergraduates was \$186 million, as I also indicated in the third paragraph above. The total of the \$412.1 million and the \$186 million is \$598.1 million.

The \$154.3 million direct cost of undergraduate instruction was about one-quarter (25.8%) of the \$598.1 million. Where did the rest of that money go? Some certainly must have been used to make up for recent declines in state appropriations. Some went into the library, instructional technology, laboratories, student activities, and so forth. But some also went to the expansion of administration and to the high salaries of our top people and middle managers.

I began this article by listing the \$61.6 million in budget items that I think could be wholly or partially cut to meet the expected loss of State appropriation money. I will end it with a few more suggestions:

- The amount of money Temple collects from tuition and fees has increased by about 50% since 2004, from \$414.3 million to \$620.5 million. There should be no further increases until we get our fiscal house in order.
- The teaching of undergraduates is our primary mission. The amount Temple pays for direct instruction of undergraduates is astonishingly low, 25.8% of the money collected in undergraduate tuition and State appropriation. No more money should be shifted out of the direct instruction of undergraduates.
- We should seek significant cuts in the pay of our top earners and middle managers (e.g., vice provosts, associate and assistant vice provosts and vice presidents, deans, vice deans, and associate deans, etc.). It is not unreasonable to expect that 20% of the approximately \$89 million dollars, \$17.8 million dollars, could be cut from administration. The cuts, I would argue, should be graduated, with the highest earners taking the greatest cuts.

My calculations and suggestions are only in regard to the academic portions of the \$1.0 billion Temple budget (which does not include the health system). But I think it is fair to say that even in the academic portions of the budget there can be found a number of rational ways by which to meet the current crisis without resorting to further academic cuts and without charging our students and Pennsylvania taxpayers even more money than they pay now. ♦

The Flap in CLA

Lawson continued from page 7

also praised the historical importance of the interdisciplinary programs but also noted that Asian Studies is “a major for the future, rather than the past” in training its majors for a host of new opportunities in an increasingly global professional context. Dr. Elliot Ratzman had expressed a similar sentiment at the CHAT event that captured the applause of the crowd, declaring “while most universities in the country are moving toward interdisciplinarity, we are moving toward uncertainty.”

A number of others have commented that the recent administrative move illustrates a lack of respect for faculty governance and good management practices, prompting the Faculty Senate resolution made on April 14th. Article 5 Section B of the [TAUP Collective Bargaining Contract](#) states, however, that “the University shall not be required to bargain over matters of inherent managerial policy, which shall include but shall not be limited to such areas of discretion or policy as the functions and programs of the University,” so the matter does not fall legally under the powers of faculty governance. Dean Soufas stressed that the restructuring of CLA interdisciplinary programs is purely an administrative policy that is not changing or affecting the curriculum of the programs, so the merger should not have any negative academic effects. Despite this, no program directors, department chairs or any other official bodies of faculty were consulted before the mergers were announced, leaving faculty across the University shocked by the decision. Some faculty members have wondered whether the new policy will remove the major incentives for individuals to take leadership positions in the studies areas, save personal devotion.

Other shortfalls of information have caused the faculty to remain in the dark about upcoming changes. Without access to an accurate budget, the faculty has no way to verify the wisdom of the tough financial decisions that are being made around them. Professor Phil Yannella, who has compiled a line-item budget from a variety of records held in the Conwellana-Templana Collection, noted that CLA’s Institute for Public Affairs has an allocation that is two and a half times greater than that of the other interdisciplinary studies programs (including salaries for an associate director and a business manager). While the mission statement of the IPA states that it “conducts, supports, and disseminates interdisciplinary research to inform and improve public policy, focusing particularly on Philadelphia, the greater metropolitan area, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,” the IPA’s presence in CLA seems less visible than the other interdisciplinary programs being merged, it has no undergraduate major program, and IPA has less apparent teaching responsibility. I am not advocating that IPA be cut in any way, but program directors currently have no evidentiary basis or access to data that would enable them to understand their programs’ restructuring within the greater context of the CLA or University budget.

Faculty and administration may not agree about the new policy, but each member of faculty and administration I spoke with has affirmed their commitment first and foremost to making it work for the best educational interests of students in these tough economic times. While the answers to many questions and uncertainties will remain to be seen, the “ad hoc” committee will provide some oversight to the restructuring of interdisciplinary studies. The *Faculty Herald* will continue to follow this important issue in CLA and invites letters to the Editor on this and related topics. ♦

How We Got Here: A Forty-Year Perspective

Goode continued from page 8

Institutional Review Board procedures, outsourced trainings, the monitoring of compliance, and escalating changes in policies and procedures also require relearning and engender confusion. Moreover, a constant upgrading of equipment creates glitches and often systems that are not “friendly” to all types of user goals.

In a very short time, faculty work lives have radically changed and the non-academic budget has been put to many new resource-intensive uses. The autonomy of faculty, their time expenditures and the support staff have been reduced. Diminishing shared governance has to be understood in this context.

Depending on when faculty were hired, and where they are located at Temple, there are many different experiences of Temple and differences in degrees of disappointment, withdrawal or interest in governance. Burgan’s solution is to revitalize the faculty through organizing. She explains what is at stake in the loss of a viable tenure system. Recent events on campus may be signaling change and a new possibility that faculty will pay attention to budget priorities, especially regarding resource allocation between the academic and non-academic budgets. Faculty at Temple should refuse their frequent characterization as a group who “don’t like change.” This allegation, which sees critique as whining and blames faculty for being “old fashioned,” ignores the reasons for distrust and resistance that go much deeper. They come from observing and evaluating the effects of many past changes which have negatively affected our core academic mission. ♦

Dr. Judith Goode’s experience includes Faculty Senate Presidency (1987-8), FS executive committee service (1986-9), FSSC (2006-09), five Dean’s Search Committees, University Committee on Promotion and Tenure, CATA, executive committee of TAUP (1984-7), multiple terms on CLA committees and eleven years as chair in two CLA units.

Brief Reports of Faculty Senate Committees for 2011-12

The *Herald* would like to thank the Faculty Senate Committees and their members for their service of the past year. Full reports can be found on the [Senate website](#).

Committee on the Status of Women

Our charge is to consider areas such as salaries, retirement funds and promotion policies where women are thought to be treated inequitably and to recommend changes in policies to correct inequalities where they exist.

In past years we have advocated for a University-wide gender equity study, and continue to be interested in working with other committees to bring this about.

In October, we hosted our 2nd annual conference, "Achieving Equity: Women, the Workplace and the Law." Keynote addresses were given by Marina Angel, Beasley School of Law professor, and John Curtis, Director of research and public policy of the AAUP. A panel discussion on Legal Issues for Working Women included attorneys Sandra Sperino, Temple Law faculty (Structural Discrimination); Rona Kaufman Kitchen, Duquesne U. Law faculty (Family Leave); Amal Bass, Women's Law Project (Gender Discrimination and the Law); and Natasha Abel, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission-Philadelphia District (Sexual Harassment). Melissa Gilbert, CLA and Coordinator of the Greater Philadelphia Women's Studies Consortium, spoke on "Paths to Equity." In addition, members of the CSW were instrumental in bringing MIT Professor, Nancy Hopkins, to CST that same week to speak on "Mirages of Equality: The Changing Status of Women in Science."

Most recently, Professor Laura Levitt, director of the Women's Studies Program, joined us for a conversation about impacts of the merger of the Program into the Sociology department.

Fall 2012 marks the 40th anniversary of the establishment of this committee. To mark this occasion, the Committee hopes to preserve its archives and welcomes past members to deposit their materials in the Paley Library Special Collections department.

- Gretchen Sneff

Committee on Administrative and Trustee Appointments (CATA)

A summary statement on the mission of CATA found in the Faculty Senate Bylaws is as follows:

The Standing Committee on Administrative and Trustee Appointments shall serve as the faculty consultative body to the Board of Trustees upon (1) all administrative appointments that bear upon (1) the academic life of the University, and (2) nomination and election of new members of the Board of Trustees. It shall be the duty of the Standing Committee to insure faculty participation in the identification and selection procedures in each case.

In my six years serving on this committee, CATA has never been consulted on the nomination and election of new members of the Board of Trustees and only sporadically consulted on relevant administrative appointments.

This has been an active academic year for CATA, having been charged to identify and recommend faculty to serve on the following six search committees: (1) Dean of the School of Communications and Theater, (2) Dean of the College of Health Professions and Social Work, (3) Dean of the Tyler School of Art, (4) Dean of the College of Education, (5) Dean of the Libraries, and (6) Provost. We have managed to fulfill these requests even though we are rarely given more than three weeks to identify and recommend faculty members for these committees and our committee is operating at half strength with a membership of only five. It is a tribute to the many faculty members who have volunteered to serve on these important search committees that CATA has been able to recommend strong candidates for these committees.

- Anthony J. Ranere, chair

Lecture and Forums Committee

Committee charge:

To allocate annually the budget for University-wide lectures and forums and shall advise the Provost on these matters. To administer the budget allocated to the committee for departmental, school and agency allocations, as well as for the committee's own program, and those programs of merit pro-

posed during the course of the year. To set an annual theme for programs. To consider all proposals submitted by faculty, deans, department chairpersons, institute heads and student organizations leaders.

Activities: The Lectures & Forums Committee awarded all of its \$6,500 (a typical yearly budget is \$5000, but we did have left over money from previous years) budget to lectures and forums sponsored by colleges and departments from across the university. Funding for honoraria was awarded to such departments as Film and Media Arts, Music, English, Sociology, Art History, the Department of Spanish and Portuguese and the Department of Anthropology, Tyler, the Physics Department and more.

Examples of lecture topics included:

Women, the Workplace, and the Law

Female Subversions in the Art of the Late GDR

Geometry and Music

Caravaggio and Shakespeare

Towards Integration in Multilingual Schools

Socio-Historical Context and Linguistic Analysis

Dancing in the Streets: Motown and the Making of Modern America

To Serve the Living: African American Funeral Directors and Black

America

- Eran Preis

Committee on Invention and Patents

In many instances new ideas, discoveries and inventions that come out of our university research labs and the applied arts leads to practical and commercial applications. The University recognizes the importance of such inventions and ideas and would mutually benefit if these inventions reach the society at the earliest. So it is in the interest of the University to encourage and foster development of such ideas, discoveries and inventions resulting from the research conducted at the university. At the same time it is also important for the University to give adequate recognition and incentive to the inventors by having them share in the proceeds of the inventions. Our Invention and Patent policy is central in governing these rules and transactions and act in capacity to protect the Inventor as well as the University, to build a research enterprise to foster more research and provide guidance and rules to bring forth these inventions into commercialization.

The Invention and Patent committee met for the first time on April 25th 2011. During the first meeting the committee came to a consensus on the necessity to update the current policy to meet the requirements and needs of present day. As a first step the committee has delegated the Office of Technology Development and Commercialization to prepare comparable policies from leading technology commercialization institutions for the committee's review and comments. The committee also discussed about the need for increasing the awareness about the members of the university from students to faculty the importance of intellectual property, copyright and patenting issues. The committee is scheduled to meet in early fall with their findings and to start deliberations on the several line items in the policy.

- Feroze Mohamed

The Faculty Herald Editorial Board

The Faculty Herald Editorial Board (previously, the Faculty Senate Editorial Board) is charged with making editorial decisions about the Faculty Herald. The Board's primary role is to consult with the editor in identifying issues of concern to the University faculty and, as appropriate, to write articles and letters and to solicit others to write for the Herald. The Board is also responsible for monitoring the on-going effectiveness and community reach of the Herald, to respond to recommendations and complaints, and to recommend to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee (FSSC) a candidate for editor every other year.

The Board meets 4 to 6 times a year with the Editor and Assistant to the Editor of the Herald. Again this year, we worked closely with the Herald Editor to identify of major issues of community concern, including topics such as the 20/20 plan, Student Feedback Forms (electronic versus paper), shared governance, the Diamond Teacher program, budget cuts, budget analyses, and the size of the Temple administration. We also focused a good deal of attention on the issue of faculty interest and participation in University governance, especially as related to Senate and other governing commit-

Retiring Faculty: 2010-2011 Academic Year

The following faculty members plan to retire during the 2010-2011 academic year. We thank them for their hard work on behalf of their students and colleagues, and wish them the best!

- Herald Staff

Michael Becotte, MFA, Tyler School of Art, Graphic Arts and Design, Professor Emeritus

Kenneth E. Bruscia, PhD, Boyer College of Music and Dance, Music Therapy, Professor Emeritus

Sow-Yeh Chen, PhD, School of Medicine, Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Professor Emeritus

Arthur D. Chodoroff, MM, Boyer College of Music and Dance, Instrumental Studies, Professor Emeritus

William W. Cutler III, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, History, Professor Emeritus

James Daniel, PhD, School of Medicine, Pharmacology, Professor Emeritus

Rachel Blau Duplessis, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, English, Professor Emeritus

Thomas Getzen, PhD, Fox School of Business and Management, Risk Management and Insurance, Professor Emeritus

Eva M. Gholson, MFA, Boyer College of Music and Dance, Dance, Professor Emeritus

J. Brooke Harrington, BArch, Tyler School of Art, Architecture, Professor Emeritus

Reinhardt J. Heuer, PhD, College of Health Professions and Social Work, Communication Sciences and Disorders, Professor Emeritus

Philip Himeline, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, Psychology, Professor Emeritus

Moya Kinnealey, PhD, College of Health Professions and Social Work, Rehabilitation Sciences, Associate Professor Emeritus

Elliot B. Koffman, PhD, College of Science and Technology, Computer and Information Sciences, Professor Emeritus

Grant Krow, PhD, College of Science and Technology, Chemistry, Professor Emeritus

Helen Kwalwasser, Boyer College of Music and Dance, Instrumental Studies, Professor Emeritus

Linda L. Levy, MA, College of Health Professions and Social Work, Rehabilitation Sciences, Associate Professor Emeritus

Roland Lipka, PhD, Fox School of Business and Management, Accounting, Professor Emeritus

Rebecca R. Medel, MFA, Tyler School of Art, Crafts, Professor Emeritus

William D. Nathan, PhD, College of Science and Technology, Mathematics, Associate Professor Emeritus

Roberta A. Newton, PhD, College of Health Professions and Social Work, Physical Therapy, Professor Emeritus

John C. Raines, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, Religion, Professor Emeritus

Ingrid H. Rima, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, Economics, Professor Emeritus

James P. Ryan, PhD, School of Medicine, Physiology, Professor Emeritus

Joseph S. Schmuckler, EdD, College of Education, Curriculum, Instruction, and Technology in Education, Professor Emeritus

Larry A. Spaid, MFA, Tyler School of Art, Art, Professor Emeritus

Glenn A. Steele, MM, Boyer College of Music and Dance, Instrumental Studies, Professor Emeritus

William Stone, DMA, Boyer College of Music and Dance, Vocal Studies, Professor Emeritus

Raza A. Tahir-Kheli, PhD, College of Science and Technology, Physics, Professor Emeritus

Ann F. Vansant, PhD, College of Health Professions and Social Work, Physical Therapy, Professor Emeritus

Morris J. Vogel, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, History, Professor Emeritus

Kathy L. Walker, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, History, Associate Professor

Donna T. Weiss, PhD, College of Health Professions and Social Work, Rehabilitation Sciences, Associate Professor Emeritus

John M. Wurzel, MD, School of Medicine, Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Associate Professor Emeritus

Stephen Zelnick, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, English, Associate Professor

The *Faculty Herald* apologizes for any retiring faculty this list might have missed. The administrative process to retire during this academic year continues through June, so this list is not fully up to date.



Brief Reports of Faculty Senate Committees for 2011-12

Reports continued from page 10

tees. Efforts to solicit articles on these and other issues were outlined and several members of the Board (and the FSSC) contributed their own letters and articles.

At a Fall meeting it was suggested by David Waldstreicher that the Board go to the Faculty Senate Steering Committee to present the concept of a faculty-sponsored symposium on an issue of importance to the Temple Community. With FSSC interest and some funding from the Provost's office secured, The Board settled on the topic of faculty governance, and Bill Woodward recruited Mary Burgan, Professor Emerita at Indiana University and former general secretary of AAUP, as our speaker. Mary came to campus on April 6 and 7th, met with several prominent members of the faculty, and was the featured speaker at the First Faculty Senate/Faculty Herald Symposium on the Future of the University.

Although attendance was disappointing (approximately 25 faculty attended), Mary's talk on "What Happens to Faculty University Governance in Hard Times?" was well received, and the panel discussion that followed was very fruitful. The Board has committed to a second symposium to be held in the Spring, 2012.

Readership of the on-line Herald was down again this year although first time readership and the number of unique readers was up. Despite the

heroic work done by the Herald Editor, David Waldstreicher, in soliciting articles and letters on timely topics of interest, the Board is looking for ways to improve readership and interest the university affairs in general.

- Frank Friedman, Chair

Personnel Committee

We had a very easy year on the Personnel Committee, which is set up to be the "final faculty determinant of the rights of a faculty member in cases of dismissal, denial of tenure, or other grievances and shall after a full inquiry make recommendations to the Senate as to the fair disposition of the case."

There were no formal complaints made, and only one inquiry made about a person's employment status, an inquiry that the faculty member decided not to pursue.

- Jane DeRose Evans, Chair

Senate Student Award Selection Committee

The Senate Student Award Selection Committee has two main purposes. All of our efforts occur during the month of March.

We interview and select the Student speaker for the University Commencement. Each college recommends one student who has already been selected to speak at that college/school's commencement. We listen to their speeches and make our recommen-

dation for the speaker at the University-wide Commencement. After this, we present our recommendation to the Board of Trustees for questions and confirmation.

We also select recipients for University Memorial Scholarship Awards. There are generally 40-50 applicants for these. Our committee reviews the criteria for the awards and the applicants, and makes our recommendations for these awards.

This year, we completed all of our efforts with a very small but committed team of Faculty volunteers.



Faculty Herald Staff

Faculty Senate Editorial Board 2010–2011

David Waldstreicher, Editor, College of Liberal Arts
 Kime Lawson, Assistant Editor, College of Liberal Arts
 Frank Friedman, Chair, College of Science and Technology
 Jo-Anna Moore, Tyler School of Art
 Richard Orodnenker, College of Liberal Arts
 Michael Sirover, School of Medicine
 Gregory Urwin, College of Liberal Arts
 Linn Washington, School of Communications and Theater
 David Watt, College of Liberal Arts
 William Woodward, School of Law
 Stephen Zelnick, College of Liberal Arts

Faculty Senate Steering Committee 2010–2011

Paul LaFollette, President, College of Science and Technology
 Joan P. Shapiro, Vice President, College of Education
 Roberta Sloan, Secretary, School of Communications and Theater
 Karen M. Turner, Past-President, School of Communications and Theater
 Nora Alter, School of Communications and Theater
 Doug Wager (Interim), School of Communications and Theater
 Adam Davey, College of Health Professions and Social Work
 Joan Delalic, College of Engineering
 Margaret Devinny, College of Liberal Arts
 Deborah Howe, School of Environmental Design
 Michael Jackson, School of Tourism and Hospitality Management
 Tricia S. Jones, College of Education
 Luke Kahlich, Boyer College of Music and Dance
 Stephanie Knopp, Tyler School of Art
 Jim Korsh, College of Science and Technology
 Laurie MacPhail, Kornberg School of Dentistry
 Mark C. Rahdert, Beasley School of Law
 Charles Ruchalski, Temple University School of Pharmacy
 Jay Sinha, Fox School of Business and Management
 Jeffrey Solow (Interim), Boyer College of Music and Dance



TEMPLE
 UNIVERSITY®



The Faculty Herald remains dedicated to promoting a dialogue with and among the faculty of Temple University and invites readers to write the editor in response to anything in this or a previous issue, or on other topics of interest and import to Temple Faculty. New letters sent to the editor will be published on the Herald's website (www.temple.edu/herald) within one or two weeks of the editor receiving them and will be included in the next issue of the Herald. Readers are also welcome to post comments on select articles presented on the new Faculty Herald blog at <http://www.facultyherald.blogspot.com>.

Letters to the editor should be emailed to David Waldstreicher at facultyherald@temple.edu.

University Faculty Senate Minutes, Apr. 14, 2011

University Senate Meeting April 14, 2011 Minutes

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 1:50 pm.

Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of March 16th Representative Senate Meeting were approved as written. There is some question as to whether or not these minutes should have been approved at this meeting since this was a University Senate Meeting rather than a Representative Senate Meeting.

President's Report – Paul LaFollette:

President LaFollette said that he would make his remarks short because of the many issues facing the University Senate. He mentioned the online survey that has been distributed regarding the gender and GLBTQ climate on campus and urged the faculty members to fill out the questionnaire.

Vice President's Report – Joan Shapiro:

Vice-President Shapiro reiterated her plea for faculty to volunteer for committee vacancies and thanked those who had volunteered, been appointed and were elected.

Vice-President and Provost, Richard Englert's Report:

Vice President and Provost Englert said that he has already met with the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and that many of his remarks would be a reiteration of items he presented at that meeting the previous Tuesday.

He explained Temple's financial situation as it stands now as a result of the governor's recommendation, and said that although, no doubt, the situation will be improved after the legislative vote, Temple will still be in rather dire financial straits. In anticipation of this, he has made the following recommendations:

1. Freezing of non-union salaries within the university.
2. Asking TAUP and other unions to help.
3. Institute a hiring freeze with these exceptions: those faculty searches already underway, grant positions, positions which affect student success (such as advising), and positions directly related to revenue generation. There will be a process freeze – so that any additional administrative hires would need the Provost's and President's approval.
4. Provost Englert plans to work with the FSSC to develop travel restriction guidelines.
5. The University will be taking a look at benefits packages and seeing if there are reductions possible.
6. He said that he wanted to delay all five dean searches. He said he will continue this dialogue. His rationale was "How can we bring someone in when we cannot answer questions about resources?"
7. Provost Englert said that he will look at administrative structure and organization across the university. There will be perusal of every unit to see what efficiencies can be instituted.

8. He continued that the university will look for partners outside the university to enhance revenues or limit expenditures.
9. He plans to work with Faculty Senate Budget Review Committee and FSSC regarding the Huron Group report and discuss what may or may not work within the university.

Provost Englert said that he will be visiting the FSSC meeting next Tuesday to continue "discussion," on these items, and that the bottom line is that over the next few weeks there will be a lot of discussion within the context of what the state might do in terms of appropriations.

Unlike previous presentations by VP and Provost Englert, characterized by "Dialogue with Dick," Englert did not invite questions or comments and departed immediately after his presentation.

After Provost's Englert's departure, Faculty Senate Secretary Roberta Sloan stated that although we have constantly heard "one size does not fit all," any decision to delay ALL dean searches certainly contradicts this repeated mantra. She added that in the case of the SCT dean's search, four excellent candidates had already been brought on campus, interviewed, and faculty input was solicited. Of these four candidates, two are African American women, one is an Asian man and one is a Caucasian man. She continued that when one looks at the Council of Deans, where there are only two women, and one of them is African American, out of a total of seventeen, it would be reprehensible to stop the SCT dean selection process, if only diversity were taken into consideration. She also mentioned that if a search is stopped AFTER four very viable candidates visit campus, this will greatly blemish the reputation of Temple University nationally.

President's Report Continued:

President LaFollette announced that the steering committee has agreed that balloting on the Faculty Senate Bylaws will be done through electronic voting. Later in the session, it was agreed that the voting period will be ten days.

President LaFollette called upon Professor Marina Angel who was accompanied by Professor Jane Evans to the stage in order to make a presentation on their proposed amendments to the amendments already distributed regarding the Faculty Senate Bylaws.

Professor Angel verbally explained her suggestions which were fully explicated on a yellow sheet memorandum which was available to all those attending the meeting, and fully expressed her views on each of the amendments proposed.

Professor Jane Evans said that after discussion with various faculty members, she will now not object to the specific amendment that will allow non-tenured faculty members to have voting privileges as senators as soon as they begin their work at Temple. After Professor Evan's comments, Professor Angel said that she would agree to withdraw her objection to that particular amendment.

Carla Davis Cunningham, representing the librarians presented a rationale for allowing librarians to be full members of the Faculty Senate, and her rationale for this request. This, too, was distributed on hard copy to the senators attending the meeting.

University Faculty Senate Minutes, Apr. 14, 2011

Minutes 4/14 continued from page 13

Vice President Joan Shapiro said that she strongly supported the idea of librarians becoming full members of the Faculty Senate.

President LaFollette invited Professor Laura Levitt to speak to the University Senate.

Professor Levitt explained her background and what her duties at Temple have been for the last fifteen years including her participation on interdisciplinary programs including Women's Studies and Jewish Studies. There are currently five interdisciplinary programs. She said that she and the other director of the existing interdisciplinary programs were called into College of Liberal Arts Dean Teresa Soufas' office and told that the interdisciplinary programs were to be folded into existing departments and that the Directors will no longer be needed.

Professor Levitt said that faculty were not privy to any concrete plans about this, and that all the directors were shocked. Apparently the CLA Executive Committee was not consulted about this decision and received the announcement AFTER the directors were told. Additionally, the departments into which the interdisciplinary programs are to be folded were neither told nor consulted.

The interdisciplinary programs and affected departments include:

Asian Studies folding into the Department of Critical Languages
 American Studies into the Department of English
 Women's Studies and the LGBT minor into the Department of Sociology
 Jewish Studies into the Department of Religion (ironically a department that has a secular Jewish Studies Certificate)
 Latin American Studies into the Department of History

Professor Levitt related that the students in these programs are devastated, upset and angry. Many of the faculty and directors feel the same way. All of these programs have had very positive program reviews with reviewers recommending their continuation and support.

Professor Scott Gratson (SCT) stated that "it is particularly concerning that of the five interdisciplinary programs being affected by Dean Soufas' decision, four represent minority groups."

Professor Levitt stated that the folding of these programs into departments will have little monetary advantage, and if asked, the directors of the programs would have been very willing to work with Dean Soufas to reduce these costs. Professor Levitt concluded by asking for the support of Faculty Senate for the retaining the Interdisciplinary Programs as independent entities.

Professor Art Hochner pointed out that this kind of change potentially violates the TAUP contract and at the very least shows a distinct lack of shared governance. He believes that this raises very serious questions.

Professor Angel presented a motion "that the Faculty Senate state that it deplors the lack of consultation by the administration to fold interdisciplinary programs into existing departments and that the Faculty Senate disagrees with this decision." The motion was seconded and a discussion ensued.

Senator Jim Korsh asked if any of the bylaws of the college had been violated. Apparently Dean Soufas asserted that nothing in the curriculum will change.

There was a comment that curricular changes cannot be divided from the structure of the programs. The following questions emerged:

1. What is going to happen to the integrity of these programs?
2. Who is going to advise the students?

3. Who will take leadership in developing the interdisciplinary offerings?
4. How will the health of these programs be assessed?
5. How will these programs continue to cross schools, cross colleges and maintain their interdisciplinarity without oversight and leadership?
6. Who will be responsible for recruitment?
7. Who will answer queries?
8. Who will run the steering committee for Interdisciplinary Programs?

Although the Interdisciplinary Program Directors were told that nothing is changing, this decision means changes at every turn.

Professor Tony Ranere said this was a hasty terrible decision and feels that it should be reversed. He suggested that the Faculty Senate needs to "push back hard" on this issue.

Professor Terry Halbert feels that we need to make a strong statement. She mentioned that something similar happened in the Fox School of Business. She asked "How can these wonderful programs survive under this new plan since they each need someone to oversee the programs?"

Since normally a motion needs a second reading before it can be passed, President LaFollette asked for a vote on whether the motion could be considered on first reading. This is possible if a 2/3 majority of those senators present vote that the motion can be voted upon at the first reading.

The decision to consider the motion and vote upon it without a second reading passed with considerably more than a 2/3 majority.

It was suggested that the motion should be stronger. Professor Angel accepted a friendly amendment to strengthen the original motion.

The motion:

Resolved: that the Faculty Senate state that it deplors the lack of consultation by the administration to fold interdisciplinary programs into existing departments, that the Faculty Senate disagrees with this decision, and that the decision should be immediately reversed,

Passed unanimously.

Professor Angel made a motion that not all administrators be allowed to vote in faculty elections. There was lively discussion.

The motion:

Resolved: that the word "Dean" in Article III Section 3 of our current constitution be taken to mean the actual Deans of our schools and colleges, but does not include any other people whose title contains the word dean such as vice deans, associate deans, and assistant deans; and that the words "Vice President" in the same Section shall apply only to the organizationally highest ranked Vice President in any unit. The list of eligible voters will be adjusted to reflect these meanings.

This motion passed unanimously.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
 Roberta Sloan, Ph.D.
 Faculty Senate Secretary

University Faculty Senate Minutes, Dec. 9, 2010

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 1:50 pm.

Guest – Provost and Interim Senior Vice-President, Dick Englert:

Interim Vice President and Provost Englert complimented the faculty on the conclusion of a “great semester.” He mentioned listening to a Temple Jazz Band performance at the Temple Performing Arts Center and attending a class that dealt with interdisciplinary projects, and how impressed he was with both.

Provost Englert mentioned the dean searches being conducted and reported that he feels that these are progressing in a timely manner.

The Tenure and Promotion Guidelines Committee will finish its work shortly and will submit their findings and recommendations to President Hart by December 1, 2010. Provost Englert complimented the committee and President LaFollette on his service co-chairing the committee. After the recommendations are submitted to President Hart, she intends to post them on a Temple website and invite comments from faculty.

Provost Englert mentioned that at the recent FSSC/Provost Retreat, the steering committee made thoughtful comments about the Temple websites. He has shared these concerns with President Hart who plans to set up a task force to deal with issues concerning the Temple websites.

Provost Englert mentioned that five specific academic policies for students have been discussed and will soon be ready to be released. These topics include:

1. Withdrawal from classes (U and G)
2. Academic forgiveness (U only)
3. Academic standing (U only)
4. Repeating classes (U only)
5. Leave of absence (U and G)

When a question came up about who was on the committee that developed these new academic policies, Senior Vice Provost of Undergraduate Studies, Peter Jones, said that the work on these policies began two years ago, though EPPC discussions. He mentioned that a number of sources have had input, and that ultimately, the policies came back to the EPPC for its recommendations.

Provost Englert invited everyone to President Hart’s Holiday Party and said that it’s an excellent way to meet others from across the university.

He mentioned that the university will be closed from 12/23/10 through 1/2/11. The Tech Center will also be closed during this time. He stated, however that the library will be open on December 28th, 29th, and 30th from 9:00 – 5:00 pm.

Professor Gregory Urwin (CLA), said that at the last Representative Faculty Senate Meeting, a colleague mentioned her objection to the fact that the Tenure and Promotion Guidelines Committee contained no members recommended by the Faculty Senate. He asked Provost Englert about this, and how this might impact other upcoming committee appointments. Provost Englert said that he appreciated the underlying criticism and that he personally takes responsibility for who was chosen. He mentioned that because President Hart intends to post the recommendations, there will be ample opportunity for faculty to have input before the new Tenure and Promotion Guidelines are decided upon and published.

Approval of Minutes:

The minutes from the last University Senate Meeting of May 5, 2010 were approved, as written.

President’s Report – Paul LaFollette:

President Paul LaFollette discussed the FSSC/Provost Retreat and shared that one of the emerging issues is the inadequacy and the difficulties involved with the university websites. According to President LaFollette, Provost Englert brought these issues to the president and she intends to have them addressed by creating a task force to review them.

The draft template bylaws were discussed at the retreat, and twice at FSSC meetings. A committee of the FSSC has been formed to further look at the draft bylaws and bring forth a report to the FSSC that will entail subsequent action.

President LaFollette requested that representatives to the Faculty Senate remind their schools, colleges, and departments not to schedule meetings at the same time as Faculty Senate meetings. He mentioned that the dates and times of Faculty Senate meetings have been published since the beginning of the year.

President LaFollette concluded his remarks by thanking Professor Scott Gratson (SCT), who is stepping down as the Parliamentarian of the Faculty Senate, after five years of excellent service. Professor Gratson received an enthusiastic round of applause. President LaFollette said that if anyone is interested in this position, he would appreciate it if he/she would contact him.

Vice-President’s Report – Joan Shapiro:

Vice President Joan Shapiro thanked everyone who ran for Senate Committee Elections. She said she hopes that there will be a greater number of people voting in the spring elections.

She added that she also hopes that senators will place their name in nomination for the EPPC and the Personnel Committee during the spring elections.

VP Shapiro pointed out that the Faculty Senate vacancies were listed on the back of the minutes, and said that she hopes people will volunteer for the remaining openings on these committees.

She mentioned that if one goes to the Faculty Senate Website, there is information about the various committees including the work that the committee accomplishes and the time commitment involved. She requested that committee chairs let Faculty Senate Coordinator, Cheryl Mack, know if any pertinent information has changed, i.e. if the committee now conducts the majority or all of its work online, so that she can post this information.

She concluded her report by mentioning that if a senator is interested in serving on a committee, he/she should send a short bio and CV to Senate2@temple.edu.

Secretary’s Report – Roberta Sloan:

Secretary Roberta Sloan, on behalf of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, thanked the two Faculty Senate Student workers, and especially, the Faculty Senate Coordinator, Cheryl Mack, for their wonderful work this past semester, and presented them with holiday gifts on behalf of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee.

New Business:

President LaFollette opened the floor for discussion.

Senator Marge Devinney (CLA) presented a motion that had been passed by unanimous vote by the College of Liberal Arts to the Faculty Senate. The motion is as follows:

The Collegial Assembly of the College of Liberal Arts is concerned about the process of policy making in the University as exemplified by three recent decisions:

University Faculty Senate Minutes, Dec. 9, 2010

Minutes 12/9 continued from page 15

- The move to on-line student evaluations
- Scheduling restrictions for the course matrix
- Rules regarding graduate fellowships and “gradadjuncts.” (sic)

Our concern is that the ramifications of any procedural changes should be fully discussed with units directly affected before any rules are put in place. We are sympathetic with the goals of central administration to ensure effective and equitable policies, but we call for careful deliberations about unintended and unfunded mandates.

This motion was brought to the floor by the CLA Executive Committee, (and) was endorsed by a unanimous vote of the CLA faculty at the collegial assembly on December 8, 2010.

Professor Dieter Forster (CST) asked that a committee be formed to study the use of the Ambler Campus.

President LaFollette invited Senators to participate in a discussion of the Student feedback forms and the Matrix. He began the discussion by asking how the SFFs should be deployed and how they should be used.

Professor Scott Gratson (SCT) asked about the effect of online SFFs and the low response rate he has encountered. He said that he had to make a decision about rehiring an adjunct and only had two SFF responses to use in making this decision. He feels this is a very serious issue and he has real questions about the validity of online SFFs.

Senior VP Peter Jones offered some feedback on SFFs. He said that two years ago, the CATEs became the SFFs and that this new instrument includes many changes meant to make the student evaluation forms more viable.

He further stated that last year and this year, the SFF Committee has looked at other aspects of the forms. One aspect that they are studying is whether or not students need or should know the results of the SFFs and the concept of using online SFFs rather than paper ones. As a result of some faculty members' requests, there was a pilot tryout of online forms. VP Jones stated that the university needs to be careful about response rates and the nature of the feedback. He said that it was decided that the first pilot program of online SFFs was too small to be significant. He has been working with various deans to see if the number of responses can be increased in the spring, 2011 semester sample. He mentioned that several hundred sections are now being piloted online by the faculty and when the data is known, the results will be shared. He noted that online SFFs are an experiment. He said that he is exploring ways to encourage students to participate. He doesn't wish the impetus to be negative. One idea being considered is that students who fill out the form online will have access to the results.

Professor Fran Viola (SCT) stated that she feels that NTT's should not be evaluated by SFFs in the same way that tenured and tenure-track professors are evaluated because NTT's often teach a 4-4 load as compared to some professors who teach a 2-2 load. She also mentioned data that asserts that female professors fare differently in SFF evaluations. She feels that these concerns need to be addressed if the SFFs are to be meaningful.

Professor Art Hochner, President of TAUP (FSBM), asked VP Jones what the SFF committee had actually done. He said that upon inquiry, three members of the SFF Committee told him that they had no part in deciding to pilot the SFFs online. He asked VP Jones about the process.

VP Jones responded that that SFF Committee had accomplished quite a lot by changing from the previous use of the CATE instrument to the new SFF evaluations. He pointed out that previously percentiles had been used, and that the SFFs does not use percentiles which often can be very misleading. VP Jones said that the SFFs are created in such a way that one or two very low evaluations cannot now distort the final overall evaluation. He made it clear that SFFs should not be used for making decisions about hiring or

rehiring adjunct professors. He said that in terms of the process itself, the SFF Committee had accomplished quite a lot.

VP Jones also mentioned that the SFF Committee had worked in tandem with the Office of Research, and that the entire process of creating the SFFs had been very time consuming and that the committee had worked very hard to create a new instrument, and in fact, had created several versions to be used in a variety of classes with varying formats. He concluded by saying that the SFF Committee had not met for three years.

Faculty Senate Past President, Karen Turner (SCT), said that she has previously stated, based upon significant research, that faculty of color and women, tend to rank lower on these kinds of student evaluation instruments, and she feels that although she has mentioned this many times, it has not been acted upon or taken into consideration.

VP Jones replied that he heard about it last month and is looking into it.

Professor Turner said that currently, there is no way that a faculty member can respond to SFFs and to what might be erroneous information that has been written by students. She mentioned that once it is written, it follows a professor's career at Temple, without the professor having any way to refute what might, in fact, be untrue. She asked that a mechanism for faculty responses to SFFs be created and utilized.

Professor Michael Hagen, (CLA) said that he felt that the decision about whether or not to participate in the pilot online SFF program has been left solely in the hands of those who wish to participate, thereby providing a basis for bias in the results of the pilot program. He stated that the discretion as to whether or not to participate in the pilot program can impact its outcome. He offered a solution: solicit volunteers and then divide them in half with one group being evaluated online and the other group being evaluated through the paper instrument. He asserted that the comparison of the outcomes of the two groups would provide more valid information.

VP Jones responded that, in the future, they do plan on using various ways to make the online SFF pilots more statistically reliable.

Secretary Sloan referred back to Professor Turner's inquiry and asked VP Jones whether or not he is looking into the impact of gender and race on the SFF evaluations. He responded that he does have some results of looking into this question and offered to share them.

Professor Dieter Forster (CST), stated that the poor number of responses to the online SFFs means that the results are not valid. He mentioned that he feels the same way about written SFFs. He said that he feels if the percentage of students filling out the forms falls below a certain level, that the results are not valid. He concluded by saying that this is important and should not be ignored.

Professor Gregory Urwin (CLA) stated that he feels, in principle, that online SFFs are a great thing, but that the number of responses is very important. He added that he does not like the idea of any punitive methodology for persuading students to fill out online SFFs and that it would be better for the students not to fill them out at all rather than to approach the issue with a negative incentive.

Professor Giorgio Ingargiola (CST) stated that he would like the CATE (sic) results to be available to the students.

Professor Scott Shall (Tyler) mentioned that too many students breeze through the SFFs and do not spend much time on them, and that therefore numerically, they are unreliable. He stated that he feels as if the written comments from the students are more revealing.

Professor John Nosek (CST), stated that, at the Air Force Academy, a study was conducted that showed there was an inverse relationship between how much the students liked a class and how well they did in the next sequential

University Faculty Senate Minutes, Dec. 9, 2010

Minutes 12/9 continued from page 16

class. He stated that feels as if the SFFs are used for the wrong reasons. He said that he feels that there should be a review of the whole purpose of student evaluations, and it should be ascertained as to whether or not they really are helping teaching and learning at Temple University. He said that he feels that the SFFs are not very effective.

Faculty Senate Vice President, Joan Shapiro (COE), shared that she administers SFFs in her classes, but of more importance and help to her as a teacher, is a second questionnaire that she passes out. On this second form are three questions. She asks for the students to state the strengths of the class, the weaknesses of the class and to add any additional comments. She stated that this second informal evaluation helps her tremendously, particularly in further developing new classes.

Parliamentarian Scott Gratson (SCT), stated that “we like to be liked,” and that at Temple University, 70-73% of the grades are A’s or B’s. He said that he feels that the results of the SFF evaluations are highly connected to the expectation of grades. He added that literature suggests that this fact encourages grade inflation. He added that he feels that, if the results of SFF data are published, and available to students, it will negatively impact teaching.

Senator Mark Rahdert (Law) stated that he believes when people talk about conducting experiments regarding teaching, he wonders whether or not the experiment has failed. He feels that it is important to identify the criteria beforehand, so that the results of the experiments can be compared to already established criteria, rather than deciding afterwards if the experiment

was successful in revealing what it was meant to explore. He said that he fears that when the results of the online SFF pilots are in, the university will move forward with online SFFs without really having a valid way of evaluating the results of the pilot programs.

Professor David Waldstreicher (CLA) stated that administrators and tenured faculty are the least affected by the SFFs, and yet they are making the decisions about the SFFs. He stated that the people with the least at stake are making the decisions for those with the most at stake

Professor Dieter Forster (CST) stated that he doesn’t want this discussion of the SFFs to be an exercise in paranoia. He felt that we should “not throw out a good thing,” because it is believed that it will result in grade inflation.

There being only five minutes left for the meeting, President LaFollette thanked everyone present for their input, and stated that the topic of the matrix, which had been announced as one of the topics to be discussed at this meeting, would be discussed at a future meeting.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 2:57 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Roberta Sloan, Ph.D.
Faculty Senate Secretary

For an archive of Faculty Senate Minutes, go to: <http://www.temple.edu/senate/minutes.htm>

Audio Recordings of these and other Senate Meetings may be found at: <http://www.temple.edu/senate/Apreso/FacultySenateApresoRecordings.htm>