Did You Know?

This issue of the Herald features several reflections on the themes of university leadership and resources. This is neither new nor surprising, though I think what our contributors have to say on these topics is surprisingly fresh and timely.

What is new, or recurring again, is that decisions that will greatly affect the faculty are soon to be made by leaders who will not be here to see the results:

• A faculty workload committee, chaired by Dean Stroker, is looking into the question of whether course loads will need to be raised. The committee has not yet received its charge as of our press date, but members include Presidential Faculty Fellows Thomas Marino and Susan Varnum.

• There is a strong possibility that some colleges or parts of colleges will be restructured, for a variety of reasons including potential savings, the opportunity presented by deanship vacancies, and perhaps the recommendations of the Huron Group, the outside consulting firm brought in last year. We are expecting a “white paper” on the subject from the Provost.

Update on Construction Costs

By Philip R. Yannella
Professor of English and American Studies

A main theme of my earlier Herald articles and letters, including the one I wrote with Professor Marina Angel, was that tens of millions of dollars annually paid by our students as tuition, as fees for instruction, and offering an explanation of the benefits that such changes might bring to us as faculty, administrators, and Temple and our students, and also any projected negative effects that these decisions will have.

Going the Distance

By Kime Lawson
Assistant Editor

Teachers accustomed to the traditional classroom model of instruction may have doubts about the merits of distance learning, but recent innovations in pedagogy and technology have certainly made taking a second look worthwhile. The new addition of Blackboard Collaborate to the Blackboard Learn package this year facilitates a more streamlined and synchronous classroom experience for distance learners and instructors alike.

To introduce instructors to these advancements in distance learning at Temple, Assistant Vice Provost of Distance and Summer Programs Dr. Dominique M. Kliger has spearheaded the Virtual Teaching Certificate Program. The Program is a twenty-hour online tutorial that will instruct teachers, at their own pace, to fashion a fully-functional virtual classroom experience with the new tools available through Blackboard Collaborate. The Program includes ten two-hour sessions that address important strategies with hands-on tutorials for online or hybrid course construction, from writing a syllabus to designing effective assignments and assessments. Twenty hours may not seem better at this point to look at what we are currently up to, and our hopes for further activities.

A Message from Paul LaFollette

By Paul LaFollette
Faculty Senate President and Associate Professor of Computer and Information Sciences, College of Science and Technology

I had originally planned to write an article describing the various achievements of the Senate and its Steering Committee during the previous academic year, but suddenly we are half way through this year and it seems better at this point to look at what we are currently up to, and our hopes for further activities.

Over the summer, as many of the Steering Committee as possible made ourselves available to meet with the Provost and President as needed to continue dialogue about Temple’s financial challenges. From about mid-summer on, the FSSC had several meetings with Provost Englert in which, at his request, we focused on a variety of proposals for restructuring various academic units at Temple. These meetings have continued into the term. On October 18 we will be having our annual autumn retreat with the Provost, and the entire agenda will be devoted to the matter of proposed re-structuring. The expectation is that following this retreat, Provost Englert will produce a “white paper” outlining the proposed changes, and offering an explanation of the benefits that such changes might bring to Temple and our students, and also any projected negative effects that these
Why Didn’t This Happen At Temple University? 
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By Michael Sirover
Professor of Pharmacology

"Judge not, that ye be not judged" Matthew: 7.1

Lindy gives Drexel U. $15 million

Brannan donates $5M to hospital

Former Philadelphia Eagles quarterback Norm Brannan and his wife, Irma, have donated $5 million for a new pediatric gastroenterology disorders center at Children's Hospital of Philadelphia. The Brannans, philanthropists and civic leaders in Miami, gave the money for the center, to be named for their daughter, Susi Brannan Lustgarten, and her husband, Scott Lustgarten, of Bryn Mawr. The Lustgarten center will provide diagnostic and laboratory resources for motility disorders, such as irritable bowel syndrome and reflux disease.

Temple University was lifelong to Philadelphia’s University. For better or worse, it’s become now a multinational corporation whose headquarters happens to be located in North Philly. When we were the former, like the City University of New York (CUNY), we were the blue collar school as compared to Penn, like CUNY was to New York University and to Columbia. So, during that time, we were an academic institution where working class students matriculated at night after work, on their time off from work and may have been the first in their family to attend college (let alone finish high school).

In accord with our role as Philadelphia’s University, our endowment was diminutive; we lacked significant donor contributions and our buildings were, for the most part, unnamed and anonymous. During the author’s three and a half decades here, this was a continuing reality acknowledged by both the faculty and the administration. However, it was accepted, grudgingly. The consensus was that the paucity of endowed funds and buildings was something that we had to live with, understanding Temple’s unique mission as stated by Russell Conwell. Now, Temple University is a multinational corporation. With that metamorphosis, several things have changed. One is the composition, mindset and philosophy of those in the Administration. Simply put, they are not what we used to call “Temple people.” Instead, as with any international corporation, they represent a professional managerial class which is set apart from the faculty, talk primarily to each other and who may view the latter as employees, servants or serfs. As noted by others, they do not remain at Temple University for a long time but instead move onward and upward to higher jobs at other institutions. Our previous Provost, Lisa Staiano-Coico, is a representative example. Although she was a reputable individual, her ties to Temple University were tenuous; she remained here for a few years which was sufficient to provide the credentials for her next move. That being said, we all wish her the best of luck as the President of the City University of New York. *

Another change which has occurred is the implementation of a new management philosophy by the Administration. In the past, the faculty was evaluated for the totality of their efforts in light of the basic Temple University philosophy espoused by Russell Conwell, i.e., teaching, scholarship and service. This is no longer true. Now, the productivity of the faculty as judged by the Administration can be reduced to a single sentence, “How much money did you generate for us this year?” If an individual faculty member received was considered an appropriate sum of extramural funding, that individual was productive. In contrast, if said faculty did not produce such funds, that individual was unproductive.

So, with respect to research funding, in the Faculty Evaluation Matrices established by the Powers That Be, they decided that the minimum requirement for salary generation is 30% of an individual’s pay from an extramural grant (with full indirect costs). Anything below that is deemed as non-productive. Accordingly, if an individual earned by his/her own merit a 4 year NIH grant which provided for 15% of his/her salary each year (with full indirect costs) that individual was deemed unproductive and unworthy (according to their administrative matrix).

As such, this corporate philosophy is no different from that of a sales company who judges their sales force by the number and amount of orders that are written. It is no different than a worker on an assembly line or a seamstress at her sewing machine being judged, respectively, by the number of units or garments that are made. In this comparison, the author means no disrespect to those individuals. His father, an immigrant from Russia, toiled for his entire life, from a young lad of 12 or so (having to leave public school to go to work) in the New York City garment center until his retirement some 50+ years later, successfully providing for himself and for his family. Rather, this comparison is intended to critique the aforementioned corporate philosophy which disregards the purpose of an education. The latter may be embodied in the old saying, “Catch a fish for a person and you feed him for a day. Teach a person how to fish and you feed him for a lifetime.”

As indicated above, the Temple University multinational corporation seeks to judge us by the profit motive of revenue generated. For that reason, the purpose of this article is to apply the same standards to their efforts. How good a job are these corporate officials doing in the generation of extramural funds? How proficient are they in the amount of alumni funds generated, the donors who provide endowments and interested individuals who provide funds of the magnitude necessary to view their names on our facilities, colleges or schools?

As indicated by recent articles in the Philadelphia Inquirer and other local newspapers, it appears that this multinational corporate administration is not doing that well. Over the past year, there have been numerous articles concerning the successful efforts of Drexel, Penn and even Virtua Hospital in South Jersey. Each is a formidable achievement for which the respective corporate administrators should feel a large measure of satisfaction. In contrast, there do not appear to be any such articles about Temple. Where are the donors who have given us such sums? Aren’t their corporate officers as good as their counterparts at Abington Hospital which contains the Zipley Parking Garage? How would our current budgetary situation be different if they were more productive?

In response, it may be argued that this is an invalid argument. Do we not have the Gittis Student Union, the Fox School of Business, the Boyer College of Music, the...
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Campus that was slated to cost $147.4 million is now estimated at $215.6 million. The original plans and estimates at http://www.temple.edu/2020/projects/; the later ones are on the website of Facilities Management at http://www.temple.edu/facilities/current_projects.html.

These estimate increases mean for us educators that the squeeze on resources will continue for even longer than we might have expected. There is, furthermore, nothing to preclude more estimate increases (or cost overruns), especially for the new dormitory whose design, according to the Facilities Management website, is only 50% complete. Nor is there an acknowledged limit to how much more money can be siphoned off from tuition. Temple administrators have obviously concluded that tuition can be raised every year, with little protest from students and virtually none from faculty, and the extra income used not to enhance our underfunded educational programs but to pay for construction. Where else could the construction money come from? Has the State or have donors provided significant funds for these projects? Have we taken on more debt to pay for them?

Only Medical School students were spared tuition increases this year because, according to the “Proposed Budget FY 2012,” presented to the Board of Trustees at its meeting on June 23, “non-resident tuition is the highest of all medical schools in the country and their resident tuition ranks as the twenty-fifth highest, just $306 less expensive than the University of Pennsylvania.”

In other words, the Med School is tapped out. Last month, incidentally, U.S. News published an article that highlighted the sad fact of the Medical School’s distinction of being #1 in non-resident tuition and fees charged: see http://www.usnews.com/education/best-graduate-schools/the-short-list-grad-school/articles/2011/08/30/10-most-expensive-private-medical-schools?scid=related-links:TOP.

Did You Know?

- State budget cuts are likely to result in an effective 60-100 million dollar budget shortfall, as stopgap measures run their course.
- Can the university afford to continue its ambitious building programs? Its expensive sports programs? What will be deemed expendable?
- We are entering a TAUP contract negotiating season this spring.

All this suggests a pressing need to stay tuned, and make faculty voices heard. The turnover in leadership may actually present an opportunity for positive change and for a demonstration that faculty can, indeed, see the big picture. I for one would like to see a conversation about what sacrifices the administration might be willing to make if I took on an extra course every year.

I’m impressed that the administration changed course on, for example, the hiring of a Vice President for branding in 2010 (a very impressive individual who was not retained this year). One might conclude that the criticisms of the implications of such a hire that were voiced by faculty at the time were actually heard. Let’s hope – no, let’s push – for a more extended deliberative process about the changes afoot in 2011-12.

Introducing Your New Ride – Zimride

By Kathleen Grady, Office of Sustainability

Temple faculty can now take advantage of Zimride, Temple’s new online ridesharing software, to help save money on their commute and travel. Zimride is an easy and free way for members of the Temple community members to share seats in their cars or catch rides. With Zimride, Temple faculty can find others in the Temple community who are traveling in the same direction. It can be used for a single ride or for a daily commute. It even includes a feature that allows users to pick how much they want to receive or pay for a ride. Zimride also has the ability for optional Facebook integration. Zimride is exclusive to the Temple community and is only available to those with a temple.edu email address.

Temple’s Office of Sustainability launched Zimride in April 2011, becoming the first university in Philadelphia to offer the program. Temple joined over 60 colleges and universities around the country to offer Zimride. The Office of Sustainability introduced Zimride as a way to fulfill Temple’s Climate Action Plan, which seeks to reduce 30% of its greenhouse gas emissions by 2030. According to the Climate Action Plan, 19% of the University’s greenhouse gas emissions were from transportation. This statistic includes how the Temple community moves to and from campus. Zimride makes it more convenient for the Temple community to share rides and eliminate the use of single occupancy vehicles.

In order for this service to expand, it’s critical for the user base to grow as well. The signup requires nothing but a few minutes of personal information and a credit card number for security. Temple’s Office of Sustainability is offering a discount of 10% off the regular $49.99 fee until September 30, 2011, for Temple faculty and administrators who sign up for Zimride at http://www.zimride.com/temple.

Hyphen Needs Your Help!

Dear Temple Faculty and Administrators,

I am writing this letter as Managing Editor of Hyphen, the undergraduate literary journal. The magazine began twelve years ago as a project created by Professor Jena Osman. Since then, Hyphen has published 363 fiction writers, poets, and visual artists; each new publication our production values have been increasingly greater. This year, three students published in Hyphen were nominated for publication in Bennington College’s plain china, a national undergraduate anthology. If chosen, Hyphen will be featured alongside journals from Stanford, Harvard, Princeton, and numerous others. Recently, Hyphen alongside Drexel University’s literary magazine, Maya, has collaborated with the Mighty Writers in South Philadelphia. Every year, we strive to maintain a high level of content, production values, and community engagement open to all undergraduates.

As a student-run organization, we have relied on the faculty’s support since our first issue published in 2000. This mutual relationship helps sustain the magazine and fosters a thriving literary community on campus. During the last few years, the Student Activity Fund had financed the entire cost of publishing our magazine ($5000). However, due to a miscommunication between last year’s printer and my predecessors, that money is no longer available for the magazine’s use during the 2011-2012 academic year. Please help support Hyphen this year with a financial contribution in order to sustain our work serving both as a creative outlet for undergraduate artistic expression and an organization that helps the Philadelphia community at large. Donations in cash and services can be arranged with me via email: tuc33436@temple.edu. Check donations can be sent to:

HYPHEN
Department of English
Temple University
1114 W. Berks Street
Philadelphia, PA 19122
Best,
Mark Christian Inchoco,
Managing Editor
Going the Distance
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sound like too sizable of a time commitment for busy instructors, but Dr. Kliger insisted that this tutorial is designed to train even the most novice users to learn Blackboard Collaborate. More experienced users would pick up the new software much more quickly.

Blackboard Collaborate (formerly known as Wimba Live Classroom) offers a number of new features that generate a more powerful online “social presence” between distance teachers and students than previously available. With Blackboard Collaborate instructors can use the Screen Share tool to post presentations or review assignments with students in a live setting. Instructors can also capture course sessions on video with the archive tool and create quizzes or polls for students on the spot. Students can also use voice or text tools to ask questions during sessions, and the “whispering” function allows students to ask questions of the instructor privately. Voice authoring and grading also presents new and unique opportunities for students and instructors to work together constructively. With voice tools students can practice their speaking skills while also having better assurance of the intention behind their instructor’s feedback on their assignments by hearing their teacher’s specific vocal intonation. For many teachers voice grading assignments that are video or voice authored by students could take less time than the traditional red pen hand-written style of commenting, and can also uniquely safeguard against dishonesty since the instructor will be able visually to judge the students’ voice and mannerisms. Teachers can also divide course materials, generate discussions, engage smaller groups by placing students into virtual breakout rooms or invite guest speakers to classes more easily through the new online format. Blackboard Collaborate is also accessible through a telephone, in case an instructor is unable to get access to a computer or has internet connectivity problems.

The Virtual Teaching Certificate Program could not have more capable direction. Dr. Dominique Kliger earned her Ph.D. in Communication at Temple University in 2002, but has been a part of the Temple community since she came to Philadelphia in the late 1980’s on a Fullbright Fellowship. She has been active in distance learning research since the early 1990’s. Dr. Kliger first became interested in distance learning after seeing video conferencing make a difference in teenage cancer patients’ lives at the First School of the Future in her native Brazil, where during the 1990’s a pilot program used online tools to help patients offer much needed emotional support and advice to each other remotely. Since then, Dr. Kliger has published extensively about distance learning and her work has earned nearly $400,000 in grants from the United States Department of Education for highlighting the various benefits that distance learning facilitates for students with disabilities.

Distance learning can make a difference for many students and teachers at Temple. Students with disabilities or professional scheduling conflicts that impede them from a brick-and-mortar classroom experience can overcome these difficulties through distance learning. Temple teachers have also earned national merit for innovative distance approaches. The National University Technology Network (NUTN) has honored two Temple faculty members for providing superior synchronous distance learning. Dr. Ruth Farber won the Shirley Davis Award for Excellence from NUTN in 2010 and Dr. Catherine Schiffer received an honorable mention in 2011.

Distance learning has come a long way very quickly at Temple due to generally decreasing hardware costs for students, energetic leadership and a capable nexus of technical support. Recent research on distance learning has also shown that hybrid courses utilizing both traditional classroom and distance methods result in increased student satisfaction. As demand for distance learning approaches is likely to increase in the future, now is the perfect time for teachers to expand their repertoires.

For more information on the Virtual Teaching Certificate Program, visit http://www.temple.edu/oll/events/fac_newsvol6_3611.html ♦

Past Present and Future of RPPC: An Update and Report

by Professor Marina Angel, School of Law, Chair RPPC

Colleagues,

RPPC (the Faculty Senate Research Policies and Programs Committee) is cancelling its Fall 2011 Seed Money Application process. In the Fall of 2010, RPPC asked Dr. Kenneth Blank, Senior Vice President for Research, and Dr. Richard Englert, Interim Provost, to substantially increase our $75,000 per year Seed Money allocation for the entire University. This is the only Seed Money available to all faculty University wide. Seed Money, by definition, is meant to bring more money to Temple University by way of outside grants. RPPC is made up of prominent faculty researchers from throughout the University. Several of our members sit to evaluate multimillion dollar NIH grant requests.

Instead of substantially increasing our $75,000 allocation, Dr. Blank recently notified us that he was reducing it to $60,000.

We were also told in the Fall of 2010 by Dr. Blank that each school or college has its own Seed Money. We were promised a list of such Seed Money by school or college. We have not received it despite numerous requests. It seems that Deans do have research money, but many faculty do not know about it or how it is allocated. It seldom seems to be used as Seed Money. There needs to be transparency.

At the suggestion of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, RPPC is preparing for discussions with the Administration for an increase to $250,000 for this academic year, with additional increases in future years.

Research is one of the four major funding sources for universities, together with tuition, state funding, and donations. Temple is massively deficient in both research and donations. According to the list of the Top 100 Institutions in Federal Dollars for Science, 2009, our peer schools, U of Pitt and Penn State, are 13th and 14th respectively. We do not appear on the list of Top 100.

When we determine how much money we will have to allocate for the 2011-12 academic year, there will be one application process available for faculty. It will conform to our normal Spring Semester deadlines.

2010-11 Report of the RPPC (prepared June 2011)

RPPC is composed of 10 Faculty members, 4 elected by the Faculty Senate and 6 appointed by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee. All are dedicated researchers and teachers from throughout the University, and several participate in deciding multi-million dollar NIH grants.

Originally RPPC was funded at only $50,000. Provost Lisa raised the amount to $75,000. This year we had only $75,000 to distribute university-wide for Seed Money grants which are meant to help researchers further developed materials and pilot studies suitable for submissions to major grant authorities. At the same time Provost Lisa gave us an additional $25,000, she established her own “Faculty” Committee to distribute Seed Money Grants of up to $50,000 per grant. Her grants continued for 2 years. When she left, her $50,000 grants per applicant were discontinued by the current Interim Provost. Some Administrators are supposed to be on RPPC, but they never participate.

RPPC is currently the only university-wide source of Seed Money. This academic year Interim Provost Richard Englert and Senior Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Education Kenneth Blank told me that they were cutting RPPC back to the original $50,000. After discussion, they agreed to continue the $75,000 amount for 2010-2011 only. Given that this is the only source of Seed Money open to the entire University, and that, by definition, it aims to enable researchers to...
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Beasley School of Law and the Kornberg School of Dentistry? Don’t we have a Medical Education and Research Building in which numerous donors are recognized? 

As with the faculty member who provides 15% of his/her salary as compared to the 30% floor and is judged as unproductive, it is only reasonable to evaluate Temple University’s corporate administration by the standard they themselves have set. For all of the name schools cited above, during the author’s thirty plus years here, the School of Dentistry was only recently so named, and, on the Health Sciences Campus, the Schools of Pharmacy and Allied Health remain anonymous. How many such schools on the Main Campus are similarly unnamed? What about Temple Japan or Temple Rome? Further, during those three plus decades, our endowment has remained pitiful and the number of endowed chairs embarrassing.

Table 1: Revenue Based Matrix for the Assessment of Administrative Productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School or Administrative Unit</th>
<th>Alumni Donations from Previous Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Alumni Donations from This Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Increase or Decrease in Alumni Contribution (%)</th>
<th>Number of Donations Between $10,000 and $50,000</th>
<th>Number of Donations Between $50,000 and $100,000</th>
<th>Number of Donations Between $100,000 and $1,000,000</th>
<th>Number of Donations $1,000,000 or Greater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Provost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

may be particularly illuminating especially when we are told how tough things are, how budgets need to be slashed and how faculty and staff need to be reduced.

In response, our corporate administrators may assert that, we, as company employees, have no right to criticize their efforts. They may argue that, in any business, if an employee does not like the corporate philosophy and its method of operation, that individual is free to leave and seek employment elsewhere. That indeed is an appropriate philosophy in a capitalistic society.

With respect to that assertion, let’s consider the following: Temple University, along with the University of Pittsburgh and Penn State, are state-affiliated universities. All three receive quite generous amounts of taxpayer funds (in spite of the reductions this year). Many of our faculty, their family and their friends are citizens and taxpayers of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. If the current economic situation and the continuing concerns about governmental budgets and spending establish anything, it is that all taxpayers, citizens and voters have a fundamental right to question how their money is spent (as with Penn State’s recent request, see below).

As the constituents of a member of the Pennsylvania State Assembly, of the Pennsylvania State Senate and of the Governor of the Commonwealth, they also have the inalienable right to seek redress of grievances. As such, as taxpayers, citizens and voters we outrank the administrative officers of the Temple University corporation.

Penn State seeks more state aid

The author is a Professor of Pharmacology in the Temple University School of Medicine, 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 Emphasis Panel on Cancer Prevention. He resides in the 142nd Pennsylvania General Assembly District and in the 6th Pennsylvania Senate District.

*This article was composed prior to President Hart’s resignation letter. All of us, whatever our differences, wish her and her family well in their personal lives.

**Although significant funds were raised for the Medical Education and Research Building, those funds were accumulated over an 8-10 year interval. Accordingly, the amount of funds raised has to be averaged over that interval. ♦
Bring additional funds into the University, I have taken the position that we should be raised to the level of funding that Provost Lisa was distributing. I had earlier offered to add some administration appointees to RPPC.

RPPC’s full charge is “To develop policy on all matters related to research, and to review and ratify any proposed changes in policy and programs. The committee has responsibility and authority for presenting faculty interest on all matters involving University research policies and activities.”

The University has not consulted with RPPC in at least the past 5 years “on all matters related to research.” At our initiative this year, one of our members, Dennis Silage, a long time Temple professor and successful researcher, was supposed to meet by-weekly with Dr. Blank. In fact, few meetings have occurred. At the start of the 2010-11 Academic Year, Dr. Blank promised to provide us with the amounts the deans of schools and colleges are providing for seed money. To date, we have not received this information. From reviewing 30 to 40 applications per year, we find that deans have subsidized many worthy “seed money” projects, but a substantial number of faculty were given “seed money” by their deans for activity that could not be labeled “seed money” projects. That money could be better allocated University-wide by RPPC. The University Administration does not seem to understand the value of including experienced and successful researchers in policy making on research programs. We hope this will change in the future.

Currently, RPPC’s sole function has been to distribute a total of $75,000 from the Faculty Senate Seed Money Fund (FSSMF) over the course of the academic year. This small amount provides funding to full-time faculty for scholarly and creative research activities and projects. The grants are expected to assist a few faculty members to attract external funding and recognition to Temple.

We thank the eighteen faculty members who submitted proposals to us this Spring Semester. Temple has a wealth of talented and innovative faculty in its schools and colleges. We had to make hard choices, because our funding is so limited. The seven faculty members listed below received six grants, one was a joint inter-disciplinary application. All were unanimously selected by RPPC to receive grant money to further their research efforts. We did not have enough money to fund all worthy applications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title of Project</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Amount Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nora Engel</td>
<td>Insulators vs. Non-Coding RNAs in Regulation of Imprinted Domains</td>
<td>Fels Institute for Cancer Research and Molecular Biology</td>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shidong Li and Seong G. Kong</td>
<td>Thermal Dosimetry Useful for Hypothermia Treatment</td>
<td>Radiation Oncology and Electrical and Computer Engineering</td>
<td>School of Medicine and School of Engineering</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Mullin</td>
<td>Protecting the Nation’s Water Supplies: Mult-level Governance and the Development of Water Infrastructure to Promote Public Health and Environmental Protection</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>$4,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shriram Pillapakkam</td>
<td>Experimental and Computational Modeling of Non-Newtonian Behavior of Blood Flow in the Human Brain</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>School of Engineering</td>
<td>$6,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan B. Singer</td>
<td>Parents’ Experience Seeking Help for Suicidal Youth: A Qualitative Study</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>College of Health Professionals and Social Work</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho-Lun Wong</td>
<td>Novel Nanostructured Carrier for Extended siRNA-based Cancer Therapy</td>
<td>Pharmaceutical Sciences</td>
<td>School of Pharmacy</td>
<td>$5,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Needed for Presidential Search Committee

By Committee on Administrative and Trustee Appointments

CATA (Committee on Administrative and Trustee Appointments) is the Faculty Senate Committee charged with identifying faculty members willing to serve on administrative search committees and recommending candidates to the FSSC. An advisory committee will soon be appointed to assist the Board of Trustees in selecting the next President of the University, and CATA has been asked to identify potential faculty members to serve on this advisory committee.

If you are interested in serving on this search committee for the next Temple University President, please indicate this by sending your CV to senate2@temple.edu before the close of business on Monday, October 18th. It would help our deliberations if you could explain in a paragraph or so why you have an interest in serving on this committee and what value you would bring to the process.

I regret the short notice, but hope that you recognize the importance of having faculty participation in an appointment that is of such vital importance to the faculty and that you will consider volunteering to serve on the search committee.

Thank You,
For CATA, Frank L. Friedman
A Message from Paul LaFollette

Dear Colleagues,

I met last week with Patrick O'Connor, chairman of Temple's Board of Trustees, to discuss with him the process that the Board would use to search for a new President. I was joined by Jane Evans, who was President of the Faculty Senate during the previous presidential search, and who was a member of the search committee at that time.

The Board has the final responsibility for selecting the President of the University, and for establishing the process by which this person will be selected. They will soon be forming a search committee which will consist of a selection of board members, two or three faculty, and a student. The Board will make the final selections of the student, and of the faculty members after hearing the advice of the senate's Committee on Academic and Trustee Appointments (CATA) and of the Senate.

Based on our discussion, I anticipate a broadly based search which will look at candidates with a wide range of backgrounds from both inside and outside of academia in an attempt to identify the best possible leader for Temple University. It will be important that the faculty members present be well prepared to assist the committee in understanding the significance of such matters as academic freedom and academic integrity to the proper functioning of a major university dedicated to scholarly and educational activities. When you receive CATA's request for names, please respond both quickly and thoughtfully.

Faculty Involvement in the Presidential Search Process
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Based on our discussion, I anticipate a broadly based search which will look at candidates with a wide range of backgrounds from both inside and outside of academia in an attempt to identify the best possible leader for Temple University. It will be important that the faculty members present be well prepared to assist the committee in understanding the significance of such matters as academic freedom and academic integrity to the proper functioning of a major university dedicated to scholarly and educational activities. When you receive CATA's request for names, please respond both quickly and thoughtfully.

Senate Committee Vacancies: Updated October 10, 2011

Elected Committees

Educational Programs and Policies Committee (EPPC): 3 Vacancies
At least six schools/colleges must be represented on committee. New members may not be from College of Science/Technology, or College of Liberal Arts. Remaining 3 vacancies can be filled from any other school/college.
http://www.temple.edu/senate/committees/EducationalProgramsandPolicies.htm

Committee for International Programs: 2 Vacancies
http://www.temple.edu/senate/committees/CommitteeforInternationalPrograms.htm

Committee on the Status of Women: 7 Vacancies
http://www.temple.edu/senate/committees/StatusofWomen.htm

Faculty Herald Editorial Board: 1 Vacancy (to fill a one-year term)
http://www.temple.edu/senate/committees/FacultySenateEditorialBoard.htm

Lectures and Forums Committee: 4 Vacancies
http://www.temple.edu/senate/committees/LecturesandForumsCommittee.htm

Library Committee: 5 Vacancies
http://www.temple.edu/senate/committees/LibraryCommittee.htm

University Press Board of Review: 3 Vacancies
http://www.temple.edu/senate/committees/UniversityPressBoardofReview.htm

Appointed Committees

Bargaining Units Liaison Committee: 1 Vacancy
http://www.temple.edu/senate/committees/BargainingUnitsliaisonCommittee.htm

Library Committee: 5 Vacancies
http://www.temple.edu/senate/committees/LibraryCommittee.htm

University Press Board of Review: 3 Vacancies
http://www.temple.edu/senate/committees/UniversityPressBoardofReview.htm

For information about Committee Vacancies, contact Joan Shapiro at joan.shapiro@temple.edu or the Faculty Senate at senate2@temple.edu

Below the table,
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Below the table,
Letter to the Editor: Temple’s Secret Tax on Tuition (June 2, 2011)

By Philip Yannella, CLA and Marina Angel, Beasley School of Law

Dear Editor,

Like many other faculty, we have wondered where Temple’s Administration was getting the more than $300 million to fund a number of major construction projects while it claims that it is facing serious financial shortfalls which it proposes to address by tuition hikes, faculty hiring freezes, increased class sizes, and the like. The construction projects, which can be viewed at http://www.temple.edu/2020/projects/, are part of President Hart’s vision in her “Temple 20/20” plan.

One project, a 20,000 square foot fitness center for which a cost is not listed, has already been completed. A second project is a $48 million, 140,000 square foot addition to Pearson and McGonigle Halls that is intended “to provide new retail on Broad Street, and enhanced campus recreation facilities.” A third is a $147 million “Residence, Dining, and Retail Complex”; its size is not indicated on the website, but it will be very, very large. The total cost of these three projects is more than $200 million.

Two much-needed academic buildings are among the projects: a $10 million, 45,000 square foot building for the Department of Architecture and a $100 million science and research center of undetermined size (it is in the design stage). These two buildings, it is said, are to be entirely funded by the State of Pennsylvania.

In an interview in the May 27 issue of the Temple Times, Anthony E. Wagner, President Hart’s Executive Vice President, Chief Financial Officer, and Treasurer, said that there are “four pots of money” available for the “Temple 20/20” construction projects: 1) an annual capital appropriation from the state, an appropriation distinct from the state’s appropriation for our educational efforts (this is the money for the academic buildings); 2) gifts from donors; 3) bond sales to investors; and 4) money, or “reserves” in the language of accounting, which comes from “our operating margin, which is in the 3-4 percent range.”

The first three “pots of money” are entirely conventional. The fourth “pot of money,” the money from the operating “margin” (as in “profit margin”) is an entirely unconventional source. We have never heard it referred to at Temple prior to Mr. Wagner’s interview, nor have we heard of it as a part of construction funding at other universities.

Temple’s operating budget was about $836 million in 2010-11. $186 million of that $836 million came from Temple’s state appropriation to support the education of our students and $602.8 million came from the tuition and fees paid directly by those students. When Mr. Wagner said that the fourth “pot of money” was in the “3-4 percent range,” he was saying that the Administration took $25-33 million out of the University’s educational budget to help pay for its “Temple 20/20” plan.

How can our Administrators justify using the tuition money paid by students and the taxpayers supporting those students for construction projects that have, at best, a tenuous relationship to education? We do not believe they can.

Tuition is universally defined as “the charge or fee for instruction.” What is it called when tuition is used as a “pot of money” to fund projects that have little, if anything, to do with the instruction of the pupils? It could be called, we think, an illicit, secret tax levied on students and taxpayers without their knowledge or consent. It is a tax that apparently recurs and will, Mr. Wagner promises, continue to recur annually.

We suppose that the Administrators who levy the tax on tuition understand that the best thing about their fourth “pot of money” is that it need not be in the “3-4 percent range” but could be any percentage of the operating budget that they wish to be. That is so both because there is no oversight, no rules on how much the educational mission of the University can be shorted, and also because the tax, or “margin,” as Mr. Wagner calls it, is not an item in the University’s detailed operating budget, or any of its annual financial reports, or its IRS tax return, but is, rather, under the table. Even if the state or donors or the bond market are unable to provide the construction money, it must seem to our Administrators that there will always be that golden pot of tuition money to dip into.

A month ago, “On the Budget, Part II” was published in the Faculty Herald. It raised questions about how undergraduate tuition money was used by the Administration, noting that about one-quarter of it went for instruction and asking how the rest was spent. It answered, “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.” Now, as the result of Mr. Wagner’s interview, we have learned that a considerable amount of it is also going to help construct the Hart Administration’s vision of a brave new Temple.

Americans have become increasingly aware of the failures of higher education because in recent months and years there have been a number of books and articles documenting those failures. It is no longer news that many, many students graduate (or drop out) with high amounts of debt, that in many instances the college experience has not added much to their knowledge, that many are ill-prepared for careers in anything remotely like their majors. It is no longer news that the cost of a college education has been driven up by frills like campus recreation centers and retail shops (such as the “Temple 20/20” plan envisions), huge salaries for coaches and administrators, beautification projects, and whatnot.

Temple students, as the last few issues of the Temple News indicate, are quite aware of Temple’s basic problems. An article on April 19 complained about the Administration’s secretiveness on its uses of tuition and remarked on how Temple has shifted from aspiring to be “Harvard on the Delaware” to becoming the “profit-loss-oriented bureaucratic machine it is today” (p.5). Other articles in that same issue looked at the use of tuition money to subsidize athletics. In an article on April 26, reporter Joel Faltermayer raised the rhetorical question, “After all, what’s more important: making the campus appear hip and edgy to the parents of prospective students, or providing an education that’s not founded upon disgruntled instructors and consumer aesthetics?” The article also remarked on how another tuition increase would further reduce the chances of minority students to get a Temple education (pp. 5-6). Reading through these issues of the News, we get the clear understanding that the writers are very angry not at the Governor or Legislature because of their budget proposals but at Temple’s Administrators because of their upside-down priorities.

We have thought long and hard about what to do at this juncture, and we would like to make three simple proposals:

1) The Administration should immediately print in the Temple Times a year-by-year list indicating exactly how much money has been removed from the operating budget by the Hart Administration for construction.

2) To immediately move us in the right direction, toward properly educating our current and future students, the Administration should immediately unfreeze instructional and research hiring. That is, the money taken out of the operating budget for the Hart Administration construction plan should be put back in for academics.

3) If the Administration decides to raise the tuition of our students, it should give them an itemized accounting of how much of their 2011-12 tuition will be utilized to pay for the Hart construction plan. In addition, because so many serious questions have been raised in recent months about Temple’s priorities, it should also inform students about how much of their tuition money will be spent to pay the salaries of administrators, to subsidize athletics, and to pay for other non-instructional items.

Letters to the Editor continued on page 9
Dear Editor:

In early June, Professor Marina Angel and I published our letter on “Temple’s Secret Tax on Tuition” in the Faculty Herald. A few days later, I had a long, detailed, informative conversation with a colleague who I have long admired and respected because of his knowledge of the University. My colleague thought that Marina and I had gotten it right about Temple’s use of tuition and taxpayer money for construction projects. But he thought that our analysis was incomplete and that, more importantly, we did not convey some basic facts about Temple’s finances.

As Marina and I wrote, Vice President and CFO Anthony E. Wagner recently claimed that Temple was financing its construction projects with four “pots of money”: an “annual” capital appropriation from the state, gifts from donors, bond sales to investors, and money from an “operating margin” (i.e., the money “saved” from instruction, what we called the “secret tax” on tuition). To our comments about these money sources, my colleague correctly added the following:

- State capital funds are not and never have been automatically appropriated annually, nor are they easy to get because they must first be appropriated by the Legislature and then, second, released by the Governor; moreover, in hard times, with a fiscally conservative new Governor, it is not at all clear that there will be significant State investments in college campus buildings.

- After our conversation, I looked at State forecasts of its capital expenditures, discovering that even in the last years of the Rendell Administration the forecast was not expansive for education or for other purposes (see p. 843 of the “Governor’s Executive Budget 2010-2011” at http://www.post-gazette.com/downloads/20100209rendellbudget2010-11.pdf).

- No recent Temple construction project came close to meeting its budgeted goals for donations and, consequently, operating funds (largely derived from tuition revenues) had to be used to make up the difference between projected and real donations.

After our conversation, I looked at the information on recent donations contained in the financial statement of President Hart’s “Report from the President Fiscal Year 2010,” which is on p. 22 of http://www.temple.edu/president/documents/TU-AR-RS-v2-FINAL.pdf. For a university the size of Temple, the figures are not impressive: there was $33 million donated in 2005, $49 million in 2006, $62 million in 2007, $65 million in 2008, $45 million in 2009, and $52 million in 2010. I would gather that very little of this money was given for construction.

The 2010 President’s “Report,” incidentally, also indicates how poorly Temple’s $244 million endowment compares to the endowments of her “selected peer” institutions (the University of Pittsburgh has $1.8 billion, Penn State has $892 million, Boston University has $892 million, SUNY Buffalo has $408 million, and so forth).

- Funding construction through the sale of bonds to investors will increase Temple’s debt and the principal and interest have to be paid back annually to those investors.

Temple’s long term debt, I later discovered, was $718 million in 2009 and increased by $129 million to $847.7 million in 2010. The amount of long term debt grew by 23% since 2005, when it was $603.4 million.

Like Marina and me, my colleague was, then, profoundly concerned about Temple’s construction plans. He was also profoundly concerned about the huge losses being sustained by the Temple University Health System. He pointed out that in 2010 the System lost some $69.5 million; its “patient care activities” generated $1.08 billion in revenues against $1.15 billion in expenses. Those figures are on p. 3 of Temple’s most recent audited financial statement at http://www.temple.edu/controller/treasurer/reports/Fiscal2010.pdf.

The long term debt statement I mentioned above is on p. 2. Temple University and the Temple University Health System are separate entities, but the audited financial statement consolidates the finances of the two and thereby allows us to see the whole picture. I later studied the audited financial statements for each year from 2006-09 (each can be accessed on the Temple website – go to “About Temple,” then “Public Information,” then “Budgetary and Financial,” then “C”). In each year, the Health System’s “patient care activities” ran a deficit: $89.8 million in 2009, $74.8 million in 2008, $12.9 million in 2007, and $54.7 in 2006. The total loss from 2006 and 2010 adds up to $301.7. That huge amount of money is about as large as Temple plans to spend on its current construction projects.

How long can Temple continue to run huge Health System losses? Does the Health System have reserves that can cover such losses? What happens when the Health System can no longer cover its deficits through its own reserves? Barring a government bailout (how likely is that?), will the University step in and cover them through University funds? Will the Health System go into bankruptcy? Each of those scenarios is scary.

I work on the Main Campus. The financial well-being of the Health System is not my everyday concern. Rather, like many faculty members and administrators, my everyday professional life is impacted by the financial well-being of the University’s educational enterprise, especially its undergraduate enterprise. Like everyone else, virtually every year I receive the messages from my Dean, who receives them from the Provost, that we are once again broke, that we need to cut back more, that there will be freezes on this or that, larger class sizes, pared course offerings, and whatnot. I think I have been disciplined to regard our educational enterprise as threatened, as very tenuous, as teetering on the brink of disaster.

But, in actuality, Temple has had and continues to have plenty of money. Exactly how much is not a matter of dispute. For even after its huge Health System annual deficits are taken into account, and even after its average annual $13 million “Auxiliary Enterprise” deficits are taken into account, Temple still reports that there are large operating surpluses. Those surpluses – they are titled “Excess/(deficit) of revenues over expenses” – are reported on p. 3 of the audited financial statements. In 2010, the surplus was $61.2 million, in 2008 it was $49.2 million, in 2007 it was $98.4 million, and in 2006 it was $31.6 million. There was one year, 2009, in which there was a deficit of $14.1. The total surplus from 2006 through 2010 was $226.3 million, an average of $45.2 million per year. This is the money, paid as tuition, as the “charge or fee for instruction,” that Temple takes as a “pot of money” to pay for its construction projects (and perhaps a few other things, too). Readers can use their own imaginations to picture the enhanced undergraduate academic programs we could produce with an extra $45 million each year.

Let me summarize what Temple’s own reports show. It has a Health Care System that runs huge deficits. It is poorly endowed. It gets relatively meager annual donations. It annually loses a lot of money on its Auxiliary Enterprises. It takes $45 million out of the operating budget each year, money largely paid by undergraduates as tuition, uses it for construction projects, and, as a result, it constantly squeezes its colleges and departments.
For a state related institution, for many years, it has had very high tuition rates.

What rational steps would such an institution take in the summer of 2011, when the nation faces hard times and many economic uncertainties? Many rational institutions such as Harvard have in the past three years shelved construction plans. In March, upon learning of the enormous cuts to higher education being proposed by Governor Corbett, Penn State’s trustees immediately froze $138.5 million in construction. Across the country, rational institutions have tried hard to minimize tuition increases: an article in the July 10 Chronicle of Higher Education, titled “Few Finance Chiefs Are Optimistic in Face of Slow Recovery,” reported that two-thirds of CEOs said that their institutions would raise tuition by 3% to 6% this year, while 21% said the increase would be more than 7%

This past week, we learned that Temple’s state appropriation for this year will be cut by 19%, a large number but dramatically less than the 50% cut that was proposed by Governor Corbett in March. Last year, the state appropriation was $186 million, so the 19% cut amounts to about $35 million. Temple has announced that, in response to the appropriation loss, it will cut its operating budget by $36 million, mostly by “reducing administrative expenses.” But it also announced that it will raise undergraduate tuition by 9.9% for state residents and by 5.4% for out-of-state students. Those increases place it among the institutions with the highest tuition increases in the nation. I assume, of course, that none of those other institutions have operating surpluses, deficit-producing Health Systems, or plans for major construction during this bad economy.

By my calculation, the undergraduate tuition to be paid in 2011-12 should be about $32 million more than was paid last year. My calculation assumes that, excluding Temple Japan, there will continue to be 27,197 fulltime equivalent students and that 73% will be state residents (those were the September 2010 numbers). The arithmetic is simple: 19,853 state resident students will each pay $1172 more, which multiplies to $23.3 million, while 7344 nonresidents will each pay $1170 more, which multiplies to $8.6 million. The total, then, is about $32 million. As readers will notice, the tuition increase essentially wipes out the state appropriation cut. Regarding the promised “reduced administrative expenses,” I propose that we all adopt President Reagan’s “trust and verify” approach.

Will that $32 million in new tuition revenue be used for the instruction of undergraduates? No, I do not believe so. I expect that, as in prior years, the increased revenue will be used to subsidize Temple’s construction projects and, perhaps, a few other things.

Sincerely,
Philip R. Yannella

A Letter to the Editor (July 12, 2011)
By Mark Rahdert, Beasley School of Law

Dear Editor:

I have read with great interest and some concern the very careful analyses that Philip Yannella and Marina Angel have provided regarding the funding of Temple’s 2020 construction program. I believe they make a very strong case for the view (contrary to assurances the administration has given in the past) that (1) operating budget funds are in fact being used (in fairly substantial amounts) to fund the university’s building program, and (2) those funds are being paid through program cutbacks and student tuition increases. I believe that the time has come for the university administration to respond in detail to Professor Yannella’s and Angel’s analysis.

I believe there is widespread support among the faculty for the general thrust of the 2020 plan. There are many places where Temple needs new facilities. Many of us share the feeling that to be a truly dynamic institution we need to be constantly careful it could also see a lot of red ink, spiraling tuition, an accompanying loss of student economic diversity, and declining academic programs.

Our support for an ambitious building program should depend on how much it costs and how those costs will be paid. We cannot afford decades of crushing debt that cut into our resources for instruction, and our students cannot afford years of mounting tuition and student loan debt. We already have several construction projects under way, and I assume there is no real way to cut back on those existing commitments. But before any other projects in the 2020 plan are undertaken, I believe we need a frank – and more fully informed – conversation among faculty, students, administration, and trustees about the likely present and future budgetary and tuition implications of our building program.

Mark Rahdert
James E. Beasley School of Law

Dear Editor:

I read with great interest and some concern the very careful analyses that Philip Yannella and Marina Angel have provided regarding the funding of Temple’s 2020 construction program. I believe they make a very strong case for the view (contrary to assurances the administration has given in the past) that (1) operating budget funds are in fact being used (in fairly substantial amounts) to fund the university’s building program, and (2) those funds are being paid through program cutbacks and student tuition increases. I believe that the time has come for the university administration to respond in detail to Professor Yannella’s and Angel’s analysis.

I believe there is widespread support among the faculty for the general thrust of the 2020 plan. There are many places where Temple needs new facilities. Many of us share the feeling that to be a truly dynamic institution we need to be constantly careful it could also see a lot of red ink, spiraling tuition, an accompanying loss of student economic diversity, and declining academic programs.

Our support for an ambitious building program should depend on how much it costs and how those costs will be paid. We cannot afford decades of crushing debt that cut into our resources for instruction, and our students cannot afford years of mounting tuition and student loan debt. We already have several construction projects under way, and I assume there is no real way to cut back on those existing commitments. But before any other projects in the 2020 plan are undertaken, I believe we need a frank – and more fully informed – conversation among faculty, students, administration, and trustees about the likely present and future budgetary and tuition implications of our building program.

Mark Rahdert
James E. Beasley School of Law

Construction on Pearson Hall, July 2010
Representative Faculty Senate Minutes, March 16, 2011

Representative Senate Meeting
March 16, 2011
Minutes

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

2. Approval of Minutes:
The minutes of February 15th were approved as written.

3. Vice-President Joan Shapiro (presiding in President LaFollette’s absence) called the meeting to order and gave the Vice-President’s Report.

Vice President Shapiro requested that if faculty members are no longer on committees, please send the update to the Faculty Senate. She also asked that the updated charges of the committees be sent to her. It is important to have current information on file.

Candidates are still needed for the EPPC, the Personnel Committee, the Sabbatical Committee, the Budget Review Committee and other various committees. All of this information is available on the Faculty Senate website. VP Shapiro made passionate plea to faculty members to participate on committees. She emphasized that the faculty voice is very important, and particularly during these challenging times.

Vice President Shapiro then called on Senator Michael Jackson to give the Nominating Committee Report. As of this time, there are two candidates for the position of Faculty Senate President: Paul LaFollette and Marina Angel. Vice President Shapiro is the unopposed candidate for Vice President and Roberta Sloan is the unopposed candidate for Secretary. Senator Jackson mentioned that faculty members can still self-nominate through a petition process as explained on the Faculty Senate website.

4. President’s Report – Paul LaFollette

President LaFollette stated that he feels the principal concern of the university at this time is the budget situation. President Hart, Vice President and Provost Englert and Vice-President for Budget Tony Wagner are all in Harrisburg today speaking with the legislature.

President LaFollette shared the current activities of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, which include working on the university bylaws revision and planning the 2nd FSSC/Dean’s retreat. The Committee on Administrative and Trustee Appointments (CATA) has been asked to provide nominees for two committees; the search committee for the new Provost, and the search committee for the new Dean of Libraries.

The FSSC is also bringing the constitution and bylaws of the Faculty Senate up to date. President LaFollette pointed out some of the new proposals contained within the new Faculty Senate bylaws update and also mentioned that in some cases the revisions were simply to clarify the language. He will be sending out the proposed revisions to Faculty Senators across the university. One of the goals of the revisions is to make certain that the actions of the FSSC and the Faculty Senate conform to the bylaws.

Both April and May Faculty Senate Meetings will be University Senate Meetings rather than Representative Faculty Senate Meetings. This will allow the faculty members to vote on the new revision to the Faculty Senate Constitution. It is hoped that the revised university bylaws will be ready to be reviewed before the end of the year, and then voted upon electronically. In this way, both will be implemented by fall, 2011. President LaFollette hopes that as many faculty as possible will come and participate at the April and May University Faculty Senate Meetings.

Professor Marina Angel (Law) stated that she hoped that the amendment to the Faculty Senate constitution and bylaws will be sent via email to all senators. President LaFollette responded that he intends to do so.

President LaFollette then turned the meeting over to Vice-President Shapiro to preside since President LaFollette needed to be elsewhere.

5. Guest: Professor Leroy Dubeck, Chair of the Faculty Senate Budget Review Committee.

VP Shapiro introduced Professor Leroy Dubeck, chair of the Faculty Senate Budget Review Committee. He extolled his many accomplishments. Professor Dubeck gave a presentation and shared information and his view regarding the 2011-2012 budget at Temple University.

Some of his remarks included: Pennsylvania, unlike the federal government, has to operate on a balanced budget. Last Tuesday, the governor announced his proposal for the next year’s budget. The total decrease from the year before is $450 million, including the decrease that is due to the end of stimulus funding.

During 2010-2011, Temple had three appropriation lines; Stimulus money expended for non-recurring expenses, funding from the budget for higher education, and money which went to the Health Sciences Center through public welfare funding that came through the Medical School. This last funding source came from the Federal Government. This coming year, there will be no stimulus money and no federal funding for public welfare. Combining those losses with the reduced funding that the governor has proposed will mean that Temple University will have a $104 million dollar reduction in funds. That is if the governor’s budget prevails. There can be secondary impacts as well. For instance eliminating funding for teachers to pursue advanced degrees will, no doubt, impact the enrollment in the College of Education.

Professor Dubeck further explained that the Temple University Health System budget is inexorably intertwined with the main campus budget and that significant cuts in Medicaid will also have a negative impact on the 2011-2012 budget. He further explained how last year Temple’s Budget was better than expected because one outgoing senator was convinced to change his vote at the eleventh hour.

Professor Dubeck said that there is a possibility that if Shale Drilling is taxed, Temple will get more funding. Shale drilling taxes could garner 200-500 million dollars per year. However, even if this happens, there will be many requests for portions of this potential funding. He also mentioned that higher education was not the only entity to suffer from the governor’s budget proposal, but probably Education has been the hardest. Now that we know the worst case scenario, the important thing is to do everything possible to strive for the cut to be reduced.

The Huron Group has been brought in to examine the implementation of possible efficiencies. Professor Dubeck and other selected faculty members will be meeting with them soon.

Professor Marina Angel (law) stated that under former President Peter Liacouras, the budgets of the Health Sciences Center and the Temple University were separated in order to make certain that losses from the Health Sciences Center did not bankrupt the university. She wonders why they are now combined and stated that she believes the combination of the two positions of Dean of the Medical School and Executive Director of the Health Sciences Center was a very bad move. She said that she would like to know why this was done.

Professor Angel continued and said that she is not convinced that the university is in such bad financial shape. She pointed out the surprising fact that two days after the governor’s budget announcement, the university administration announced that it had hired a new Vice-President in charge of university architecture. She mentioned that this will entail not only the salary...
and benefits for a position which she believes is questionably needed, but also the costs for the new VP’s assistants, staff and office suite. Her question was how the university could make such a move if it is in such bad financial shape as has been reported.

Professor Dubeck said that the funding for the new Science Building has been approved, but money for the building of a new library and the renovation of Paley Library into classrooms, has not been approved.

Professor Art Hochner (Business and Management) said that the university must plan for the worst case scenario and a variety of slightly better scenarios. He stated that since there will be a reduction in funding; the university has the choice to raise tuition or take other measures. He emphasized his belief that the primary functions of the university are teaching and research. He called this a “labor intensive” enterprise, in that a large portion of the budget is spent on salaries. He said that he hoped that choices to be made will not hurt our students and make it more difficult for faculty to do their jobs. He also mentioned that it is important that faculty and students have the support of staff in order to do our jobs well. He said that faculty service is totally taken for granted. Professor Hochner further said that he believed there should be a special task force to examine budget priorities and made recommendations and that this task force should be composed of members of the Faculty Senate, TAUP and the Faculty Senate Budget Review Committee. He said that there should be more transparency and joint decision making in planning for the various possible scenarios. He believes that there should be shared decision-making regarding the 2011-2012 budget.

Professor Hochner continued and said that it looks as if student numbers will go up slightly or remain level. He said some options are to have a hiring freeze, offer buyouts, and to invoke involuntary layoffs. He said he felt that it is very important to have union representation when making these decisions.

Professor Stephanie Knopp (Art) said that it is important that we do all we can to Harrisburg and that we should educate our students about the budget situation so that they can do the same.

It was asked, “When is the faculty voice going to be heard?” It was mentioned that the Administration has mandatory costs, and that next year these include an increase of 28 million dollars in salaries and benefits. There would need to be a 5% tuition increase to cover these costs. It was mentioned that the budget problem can not be solved just by raising tuition.

**Vice President Shapiro continued the meeting leading the ensuing discussion:**

Professor Art Hochner (Business and Management) moved that the Faculty Senate, Faculty Senate Budget Review Committee and TAUP should work with the administration to create a representative task force to deal with the budget crisis facing us. The motion was seconded and then passed unanimously.

Vice President Shapiro suggested putting the students in the center of the discussion. She asked “When should the faculty voice be heard?” Professor Dubeck responded that he feels the faculty voice should be heard now. We will not know about the budget soon. It is unlikely that it will be passed before the end of May, and it may be as late as June 30th or after, however, planning must take place now. VP Shapiro mentioned that alumni, students, and parents, as well as faculty can have a significant impact. This is the time to speak loud enough in a voice that can reach people. She asked “How can the faculty as part of the Temple family best help with the budget issues we face?”

Professor Trish Jones (Education) suggested that through the Development officers and our collegial assemblies, we might be able to reach alumni and donors who could assist with a willingness to become involved.

Professor Joe Schwartz (CLA) asked “Who’s going to lead the organizing of these initiatives? He said that he thinks that Ken Lawrence is doing a good job but the most important thing is to contact the legislators who will be the decision-makers. He stated that contact from constituencies is the most effective way of organizing. This can happen all across the state. He said that it is important to target those senators who need to change their voting patterns and be more pro education.

Senator Frank Friedman (Business and Management) shared that the first Faculty Symposium featuring keynote speaker Mary Burgan will take place from 2:30-4:30 in Kiva Auditorium on April 7th. He hopes that the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Herald will be able to sponsor a symposium every semester. There will be a faculty and student panel following Dr. Burgin’s presentation.

VP Shapiro suggested using the Faculty Senate Listserv for discussions on these topics. She mentioned that she felt that our public relations effort should be stronger. For instance, how many people know that Temple University is the sixth largest provider of professional education in the United States? This is one example of an important statistic that will help our case. She said that there is enormous expertise on campus in PR that the university is not using to “get the word out.” She concluded that the public should know what we do now and what we have done in the past.

Professor Art Hochner (Business and Management) suggested that information should come from people on the front line. He said that the impact this budget cut has on students should be emphasized. He suggested that people write letters to the editor of newspapers and also make use of the op Ed pages in various publications. He said that contacting newspaper columnists would also be a good idea. He further suggested that we encourage our students to become spokespeople.

VP Shapiro concluded the meeting by mentioning that the effort should be student focused and that she is certain that many of us can eloquently state our case.

**6. Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:03 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Roberta Sloan, Ph.D.
Faculty Senate Secretary
Representative Faculty Senate Minutes, Sep. 12, 2011

Representative Senate Meeting
September 12, 2011
Minutes

1. Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 1:48 pm.

2. Introduction of President Ann Weaver Hart
President Hart thanked faculty for their support and expressed a desire to share a lot of news; at the top of the list was the announcement of her decision to resign her position as president effective in June, 2012.

President Hart indicated there were several reasons for her decision but that her choice of timing of the announcement was critical to assure the University sufficient time to conduct a thorough, national search for highly qualified candidates. She wanted to assure sufficient forces required for the recruitment and selection process to move forward systematically and thoughtfully, with the support of the Board of Trustees and an outside search firm, so that the best outcome for the University could be achieved.

Another issue was the implication of the President’s resignation on the planned Provost search; the President feels that this should be suspended for several reasons:

- It would detract from the search for a president
- The process would impact the decision-making process of any of the presidential candidates.
- A new president will want to develop their own academic plan and this has a direct impact on the Provost’s role. For these reasons the President is recommending a suspension of the search for a Provost until next year.

The President acknowledged this is a critical time for Higher Education; there is continuing uncertainty regarding (State) funding which could have a negative impact on the Presidential search process but which highlights the need for faculty involvement in the selection process. Under these stresses, the core values of the University must be the focus the search process.

The Provost was invited to share news about University Achievements; Provost Richard Englert made the following announcements:

- He invited faculty to celebrate the start of a new academic year and acknowledged that it wasn’t necessary to “welcome” everyone back as most people continued to work over the summer.
- The University welcomed 4,300 incoming freshman and 2,700 transfer students this fall; a total of 7,000 new students.
- The University wrapped up a successful series of Welcome Week Activities for students supported by the efforts of various colleges, schools and departments; these activities set a good tone for the start of the academic year.
- The University welcomed over 100 new full time faculty (51 of whom are Tenure track).
- The University announced 67 new Tenure Track Faculty lines (in addition to any Medical School Lines) and credited the prudent steps of the budgeting process for support of these new lines.
- The University hosted the Third Annual Graduate Research Fellows Symposium; special thanks to Zeb Kendrick and Jackie Tanaka for their contributions on putting this program together.
- Four Schools/Colleges (Law, Engineering, Nursing, and Psych) are undergoing reaccreditation reviews this year.
- Temple University Students continue to be the recipients of prestigious awards; several students have been designated American Heart Association Fellows and two (or three) students were Fulbright Award recipients. These awards reflect successful faculty mentorship; the Provost wanted to thank Faculty for helping TU students achieve these marks of Excellence.
- The College of Engineering has been designated as a MESA (Mathematics Engineering Science Achievement) program; one of only ten schools nationally to receive this recognition. The program reflects the success of the College of Engineering’s collaboration with Business, Government, and Industry.
- The Beasley Law School has been named as one of the BEST LAW SCHOOLS in the Nation based on Placement.
- The Provost listed specific faculty who have recently achieved national recognition:
  - Larry Steinberg (PSYCH) who received a Mac Arthur Foundation Award.
  - Elisabeth Subrin (SCT: Film & Media) whose work was one of eight artists showcased in a 9-11 tribute.
  - Richard Immerman (CLA:History) who’s work was featured on a recent edition of PBS’s FRONTLINE.
  - Jan Ting (LAW) was featured on a recent CNN special about 9-11

The Provost reminded faculty that Lindback Awards Packages are due 12/08/2011; questions should be directed to Diane Maleson (maleson@temple.edu).

The Provost thanked faculty for their collaboration; “unprecedented levels of collaboration accompanied the budgeting, search, and re-structuring discussions”. He noted that collaboration with the Faculty Senate Steering Committee over the summer resulted in five key questions on the restructuring process which will be addressed in a future meeting with the Senate Steering Committee.

President Hart has also been asked to serve on a panel to discuss “Full Cost of Attendance” for student athletes; she invited faculty to follow along with this discussion.

QUESTIONS:
Q – Jeffrey Solow (Boyer) asked about the status of the Suspended Dean Searches
A – Provost Englert indicated there are two issues impacting the Dean Searches; money (funding) as well as any impact from restructuring but noted that each candidate had been contacted about the suspension and they agreed that more certainty would be helpful to the process.
A – President Hart indicated she was meeting with the Faculty Senate Steering Committee on 9/13 and would discuss this with the committee.

Arthur Hochner (FSBM) thanked the President for her Service to the University.

Q – Professor Hochner asked about the mix of In-State and Out-of-State students and if this had changed. Specifically, the question was posed “did tuition rate increases change the proportion”?
A – The Provost responded that compared with last year, the number of in-state students are up slightly and the number of out-of-state students is down BUT that there needs to be an appropriate mix of both.

Q – Professor Hochner asked about transfers and if the number reported (2,700) was up or down over last year.

A – The Provost acknowledged the transfer number is only slightly off the 2010 numbers (about 2,800) but that his office (William Black) is looking at this data and will be able to report more on this later.
A – The President recognized the need for the market trend data to help direct recruitment activities and offered to report this data back to the Faculty Senate once the fall shakeout has concluded.

Overall, the University is pleased to see enrollment rates hold relatively steady while the demographic pool of students is shrinking. The President acknowledged the importance of scholarships in attracting students; the University recently announced program which is offering over 250 scholarships to students who live in the neighborhood surrounding Temple University.
4. President Paul LaFollette’s Report

The President began with a recap of the accomplishments from last year:

- Changes were made to the Senate By-Laws and Constitution
- Faculty Senate now includes a Senator from the Library (one representative in the audience self-identified and was applauded)
- The Steering Committee, along with the Office of the President, conducted a survey of GLBT Climate at Temple University (report pending)
- The Senate began discussion on relevant content of by-laws for the collegial assemblies of the Schools and Colleges at Temple University
- There is a need to revitalize Faculty Governance at the school, college and University levels. Faculty, and the Faculty Senate, must offer more support for collegial assemblies. Both the Senate President and the Provost will actively seek to attend at least one meeting of each collegial assembly
- The Senate continues to discuss ways to encourage recognition of service (which is often tied to governance) including the impact on Merit. The President noted the “message” of service is heard at the top (levels of the university) but this message is not being heard at the Middle (Dean and College levels)
- The 2010-2011 year marked the second Annual Meeting of the Steering Committee with the Council of Deans; there is hope to continue this annual meeting to encourage discussion (the topic of the 2010-2011 meeting was on Encouraging Entrepreneurial Actions)
- The Senate also celebrated its first annual/joint sponsorship of an event with the University Faculty Herald; there is hope that this collaboration will continue.

Looking forward the Faculty Senate:

- Is looking forward to the engagement of the Steering Committee in the search for a new President; the Steering committee will work with the Board of Trustees to assure faculty engagement in the recruitment and selection process.
- Will continue to work on Collegial Assembly By-Laws.
- Will work with Colleges and Schools to promote service and recognition of service.
- Will continue to work with and foster communication between the Faculty Senate and the top levels of University Administration.

President LaFollette then introduced the Vice President Joan Shapiro

4. Vice-President Joan Shapiro gave the Vice-President’s Report.

The Vice President stated a key responsibility of her position is to populate over 30 Faculty Senate Committees but that faculty assistance is needed for both appointed and elected positions. There are over 200 people currently serving on Senate committees.

A key issue of the Faculty Senate (and the faculty) is service and the role of service in the University Community; she asked “what does service count for; merit? P & T?”

The real role of service is to assure shared governance which is critical in public higher education. She challenged faculty to “think beyond yourself” to get involved, and to get others involved. Service activities serve a variety of needs (including developing curriculum, furthering of the research agenda, and choosing leaders) and so it is the responsibility of all faculty to become engaged.

The VP focused on the need to foster a culture of service; Michael Jackson (STHM) will announce a new program to recognize service and set a new tradition. Faculty on P&T should discuss the role of service with junior faculty.

Vice President Shapiro indicated that vacancies for positions on Faculty Senate Committees were listed on meeting notes for the day (for elected positions) as at the Senate Homepage (for appointed positions) and that nominations were now being accepted at senate2@temple.edu; elections will be held on 9/26/2011 but nominations are needed.

There was a question about semantics in the by-laws; TAUP guidelines state “selected” committees; Faculty Senate uses a combination of both ELECTED and APPOINTED members for committees. The Senate homepage has information about the specific functions, work-loads, etc for each position. Candidates are asked to submit a 2-3 sentence statement of interest and their CV to the nominating committee at senate2@temple.edu.

The role of faculty service is becoming even more critical with the budget constraints and service on Faculty Senate is important.

QUESTIONS:

Q – Arthur Hochner (FSB) – the TAUP contract language states that …the Faculty Senate will “select.”

A – Vice President Shapiro clarified that in many cases the Senate has chosen to ELECT for certain positions.

Q – Professor Hochner asked about the focus on Service at the expense of teaching; he indicated that a recent analysis of Merit awards showed over 60% went to faculty for “research” but that less than 20% (just about 17%) went to faculty for “teaching”. Although Temple University is a research institution, there should be a balanced focus on the teaching mission in light of these objectives.

A – The Vice President thanked Professor Hochner for this information and perspective.

Q – James Korsh (CST) made the recommendation that each collegial assembly should have a standing nominating committee to serve the needs of the collegial assembly as well as the senate.

A – VP Shapiro thanked him for this recommendation.

Q – Jeffrey Solow (Boyer) asked that merit for teaching consider Teaching
Excellence, not just teaching innovation.

A – VP Shapiro thanked him for this recommendation.

The VP concluded by announcing that Roberta Sloan (SCT) is on leave for the academic year and unable to fulfill the remainder of her appointment as Faculty Senate Secretary; the VP introduced Karen Turner (SCT) to speak about the need for nominations for the Secretary position.

5. Karen Turner (SCT) on a Critical Opening in the Steering Committee
Karen Turner indicated that the Faculty Senate has a one year vacancy for the Secretary Position; this position is on the Senate Steering Committee which requires the candidate (Tenured or Tenure Track Faculty only) to attend and record weekly meetings (Tuesdays 2-3PM) as well as monthly Senate Meetings. The Secretary would also serve on the Executive Committee. The Secretary is responsible for collecting the annual reports from all Senate Committees and would be eligible for a one-course release during the academic year.

Interested faculty members should contact Karen Turner (karenmturner@temple.edu) or any member of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee. Further information will be shared by the Senate through the List serve.

6. The President introduced Michael Jackson (STHM) with an update
Professor Jackson reminded members of the audience that The Faculty Senate has been focusing on the issue of providing more acknowledgement of faculty service. In support of this, an event has been scheduled to honor faculty from across the University for their Service Contributions.

The event will be held on 10/20/2011 from 11AM-1PM on the 7th floor of Alter Hall.

Jackson indicated hope that the Faculty Senate can lobby for these to become an annual (spring) event which might also be supported by cash awards. Faculty are asked to watch for upcoming announcements for nominations and the event.

The members of the Faculty Senate feel strongly about the role of service in governance and remind faculty to work to recognize and reward service in their school (and in the P&T process). Schools are being asked to nominate faculty for this award and an announcement about this process will be distributed through the Senate List serve.

7. Old Business
There was no request to discuss old business.

8. New Business
There was no request to open discussion on new business.

9. Adjournment:
The meeting was adjourned at 2:52 pm.

Submitted,

Mary Conran
Dean’s Teaching Fellow/Fox School of Business