By Philip R. Yannella
Professor of English and American Studies

As I write this, we are waiting to hear how much money Governor Corbett wants to cut from next year’s appropriations for the state-related universities, Temple, Penn State, the University of Pittsburgh, and Lincoln University. I do not know in any detail how the other universities will react to the announcements. But, because we have been through it so many times in years past, I will predict Temple’s reactions. They will be premised on the idea that Temple stands on the edge of a deep financial cliff from which it will plunge if we do not cut expenses, especially at the collegial and department levels. Consequently, this and that will be frozen, this and that real or alleged redundancy in the educational program will be attacked, some deans will be told to pare their budgets, some things will be reorganized, savings will be sought through increased class sizes and increased teaching workloads, promises will be made that administrative budgets will be cut, delegations of students will be bused to Harrisburg to attend rallies and to lobby legislators to give more money, other members of the Temple “family” will be asked to sign...
On the Necessity of Taxpayer Oversight of Temple University: Questions of Age Discrimination

By Michael Sirover
Professor of Pharmacology

“‘It may be legal, but it is not appropriate.’”
The Taxpayers of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania-November, 2011

What do the taxpayers of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania expect of Temple University? The answer to this question would seem to be simple, direct and a "no-brainer." As taxpayers, we would expect it to be first and foremost concerned with the education of our young so that they may not only become responsible adults but also so that they may rise to their full potential. Second, we would expect it to engage in the pursuit of knowledge so that we may not only understand our world and ourselves better but also to be able to use that knowledge to develop new technologies to improve the world around us. Finally, we would expect it to help provide for the good and welfare of us all, i.e., we are the “Common Wealth” of Pennsylvania, and to conduct itself in a manner befitting the special regard in which it is held. We expect it to conduct itself in a manner befitting its mandate to provide for the Common-wealth.

With that in mind, the purpose of this article is to consider whether the alleged policies of age discrimination described in this article violate the mandate given to Temple University by the Taxpayers of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Each by itself, and certainly when combined, calls for greater taxpayer oversight in light of the removal of Temple’s special exemption from the “Right To Know” law.

Question 1: What do older faculty (or other older personnel) pro-
provide for the “Common Wealth” of Pennsylvania that younger fac-
ulty or older personnel do not? Let’s first consider a March 31, 2011 letter sent to Temple University by Dr. Toni Scarpa, the Direc-
tor of the Center for Scientific Review of the National Institutes of Health (NIH). It concerns the appointment of a Temple University fac-
ulty member (not the author) to serve as the Chair of one of its commit-
tees. The letter states, in part:

As you know, membership on a study section represents a major commitment of professional time and energy as well as a unique opportunity to contribute to the NATIONAL BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH EFFORT. Members are selected on the basis of their demonstrated competence and achievement in their scientific discipline as evidenced by the quality of research accomplishments, publications in scientific journals, and other scientific activities, achievements and honors. Service on a study section also requires MATURE JUDGEMENT and objectivity as well as the ability to work effectively in a group. The skill and leadership of the chairperson determine to a significant extent the effectiveness and efficiency of the review group.

Or consider a similar statement from Dr. Sally Rockey, the Deputy Director for Extramural Research of the National Institutes of Health:

“The NIH wishes to thank all who served in the initial level of NIH peer review in the year 2011. Our ability to identify and support the most promising research depends on participation in the process by dedicated members of the extramural scientific community.” (January 20, 2012)

It’s reasonable to suggest that these are prestigious appointments. Such an individual is able to contribute directly to our collective efforts to improve human health, i.e., such a person can make meaningful contrib-
tutions to the “Common Wealth” of Pennsylvania and the world beyond.

Who gets appointed to this type of position? It’s also reasonable to suggest that senior individuals, by virtue of their training, expertise and record of performance, will be entrusted with this responsibility. By

definition, younger individuals, irrespective of their potential and their promise, do not have the requisite experience for such an appointment.

Similarly, a senior faculty member may be qualified as a community speaker, i.e., someone with the expertise and perspective developed over the years to, as a guest lecturer without fee, discuss relevant issues in his/her field which may be of interest to the community at large. These could include women’s groups, men’s clubs, Rotary, etc. It’s a public service, a way to inform Pennsylvania taxpayers on issues of the day.

Older faculty may mentor younger faculty. In the author’s case, when he was a young, naïve, Assistant Professor (as opposed to now when he is an old, naïve, full Professor), he was privileged to have as mentors Charlie Papacostas (Art’s father), Connie Harakal, Sidney Weinhouse and Peter Magee. Charlie and Connie advised him on his development as a teacher while Sidney and Peter were consulted with respect to the development of his research program.

Now, as a senior individual, the author has assumed a similar role as an advisor for a number of junior individuals. In that position, he has helped a number of younger individuals who are now either are, or are becoming, established faculty. In this, the author is not alone. Many senior individuals serve as mentors for younger faculty both at Temple University and at many other such institutions. The term used sometimes for these efforts is "Pay it forward."

In each of these three examples (and many others which may occur to the reader), senior individuals are contributing to the “Common Wealth” because of the seniority which they hold and the expertise they have developed during their career. It is highly unlikely that junior individuals, whatever their potential, could make such contributions. Hopefully, in the fullness of time, they will.

Question 2: “How much money did you make for us last year?” Or: Why do Temple University corporate officials institute policies and practices which belittle, discourage and penalize older faculty who contribute to the “Common Wealth”? Regrettably, state-affiliated colleges and universities are not the kindly old Alma Mata that so many Pennsylvania taxpayers may remember. Temple University can be thought of as a multinational corporation which has a professional administrative class separate and distinct from the faculty which it manages. Further, it has implemented new policies and procedures which are separate and distin-

Question 3: Does the response of Temple University corporate officials to the provision of the older among us for the “Common Wealth” constitute age discrimination?

The matrices used by Temple University to measure faculty productivity do not include credit for the provision of the “Common Wealth.” Accordingly, individu-
als who provide such service will be at a disadvantage as compared to other fac-
ulty, i.e., their service contributions are excluded from consideration. By defini-
tion, such matrices will discriminate against older individuals who provide, for the most part, more for the “Common Wealth” than do their younger associates.

In response, Temple University administrative officials may assert that they are entitled to set the work rules under which their corporation operates. They may
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petition, undergraduate tuition increases will be said to be inevitable, and so forth and so on.

This essay has two parts. In the first part, I briefly summarize the major themes of the several articles on the budget that I published in the Faculty Herald over the past year or so. In the second part, I discuss the extremely important, sobering reports on Temple’s current financial situation by two financial agencies, Standard and Poor’s and Moody’s Investor Service.

Here is a summary of the main themes of my earlier articles:

I. Temple’s 2009-10 budget detail included tens of millions of dollars of vaguely described items and discretionary items that could be cut and a $30 million “Contingency” fund. Its 2010-2011, now deposited in Paley Library, also contained vaguely described items, discretionary items, and a “Contingency” fund of $33 million. By cutting some or all of the slushy items and using the “Contingency” fund, cuts to the educational program and increases in tuition could easily have been avoided in past years, but our Board of Trustees and central administration chose to preserve slushy budget items and the “Contingency” money. We do not have access to the current budget detail, but we can infer that it contains considerable slush and a “Contingency” fund.

II. Temple had an operating surplus of $94.2 million in 2010-11. We could have avoided a 10% undergraduate tuition increase and cuts to college budgets by having, say, a $40 million surplus instead of that $94.2 million surplus. I was not and am not arguing that Temple should break even or run deficits. Surpluses are great things to have. Running a smaller surplus and avoiding the collegial cuts and tuition increases would not have harmrd our ratings by those outside financial agencies. But our Board of Trustees and Central Administration chose not to do that.

III. Asserting that it is building for the future, that building is absolutely essential to attract future students, our Board of Trustees and Central Administration have planned a number of costly construction projects. Part of the funding for the initial projects, perhaps $30 to $40 million in each of the last two years, has come from tuition money. Why should current students be “taxed” to create a more entertaining, prettier, and more convenient environment for future students? They should not, I would argue. What would our fiscal situation be if some of the projects, those not supported by donors or by State capital funds, were put on hold? A lot better, a lot less risky, I have argued. Our Board and Central Administration, though, chose construction.

No member of Temple’s administration ever challenged my facts or anything else contained in my earlier articles. But from time to time I have heard it said that certain of my ideas, such as using the surpluses and the “Contingency” funds to avoid collegial cuts and tuition increases, cannot possibly be done because the University must satisfy outside financial agencies such as Moody’s that it has such money. In his recent “White Paper” on reorganization, for instance, Provost Englert remarked that one of our goals was to “maintain financial stability, including stable bond ratings (which are independent assessments of the financial health of an institution).” He extended this remark in an appendix that cited a recent Moody’s document about the top factors driving higher education financial ratings upgrades and downgrades, one of which states that universities should show “consistently strong operating performance and retention of surpluses.” However, Moody’s says nothing whatsoever about optimal surpluses or managing budgets so that they produce a meaningful surplus but do not cut essentials or increase tuition. Indeed, universities with higher ratings than Temple’s sometimes report significantly smaller surpluses as measured by surplus as a percentage of overall operating expenses.

Moody’s and other outside financial agencies are important. Guidelines for understanding how bond ratings can be upgraded or downgraded are useful. But they are not as important, as relevant, or as crucial to understanding our situation as the actual ratings reports that the agencies produce. Standard and Poor’s issued a short report on its downgrade of the rating of the Temple University Health System (TUHS) in October 2011. Moody’s issued an extensive report on Temple in March 2011, when the University sought $120 million from bond investors to support construction projects. Some of the statements in the Moody’s report, I believe, support the arguments I have been making. Neither of these reports was cited by Provost Englert. Neither has been publicly cited by any other Temple official, so far as I know. I will guess that they have not been cited because they do not support the picture of fiscal prudence and smart management that officials try to project.
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As Peter Gran noted at this week’s Senate meeting, some central Pennsylvania legislators expressed a willingness to spare some budget cuts – if only Temple (and Penn State, etc.) would divulge the salaries of its highest paid employees! Accounting for the effects on programs and staff. Meanwhile, the presidential committee has finished its deliberations on guidelines for possible course load increases for the faculty. Apparently much of the impetus for these guidelines are the sweetheart deals for new faculty of 2003-5, especially in the sciences, rather than the more standard loads of most of the presidential faculty. A better idea, highlight by Marina Angel and one not contradicting the spirit of those parts of the White Paper calling for efficiencies and attention to Temple’s historic mission, would be some serious attention to high-salaried positions and administrative bloat. As Peter Gran noted at this week’s Senate meeting, some central Pennsylvania legislators expressed a willingness to spare some budget cuts – if only Temple (and Penn State, etc.) would divulge the salaries of its highest paid employees! If this means we can’t recruit such administrative luminaries from other institutions, all the better: we’ve had enough such corporate-level brilliance. I’ve met some pretty smart an administratively experienced faculty here who would do just fine as deans or assistant executive vice provosts (maybe even without the permanent post-acting-deanship hike in salary that left one of my not especially research-prolific colleagues retiring with $150K), and happily return to the faculty in 5 or so years, rather than burningish their CVs with administrative flats that can be touted when auditioning for their next executive position.

Or the money could be taken out of the portion of the big-sports athletic machine that doesn’t recoup its own expenses. We have no business creating entertainment for a state and a city and a population that encourages us to expand but then leaves us little choice but to either casualize our labor force, fire folks, increase class sizes, raise tuition, or raise workload, and/or abandon subsidized construction projects. I might add that a university that can’t find a way to nurture and grow its own program in Women’s Studies or American Studies in the 21st century is not one worthy of a great metropolis, and not one that needs football. (Maybe if we had nurtured those programs we would understand why we find ourselves facing such choices.) Or, if money is the issue, considerable monies could be taken out of the contingency fund, as Phil Yannella argues in his ongoing analysis of the Temple budget, in this issue.

During one of the “Dialogues with Dick” at the representative senate meeting, the Provost, noted that while he’s not known for “vision,” he is a good listener. We wish it were clearer who he’s really listening to now. The faculty has spoken pretty clearly, though the Senate, of its desire to slow down the apparent speed-up of restructuring. Surely the impetus is not coming from a president.

Editorial continued on page 8
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justify the construction of their faculty evaluation matrices as consistent with existing law, i.e., everything they have done is legal. 3 They may also express their sympathy with older individuals, stating that such older individuals are free to pursue their efforts to improve the “Common Wealth.” However, as those efforts do not fit with the revenue goals of Temple University’s corporate plan, they will continue those policies which discourage, demean and belittle such efforts. They will also note that older faculty (or other personnel) are free to seek relief through our judicial system.

Question 4A: Why should the Taxpayers of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania be concerned with this alleged incidence of age discrimination? Why isn’t this simply a matter for civil litigation?

“Equal Justice Under Law” is a basic American precept. It is a foundation of our democratic tradition, i.e., all persons, irrespective of position, wealth or privilege can seek redress of their grievances through our courts. This tradition is illustrated usually by a blindfolded Lady Justice with her scales balanced equally. Of course, in reality, our justice system has yet to achieve that theoretical goal but it’s something for which we strive.

What we don’t strive to do is to weight the scales down so that one party is in a more favorable position than the other. Of course, this is also a theoretical goal. Not everyone can hire the Dream Team as did OJ. However, one thing that we can agree on is that the Taxpayers of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania should not choose sides, i.e., we should not support one party over the other such that the Scales of Justice at tipped to one site.

Yet Temple lawyers, when confronted with their responsibilities to ensure justice, utilize a strategy of delay, discourage and deprive. Delay the proceedings as long as possible by any legal means available, discourage the individual by extending the time between filing the lawsuit and the individual actually getting to court, lastly, and perhaps the most cruel, deprive the individual of the financial resources required to pursue the case by the number of motions or depositions required, i.e, bankrupt the person.

It should be noted that this is a strategy which corporations use all the time. Regrettably, in many instances it works. That being said, the Taxpayers of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania have the right to respond by saying, “It may be legal but it is inappropriate.” We have the right to inform Temple University corporate officials that the use of taxpayer funds to employ this strategy is unacceptable, that they should cease and desist, that their Commonwealth Appropriation was not intended to permit such abuse.

Question 4B: Why should the Taxpayers of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania be concerned with this alleged incidence of age discrimination? Why isn’t this simply a matter for civil litigation?

The events at Penn State may be important to all of us not only because of the young men allegedly abused by Mr. Sandusky but also because of the lack of action by Penn State administrators reveals their callous disregard for the welfare of those young children. Simply put, those professional managers ensured that such suffering would not be allowed to imperil the success of the football program as well as the image of Penn State. The latter translated into the funds obtained from the football program, gift giving by enthusiastic alumni, the desire of students to matriculate at Penn State and the generosity of the taxpayers through Penn State’s Commonwealth Appropriation. All of that could have been imperiled had the alleged child abuse by Mr. Sandusky become public. Thus, Penn State did what anything corporation tries to do under similar circumstances, i.e., it covered up. The wagons were circled; Mr. Sandusky was protected; the children were sacrificed.

Here at Temple University, instead of the youngest among us being sacrificed for the greater good of the institution, the charitable works of the older among us are being sacrificed on the altar of corporate profits. This has a ripple effect not only with the individuals directly affected but also on younger faculty who witness such treatment. What lesson are they learning which will carry over into their later years? What efforts for the “Common Wealth” will they provide when it is their time to do so?

Is the lesson that the Taxpayers of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania want to be taught at Temple? Instead, we have the right to insist that, in pursuit of corporate profits, it may be legal but it is not appropriate for Temple (or any state affiliated institution) to penalize the older among us when, because of the positions they hold and the expertise they possess, they use those talents to provide for the “Common Wealth” instead of raising revenue for Temple. We can demand that, instead of being pilloried for those contributions, they should be celebrated. Instead of being demeaned, they should be praised. Instead of being penalized, they should be rewarded. Post Penn State 2011, as with a Hebrew National hot dog, Temple as a state-affiliated institution needs now to answer to its higher authority. ♦

3 The National Institutes of Health (NIH) is the premier federal agency responsible for the conduct of scientific research in the United States. It funds most of the research programs which are responsible for the development of many current therapies which save innumerable lives. Its committees, composed of scientists from institutions throughout the country, review research proposals sent to it for their merit and recommend those which should be funded.

3 Direct costs are provided by NIH to help defray institutional costs necessary for conduct of funded research. These include costs for electricity, heat, water, administration and so forth. Temple University’s indirect cost rate (some 50.5% of direct costs) means that for every $100,000 in grant award (tender direct costs) Temple University receives and additional $50,500 in indirect costs. There is continuing concern about the misuse of indirect costs, i.e., some years ago at Stanford they were used to pay for a yacht. Note that President Hart did not say that we had to generate more funding to do more research to help the “Common Wealth.”

The author is a Professor of Pharmacology in the Temple University School of Medicine, a Past President of the Medical Faculty Senate and a former Secretary of the All University Faculty Senate. He resides in the 142nd Pennsylvania General Assembly District and in the 6th Pennsylvania Senate District.

The New Herald Editor -- You?

By David Waldstreicher, Editor

After three and a half years, it is time to turn over the editorship of the Faculty Herald. I’m writing this now, rather than later in the spring, because I would like more of our readers to consider serving as editor.

I learned more about Temple than I could have in any other way. I’ll be a better colleague, and a better citizen of my department and my college, for these experiences. But the best part by far was watching other faculty use their collective intelligence to solve real problems. I gained a great deal of pride in this community of scholars and practitioners – pride that helps me to get through the minor alienations of working in a large and legendarily bureaucratic institution. I would especially single out the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, and the senators, who weekly and monthly face the limits as well as the possibilities of faculty influence at what Benjamin Ginsberg calls the “all-administrative university” with humor as well as patience.

So if you are looking for a break from the departmental routine, feel like you may have something to add to the conversation about the future of Temple, are willing to attend some meetings, to keep an ear open to remarks - You?
Open Letter to the Presidential Search Committee:

By Faculty Senate Committee on the Status of Faculty of Color

As the Temple University community prepares for a new era, the members of The Faculty Senate Committee on the Status of Faculty of Color (FOC) want to publicly acknowledge support of the University’s commitment to first-generation college students and our pride in being recognized by *Diverse: Issues in Higher Education* for being among the top ten institutions awarding the most bachelor’s degrees to African American students. We also want to encourage the University to reaffirm its commitment to the recruitment and retention of faculty of color. Building on our brand as “The Diversity University”, we must not rest on our laurels but strive to accomplish the work that’s yet to be done.

In particular, we want to draw the community’s attention to the fact that for a university that brands itself as “The Diversity University,” we have a very small number of faculty members of color. The University’s Common Data Set shows 32% of our current undergraduate population self-identifies as foreign national, Asian American, African American, Latino/Hispanic, or Native American. In contrast, according to the 2010 data available from the IPEDS website, only 23% of our current full-time faculty are ethnically diverse (21.8% of the tenured/tenure-track faculty and 23.5% of the NTT faculty). If we limit ourselves to the traditionally underrepresented ethnic/racial groups (Native American, Hispanic, and African American), only 9% of the full-time faculty represents these groups compared to 19% of the undergraduate students.

As we prepare for the challenges presented by the resignation of President Ann Weaver Hart, we must strive to create new opportunities to bolster diversity initiatives:

- In addition to focusing renewed efforts on building diverse faculty of color in our academy of the future, we need to aggressively recruit faculty of color by identifying new networks and untapped resources;
- As we move forward in preparation for new transitions, both in administration and schools and colleges, we hope representatives of the various centers on diversity have a standing seat on all future searches to ensure more inclusive networks;
- The FOC strongly recommends establishing more professional development opportunities targeting faculty of color, who are often unaware of, or denied access to, the process of navigating the culture of the Academy;
- The FOC strongly recommends the University renew its commitment to institutional entities that support diversity initiatives such as the Office of Institutional Diversity, Equity, Advocacy and Leadership (IDEAL), The Academic Center on Research in Diversity (ACCORD), the Teaching and Learning Center (TLC); and the Center for African American Research and Public Policy (CAARPP);
- The FOC strongly recommends that the University institute a pro-active, mid-level mentorship program.

We look forward to hearing from the Presidential Search Committee as to what extent and in what ways the diversity initiatives outlined above are being considered as factors in the presidential search process. Will there be further engagement with the larger Temple University community as this process narrows? Is a commitment to continue Temple University’s reputation as “The Diversity University” a necessary qualification for selection of our next President? A timely response to these concerns is greatly appreciated.

As we stand on the precipice of a new transition period, hopeful for an increased climate of “diversity inclusivity,” the Faculty Senate Committee on the Status of Faculty of Color looks forward to working in partnership with all stakeholders invested in continuing Temple University’s national reputation as a leader in diversity and education.

Respectfully submitted,

Faculty Senate Committee On The Status of Faculty of Color
foc@temple.edu
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The Standard and Poor’s report, which can be accessed [here](#), explains that it has downgraded TUHS to BBB- because of the possibility, despite the efforts being made, that there may be “considerable operating loss in 2012.” In the S&P rating system, BBB- is “Considered [the] lowest investment grade by market participants.”

The long and detailed March 2011 Moody’s report on Temple includes, among other things, discussions of TUHS, our debt, our core market, the risk involved in our current construction plans, the “elasticity” of our tuition rates, the future possibility of Temple being upgraded or downgraded, and our $1 billion in short-term, liquid investments. It summarizes its findings as follows:

> The Aa3 rating for Temple University reflects its established market position as the largest Pennsylvania public university in southeastern Pennsylvania with good enrollment growth, strong University operating performance and good financial resource levels supporting debt and operations. These offsets are by the weak operations and market challenges of Temple University Health System, proposed dramatic cuts in state funding and expected substantial capital plans [i.e., the 20/20 construction projects]. The negative outlook reflects potential operating and liquidity pressures on the University due to financial stress at Temple University Health System (TUHS) as well as the impact of the dramatic reductions in state operating funds. The MIG 1 [Moody’s Investor Grade 1] rating is based on Temple's market access for its notes issuance and its strong liquidity position.

Most troubling to me in the Moody’s report are the comments on the potentially rippling effect of the TUHS situation, on the risks involved in the 20/20 construction, and on our tuition “elasticity” in relation to our core regional market.

The report also comments on Temple’s $1 billion short-term investments. This $1 billion is separate from the “Contingency” fund, the annual surpluses, and the money that can be found in the budget detail. Drawing some money from the short-term investments, or even just taking some of the substantial interest earned from them, would be still another way – besides using the “Contingency fund, besides planning for smaller surpluses, besides shoveling the slush out of the budget detail – to obviate any need to raise tuition again or to again cut collegial budgets.

A copy of the Moody’s report that includes some marginal comments by me can be accessed by clicking [here](#). The report, and many others on Temple’s financial situation, can be accessed at [http://www.bondsonline.com](http://www.bondsonline.com).
What Kind of President is Likely to be Chosen by Temple’s Trustees?
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appropriate role in fulfilling the mission of Temple University, in balancing an internal commitment to higher education with marketing the University's brand, in personally representing Temple's trademark diversity, and in raising funds or political influence to boost an increasingly beleaguered annual budgetary outlook. But with no current prospective candidates and no public discussion of the search process until March, however, we have little else but vague questions, a website, a resolution for search policies and procedures, and a list of search committee members as tools for prognosticating the character of likely candidates. Given that twelve of the fifteen search committee members are Trustees, and that the official website is also controlled by the Board, taking a closer look at the profiles of the most powerful members of the committee may shed light on the direction of the search. In points of fact where more background information or clarity may be warranted, the author has provided hyperlinked items.

The Search Committee is chaired by Patrick J. O'Connor, who is the current chairman of Temple University's Board of Trustees, a member of the Board of Consultants at Villanova Law School, and co-founder of the multinational law firm Cozen O'Connor. O'Connor earned his Bachelor's degree in History and Government at King's College in 1964 and his Juris Doctorate from Villanova Law School in 1967. He was a Temple Trustee between 1971 and 1984, before being appointed to the Board again in 2001 and elected chair in 2009. O'Connor is a specialist in contract litigation and has been recognized for a number of years as one of Philadelphia's "Super Lawyers." He is currently the secretary of the Pennsylvania Society, which has sponsored an annual New York City retreat for influential Pennsylvania politicians every December since 1899. O'Connor is also the chairman and only "interested" member of the board of BNY Mellon Funds Trusts, a board member of Crowley Chemical Company, chairman of Franklin Security Bank and on the advisory board of the Fox Center for analytics, Inc., a forecasting and consulting company. O'Connor is currently a member of the Board of Visitors for the Beasley School of Law at Temple University and on the Board of Consultors at Villanova Law School, and is currently a member of the Board of Trustees in 1985 and has served four terms.

Theodore Z. Davis was appointed to the Board of Trustees in 1991 and also sits on the Board of Temple University Health Services and the General Alumni Association of Temple. Davis has had a relationship with Temple University for over fifty years. He earned his Bachelor's in Business Accounting from Temple in 1958 and his Bachelor's in Law from Temple University School of Law in 1963. He also worked seven years as an adjunct in Temple Law. In 1974 he was appointed to the New Jersey Supreme Court Board of Bar Examiners and was chair until 1981, when he became a Superior Court judge. Davis was named chair of the New Jersey Supreme Court Task Force on Minority Concerns in 1986, the first task force of its kind in the nation. In 1991, Davis was appointed Presiding Judge of the Chancery Division – General Equity in Camden County and he retired from the bench in 2003. Davis has had over forty years of experience in Camden municipal politics as an assistant city attorney and assistant county prosecutor. Since his retirement, Davis has been a member of Cozen O'Connor and was appointed Interim Chief Operating Officer of Camden, NJ by Governor Jon Corzine in 2007 until he stepped down in 2009.

Ronald R. Donatucci was appointed to the Board of Trustees and to the Board of Temple University Health Services by Governor Ed Rendell in 2006. He also serves on the Board of City Trusts for Philadelphia and is the Chairman of the Board of Wills Eye Hospital Health System. He earned his Bachelor's in Political Science from Temple University in 1970 and his Juris Doctorate from the University of Baltimore School of Law in 1974. During that time span he also worked as a state auditor, a clerk in the Solicitor's Office under Mayor Frank Rizzo, the chief enforcer of Philadelphia License and Inspections, and counsel to Philadelphia Parking Authority. Donatucci followed in his father's footsteps and became leader of the Democratic 26th Ward in 1974. In 1976, he was elected Pennsylvania State Representative of the 185th district. He held the seat until 1980, when his brother Robert was elected and held the seat until 2000. In 1979, Ronald Donatucci was elected Register of Wills and Clerk of Orphan's Court for the city of Philadelphia, and he has remained in that office for eight consecutive terms. In the 2008 Presidential Election, Donatucci was a Democratic Party Super Delegate.

Richard J. Fox was appointed to the Board of Trustees in 1967, is chair of the Alumni Relations and Development committee, and a member of the Executive, Investment and Student Affairs committees. Fox earned his Bachelor's in Engineering from Georgia Tech just after World War II, and was awarded an honorary Doctorate of Humane Letters from Temple in 1996. After serving active duty in the Korean War, Fox returned to Philadelphia and co-founded Fox Companies with his brother Bob. Fox Companies became one of the major real estate development and management corporations in the Greater Philadelphia region, constructing thousands of homes and apartments, shopping centers, and the Wells Fargo Center. Fox is chairman of Planalytics, Inc., a forecasting and consulting company he founded in 1990 that specializes in "business weather intelligence." The Richard J. Fox School of Business and Management was renamed in honor of Fox in 1999. Fox also endowed Temple's Myer and Rosaline Feinstein Center for American Jewish History, the Fox Center for Biomedical Physics, the Center for Frontier Science, and the Fox-Gittis Room of the Liacouras Center. Fox has also been active in national and state republican politics. In 1980 he was the chairman of the Reagan/Bush campaign in Pennsylvania and in 1988 he was Jack Kemp's national finance chairman. Fox also co-founded the Republican Jewish Coalition, and is currently Chair of the Jewish Policy Center. In 2007 Fox backed "Freedom's Watch," a lobbying group that promoted the Iraq War "surge."

Louis F. Gould, Jr. was appointed to the Board of Trustees in 1985 and has served four terms. He has also been on the Board of Temple University Health System since 2007, and currently sits on the Board of Directors for Harriton House. Gould has also been a member of the Board of Directors Delaware Regional Planning Committee and was the Chairman of the Board of SEPTA from 1983-1988. Gould earned his Bachelor's from Temple's University School of Pharmacy in 1962 and his Juris Doctorate from Penn State's Dickinson School of Law in 1966. Gould is currently at partner at Duane Morris LLP and has been chair of their Intellectual Property Department since 1999. Gould has over forty years of experience in intellectual property and patent law (international and domestic) with a total of five firms, and is recognized as one of Philadelphia's "Super Lawyers." Two of his cases have resulted in United States Supreme Court decisions. Gould has been elected to five consecutive terms as the Republican leader of Lower Merion's 11th Ward, including the areas of Bryn Mawr, Rosemont and Gladwyne, and has served as Commissioner of Lower Merion Township since 1995.

Lewis Katz was appointed to the Board of Trustees in 1998 and serves as the chairman of the Athletic Committee. He has also served on the Board of Governors at Dickinson University and is currently a member of the Board of Visitors for Columbia Medical School, where he has endowed the annual Katz Prize in Cardiovascular Research. Katz earned his Bachelor's in Business from Temple University in 1963 and his Juris Doctorate from Penn State's Dickinson School of Law in 1966. In 1968, he co-founded the law firm Katz, Etting and Levine in Cherry Hill, New Jersey. During the 1970's and 1980's, Katz was the principal shareholder in Fellowship Bank, First Peoples Bank of New Jersey and Cherry Hill National Bank. After those banks were sold to Wachovia in 1990, Katz bought Kinney System Holding Corp., a the largest parking company in New York and was Chairman of Interstate Outdoor Advertising from 1984-2000. During the late 1990's Katz was a principal investor in professional sports teams, the New Jersey Devils hockey team and the New Jersey Nets basketball team, until 2004. He is currently a part-owner of the New York Yankees with a stake in their television network. Katz has received the Alumni Distinguished Service Award for his great financial contributions to Temple University and is well known in Camden for his philanthropic activity. Katz also generously donated 15 million dollars toward the construction of the state-of-the-art Lewis Katz Building and Lewis Katz Hall at Penn State's Dickinson School of Law, completed in 2009 and 2010 respectively.

Susannah E. Lachs was appointed to Temple's Board of Trustees in 2004 and serves on the committees of Academic Affairs, Budget and Finance. She is also vice chair of the Alumni Relations and Development Committee and sits on the Board of Visitors for the Beasley School of Law and the Trustee's Council of Penn Women. Lachs earned her Bachelor's in English at the University of Pennsylvania in 1974, her Master's in Communication from Temple's Annenberg School in 1976 and her Juris Doctorate from Temple's School of Law in 1978. Lachs had
On Dick Englert's "WHITE PAPER"

By Marina Angel, Professor of Law, Temple's Beasley School of Law

1. The Provost

The Provost is supposed to be the Chief Academic Officer of Temple University. But Dick Englert's "White Paper" does not describe a plan to enhance the Academic and Research missions and reputation of Temple. Academic reputation draws excellent undergraduate and graduate students, and faculty, especially research faculty. The "White Paper" proposes minor cost cutting by restructuring, streamlining, and centralizing in ways that will destroy academic excellence. The "White Paper" seems to reflect the thinking of the "businessmen" and lawyers who dominate Temple's Board of Trustees (see section 4).

Our peer state universities in Pennsylvania are Penn State and U. Pitt. Penn State has 15 separate schools and colleges; U. Pitt has 14. We have 14. Why is there a need to cut schools and colleges?

Penn State and U. Pitt are ranked 13th and 14th on the list of the top 100 research universities. Temple isn't even on the list. Research grants can bring in big money. The Provost refuses to spend more than $60,000 a year for Faculty Senate Research Programs and Policy Committee (RPPC) Research Seed Money Grants, the only such grants available to all Full-Time Faculty throughout the University. The money given out by the Provost, Dick Englert, the Senior Vice Provost for Research, Ken Blank, and the Deans has not brought substantial grants to Temple. There is no transparency as to where this money goes or why it is given to only certain individuals and projects.

Only 6% of Temple's revenue comes from grants and donations. This is a disgrace compared to the amounts that our peer state universities in Pennsylvania generate. The rest of Temple's money comes from current student tuition and state funding, both of which are to be dedicated to current academic needs. Professor Phil Yannella, using Temple's own documents, has shown that Temple, a non-profit institution, is making massive "profits." Temple is spending money not on academic excellence but on construction of luxurious dorms, extra-curricular facilities, and shops and restaurants. The "White Paper" seems to envision Temple as an appealing environment (playground) to attract and keep high-income-paying students. These students will graduate "On Time", because Temple will provide dumbed-down courses taught by insecure, low paid, contingent, non-tenure track (NTT) faculty, adjunct faculty, and graduate students, and computers. Some schools and colleges at Temple have already introduced computerized courses, which students can't fail because they receive several chances to get the "right" answer.

2. The President

The job of the President is to develop and implement an academic vision for Temple. The last President to do so was Peter Liacouras, who was selected by a Presidential Search Committee with a substantial number of faculty members. The last two Board-dominated Committees brought us David Adamany and Ann Hart.

The only member of the Board with academic experience is Jim White, former Executive Vice President of Temple, who is dedicated to Temple's academic mission. He is not on either the Board's Executive Committee or the Presidential Search Committee. Trustee Scott Mazo is a partner in University Place Associates.

Penn State's ex-President expanded Penn State to 28 campuses in Pennsylvania, enhanced its academic reputation, attracted excellent students and faculty, and oversaw the development of massive research grants and donations. I, who teach abuse, can almost forgive what seems to have been his one moral failure to act. He was paid only slightly more than our President Hart ($7M range). For her great leadership and advice, Temple's Board of Trustees awarded Hart a $7M "consultant fee" for the 2012-13 academic year — after she's gone.

3. The Upper Level Administration

Temple has a massively bloated Upper Level Administration. Temple is not enhancing its academic programs and has slowed down and limited the hiring of new tenure track or tenured faculty who actually teach and research. At the same time, Temple is adding more and more Senior, Associate, and Assistant Vice Presidents and Provosts, even a University Architect (the second high level person hired within six months to oversee construction). Each new high level Administrator needs a high salary, fringe benefits, a new and redecorated office, staff, an expense account, and a travel account.

Almost all the tenured and tenure track lines available last academic year, 2010-11, went to new high-level Administrators, like the new head of the Health Science Center/Dean of the Medical School. Very few tenure track or tenured Faculty who will actually teach and research at the same time were hired (see the list in the brochure for the President's/Provost's Fall-2011 Reception for new faculty). Almost all the new "real" Faculty were hired on contract.

4. The Board of Trustees

The main job of a university's Board of Trustees is to donate substantial sums of money to the institution and to solicit substantial donations from their friends, colleagues, acquaintances, and others. They are also charged with advancing the academic mission of the university. Temple's Trustees have done neither.

I spent a great deal of time last Fall researching the members of Temple's Board of Trustees. To the degree possible with limited time and resources, I looked at their current employment, academic credentials, connections to Temple prior to joining the Board, and donations to Temple. I had an argument last Fall with Provost Dick Englert about his lack of support for the Faculty Senate Research Programs and Policies Committee. I told him Trustees' donations to Temple were peanuts. He strongly disagreed. On November 11, 2011, shortly after that meeting, I sent him a detailed chart of Trustee donations to Temple and asked for corrections. Dick Englert always responds to my e-mails, but I received no corrections.

I counted 34 Trustees. Thirty are lawyers. The only organizational structure most lawyers know is hierarchical. They seldom understand the collegial structures of academia. A majority of the rest are "businessmen," who operate or are employed by relatively small "for profit" entities located almost exclusively in the Philadelphia area. There are only five women, including Ann Hart, on Temple's Board. None seem to be on the Temple Board's Executive Committee. Two are on the Presidential Search Committee. According to the University of Pennsylvania's Alum magazine, one of them was recently honored as a U. Penn alum, and the magazine claimed she and her whole family went to U. Penn. She holds a Temple law degree. Three of the women seem to be retired or engaged in small charitable foundations. I believe only three persons of color sit on the Board, two Black men and one Latino. Several members of the Board are retired and have been for a long time. Some are political appointees.

Thirteen members of the Board do not seem to have attended Temple and have no Temple degrees. They seem to have had little connection to Temple before they were put on the Board. I could find no prior connection to Temple for the current Chair of the Board, who is the Vice Chair of a Philadelphia
22 years of experience as a civil litigation attorney before retiring from prac-
tice, but has been so active in higher education as a philanthropist and fund-
raiser that she was profiled in a June 2007 Chronicle of Higher Education
article entitled “Courting Female Donors.” While directing the fundraising
mission of Temple's Conwell Society, Lachs and her husband Dean Adler
have also endowed an acquisitions fund for the University of Pennsylvania
Library Collections to use for any academic discipline. They have also been
active donors to the Penn Law School, the Center for Advanced Judaic Stud-
ies, the Wharton School's Zell/Lurie Real Estate Center, and the Teacher's
Institute of Philadelphia.

Theodore A. McKee was appointed to Temple's Board of Trustees in 2002
and is vice chair of the Student Affairs Committee. McKee earned his
Bachelor's from SUNY-Cortland in 1969 and his Juris Doctorate from the
Syracuse University College of Law in 1975. McKee became friends with
Howard Gittis while at private practice in the firm Wolf, Block, Schorr &
Solis-Cohen, before he served as Assistant United States Attorney in Penn-
sylvania's Eastern District between 1977 and 1980. In 1977, McKee investi-
gated police brutality before a special grand jury as part of a nationwide
probe initiated by the United States Civil Rights Commission. McKee was
Philadelphia’s Deputy Solicitor between 1980 and 1983 and became General
Counsel for Philadelphia Parking Authority in 1983. During the 1980's,
McKee was also a lecturer at Rutgers Law School. Between 1984 and 1994,
McKee was elected as Judge on the Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas. In
1994 Judge McKee was nominated by President Bill Clinton to the United
States Court of Appeals Third Circuit, confirmed and commissioned by the
Senate. On the Third Circuit, McKee has served on the Task Force on Equal
Treatment in the Courts and co-chaired the Commission on Racial and Ethnic
Bias. Judge McKee is also a trustee at the Vera Institute of Justice, and has
been a member of a number of boards of directors, including the Fox Chase
Cancer Center and the Jerry Lee Center of Criminology at the University of
Pennsylvania.

Mitchell Morgan was appointed to the Board of Trustees in 2002 and is
chair of the Finance Committee and a member of the Alumni Relations &
Development, Executive and Investment committees. On the Finance Com-
mittee, Morgan has headed many recent Temple building initiatives. He
earned his Bachelor's in Accounting at Temple University in 1976 and his
Juris Doctorate from Temple University School of Law in 1980. In 1985
Morgan founded Morgan Properties, Inc., a real estate company that is cur-
rently worth $1.5 billion dollars and grew to recently buyout AIG's stake in
over 15,000 apartment properties after settling a lawsuit. Morgan is the
founder of the Mitchell and Hilarie Morgan Family Foundation, a trustee for
the National Museum of American Jewish History; and has been an active
donor to the Beasley School of Law. Morgan has also been an active Republic-
ian party fundraiser and is currently on Mitt Romney's Pennsylvania Fi-
nance Committee.

Bret S. Perkins was appointed to the Board of Trustees in 2010, and is on
number of committees, including Academic Affairs, Alumni Relations and
Development, Budget and Finance, Campus Life and Diversity, Executive
and Government Relations, and External Affairs. Perkins is also President of
the Temple University Alumni Association. Perkins earned his Bachelor's in
Business Administration from Temple's Fox School of Business in 1991, and
is currently Vice President of External and Government Affairs for Comcast.
During the 1990's Perkins was Vice President of System Services and Assis-
tant to the President of Mercy Health System. He implemented new hospital
management integration, gained legislative and regulatory affairs experience
with Keystone Mercy Health Plan, and directed a Department of Defense
research and development grant. In 2001 Perkins joined Comcast, bringing
his management and regulatory experience to help build bridges between
Comcast, state and local governments and grassroots groups. In 2008, Per-
kins received the National Cable and Telecommunications Vanguard Award
for Young Leadership. In 2011 Perkins spearheaded the launching of Com-
cast's "Internet Essentials" program, the largest initiative of its kind in the
nation, which offers affordable broadband internet services to the families of
children who are enrolled in the National School Lunch Program. Perkins
also sits on the Board of the "Committee of Seventy," a political watchdog
and reform group that has been active in Philadelphia politics for over a cen-
tury.

Daniel H. Polett was appointed to the Board of Trustees in 1992, served as
its Chair between 2006 and 2009, and chaired the search committee that
selected President Ann Weaver Hart. Polett is on the Budget and Finance,
Executive and Facilities committees, is chair of the Trustee Affairs Commit-
tee and has served Temple University Health System for over two decades.
He earned his Bachelor's from Fordham University in 1960, but his relation-
ship with Temple has spanned over forty years. Polett was the manager and
owner of Wilkie Buick dealership across from Cornell Hall on Broad Street
for twenty years before selling the property to Temple in 1988. The Li-
acouras Center was built on that property in 1997. In 1998, Temple Univer-
sity awarded Polett an honorary doctorate in Public Service. Polett was also
a recipient of the Diamond Award in 1993, awarded to donors who have con-
htributed more than one million dollars to the University, and the Russell
Conwell Award in 1995. Polett is currently the CEO of Lexus of Chester
Springs and Wilkie Lexus of Havertown. He has also been on the boards of
Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, Better Business Bureau, Merid-
ian Bankcorp, CoreStates Bank, First Union Bank, Catholic Social Services,
and St. Ignatius' Nursing Home.

Jane Scaccetti was appointed to the Board of Trustees in 2007 and serves on
the Audit, Budget and Finance, and Investment committees. Scaccetti is also
the Chair of the Temple University Health System Board of Directors, a
trustee at Salus University, a Director of Pep Boys, a Director of Mathemat-
ica Policy Research, Director of Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Com-
merce, and a Member of the Board of View for the City of Philadelphia. She
earned her Bachelor's in Business Administration from Temple University
in 1977 and a Master's of Taxation from Villanova Law School in 1984. Scac-
cetti became a partner at the accounting firm Laventhol & Horwath in 1987
and co-founded Drucker & Scaccetti, P.C. in 1990 after Laventhol & Hor-
wath folded. During the 1990's Scaccetti was married to Vincent Fumo, a
state politician who would later be convicted of 139 counts of corruption in
2009. She also served as a Director for First Penn Bank, DiGiorgio Corpora-
tion, and Nutrition Management Services Company. Scaccetti was named a

The preceding profiles were compiled from information readily available to
any curious party. The fact that the search process has very little difference
from the last presidential search is also worth mentioning. The members of
the search committee are certainly accomplished in their respective fields
and will likely select a candidate with certain kinds of business acumen and
legal sagacity, but will the candidate possess the other, specifically academic
and collegial, tools necessary to making a university presidency work? ♦

On Spin and the Rearrangement of the Deck Chairs

who told us she was resigning to take care of her aged mother, negotiated a $700K consulting fee, and has promptly taken the presidency of the University of
Arizona, an even bigger institution than Temple, hundreds of miles from “home” in Salt Lake City.

We know what lessons we learned from our experience with past administrations. What are the lessons of our experience with President Hart and Provost
Englert – a lesson we can take into our relationship with the next president and provost? It is time for the faculty to make its voice heard – to demonstrate
that real leadership requires not lobbying and spin so much as truth-telling, and moral clarity in difficult times. ♦
On Dick Englert’s "WHITE PAPER"
Angel continued from page 7

based law firm. The Trustees seem to have little to no knowledge of Temple's traditional mission. Temple was founded as an urban populist university, devoted to providing an excellent academic education to all, but especially to Conwell's "Acres of Diamonds," those qualified applicants who would otherwise not have an opportunity to attend a university. The "White Paper" seems to envision a Temple University mainly populated by high-income-paying undergraduate students taking dumbed-down courses in luxurious surroundings. A prior Board Chair with no Temple connection, Howard Gittis, in the same time period, gave Temple $5M and his alma mater, U. Pennsylvania, $25M. I found only four instances of $1M+ donations to Temple by current Temple Board members.

Four members of the Board, Nelson Diaz, Richard Fox, Daniel Polett, and Anthony Scirica, had Temple Honorary Doctorates bestowed on them by Temple's Board. Only Nelson Diaz had attended Temple. Board members I know and respect for their judgment and concern for Temple's academic mission are Jim White, prior Executive Vice President of Temple, Dan Polett, and Nelson Diaz. None are on the Board's Executive Committee or the Presidential Search Committee.

My sources for Trustee donations, largely from 2002 on, were: Board of Trustee Minutes, the website for Temple's 125th Anniversary Campaign, the website for the Temple Owl Club, and the National Center for Charitable Statistics that lists 990 filings for private charitable organizations. Most sources did not give specific amounts, only three wide ranges established by Temple:

- $25,000 - $249,000
- $250,000 - $999,000
- $1 million +

Specific dates were not usually given but only a range, 2002-09. A Trustee would be in one of the three ranges if s/he gave the lowest amount listed. For those Trustees for whom I found donation information, most gave Temple's 125th Anniversary Campaign in the $25,000 to $249,000 range, one was in the $250,000 to $999,000 range, and four were in the $1 M+ range. I am told that the "powers" on the Board are Richard Fox, a real estate investor and a major long term contributor to and fundraiser for the Republican Party; Mitchel Morgan, another real estate investor and major contributor to Mitt Romney; and Chair Patrick O'Connor, also a major contributor to the Republican Party. Mitchel Morgan is on the Board's Executive Committee and the Presidential Search Committee, and he chairs the Board's "Facilities" Committee. Temple is investing in luxurious real estate construction rather than academics. There are supposedly major cost overruns on Temple's construction projects. Temple is being run on the "Romney model" of taking over an organization and restructuring, streamlining, centralizing, and going to a contingent work force.

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 to a prominent place 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.

Representative Faculty Senate Minutes, November 9, 2011

Attendance:

Representative Senators and Officers: 59
Ex officio: 1
Faculty, Administrators and Guests: 24
Total Attendance: 84

1. Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 1:47 PM.

2. Approval of the Minutes:
The minutes for the October 11, Representative Faculty Senate meeting were approved with corrections.

3. President's Report:
President LaFollette reported that the Faculty Senate Steering Committee (FSSC) met in its annual retreat with the Provost. The topic was potential restructuring of schools and colleges within the University. The Provost is in the process of preparing a white paper on the topic. It is rumored that a draft of the white paper has been circulated among Deans, but none has been distributed as yet to the Senate or the FSSC.

LaFollette reported on a recent experience he had greeting and answering some questions for a group of prospective students he happened to encounter during their tour of the campus. He observed that the Admissions Office welcomes faculty members, when they encounter such groups, to stop and say hello to the prospective students if they are so inclined.

LaFollette reported that the Presidential Search Committee has been formed, and its two faculty representatives are himself and Professor Luis Gonzalez del Valle (CLA). They are both present at this meeting to hear from faculty members on the qualifications they should consider in searching for a new University President. At this point LaFollette yielded the chair to Vice President Shapiro, so that he and Professor Gonzalez del Valle could attend to faculty comments.

4. Factors to consider in the Search for Temple University's next President:

Vice President Shapiro invited faculty members present to address the qualities and characteristics that the Presidential Search Committee should be looking for in a new University President. She noted that a summary of remarks (without specific attribution) will be prepared and sent to the faculty representatives on the Search Committee. Several faculty members offered their views. The points raised included the following:

• Search committee members need to be able to find out about candidates from individuals at the institutions with which the candidates have previously been associated. This checking needs to occur early enough in the process to have a meaningful impact on the selections of finalists for the position. Waiting until the end of the process could be harmful because it will cut off potentially important sources of information until it is too late to make good use of them.

• Committee members need to be wary of search firms, which have a vested interest in pushing candidates that appear to prove the search firm's value and justify their fees, regardless of whether those candidates truly fit the needs of the institution.
• Committee members should be wary of secrecy, which if done too strictly can cut off valuable sources of critical information.

• There should be no advance agreement to make the final vote unanimous. Such an agreement can be used to silence genuine differences of opinion on the committee.

• The search committee is not constituted in a way that will reflect or support shared governance, so there will be an extra burden on the faculty representatives to push for giving that issue sufficient prominence in the search process.

• There are arguments going both ways as to whether the next University President should come from an academic background or from some other institutional setting. If a candidate is not from academia, it will be important to know what his/her past connections with higher education have been, as well as the candidate’s attitudes toward the role of higher education in society. If the candidate is from an academic setting, we need to know how open the candidate has been to faculty voices on matters of significance to the university.

• Given our eroding public support, we need someone who will be effective lobbying Harrisburg and Washington for support. Perhaps a prominent politician with strong state and national connections could be an effective choice at this juncture.

• Higher education is in the process of becoming an academic industry. That change has brought a strong trend toward top-down management. This can have a negative impact on the university’s mission. We need a leader who understands the difference between collegial and hierarchical administration and is prepared to implement the former. One key indicator will be how the candidate views governance within the university.

• A candidate’s view toward organizational development will also be important. If the university is an academic industry, its product is purely intellectual in nature. Highly structured hierarchical approaches to organization and management do not work well in such a setting. A candidate’s philosophy toward organizational development could be very revealing regarding his or her management style and how it will play out.

• A candidate’s potential longevity as president should be a factor. After two relatively short presidencies, we need someone who can make a long term commitment to Temple that will facilitate meaningful long term planning and development.

• We need to know the candidate’s vision for the relationship of the university to its surrounding community.

• The candidate’s articulated vision for Temple needs to move past generalities about the university as a whole to a specific vision concerning the future development of schools, colleges, and specific academic programs.

• We need to know the candidate’s views toward faculty shared governance. Will s/he commit to support it and take it seriously?

• The candidate’s views on faculty hiring are important, including views regarding the hiring and roles of tenure-track (TT), non-tenure-track (NTT) and adjunct faculty. How the candidate has related to faculty in various ranks in the past is also important.

• We also need to know the candidate’s disposition toward “academic space,” both physical (offices, labs, etc.) and intellectual (academic integrity, academic freedom, etc.).

• Attitudes toward the role of tenure are critical, since the tenure system is under fire nationally by those who want to balance university budgets by cutting labor costs. The candidate’s view toward the processes for granting tenure, taking it away, and shifting faculty lines from TT to NTT or adjuncts will be of critical importance.

• A candidate’s view of the proper use of adjunct faculty, and the relationship of adjunct to full-time faculty, is important. Does s/he see adjuncts as means of cutting costs, or does s/he have a mature conception of the educational role(s) that adjunct instructors can most effectively fill?

• Another factor is the candidate’s attitude toward computer-based instruction. Does s/he see it as a method for enhancing the quality of education by supporting or supplementing live instruction, or just as a means of cutting costs?

• Temple’s small endowment relative to its competition is a huge problem. We need someone with a proven track record who knows how and where to raise money, and is able to do it. To do that, the candidate will have to be someone who is able to resonate effectively with Temple alumni. This may mean that we should look for someone who shares commonalities of background or perspective with our alumni.

• Respect for faculty is a key criterion. Without it morale is sure to suffer. The university will collapse if faculty members lose their sense of investment and ownership in the institution.

• Views on faculty workload are also important. If faculty are overworked and students are underserved, we will lose students to other 4-year institutions, or even to community colleges.

• A candidate must recognize that an effective faculty “walks on three legs”: teaching, research, and service. All three must be valued and rewarded.

• The candidate’s approach to graduate students is important. Ours are seriously overworked, and it negatively affects the quality of graduate students we are able to attract, which in turn hurts the quality and reputation of our programs.

• The candidate needs to be someone with real experience dealing with a large, public, urban university that has a unionized faculty. Lack of effective experience in such a milieu could spell serious problems.

• The health sciences system is facing huge financial issues that could engulf the entire university. The system is already facing serious financial difficulties, and there is a strong prospect that reimbursements for the 1/3 of its patients on Medicare and Medicaid will be curtailed. We need someone with a strong grasp of those issues and a sound plan for addressing them.

• While budget issues are critical to the university’s success and survival right now, it must not always be at the center of the decision making process. Students, faculty and staff need attention. We need a leader who does not ignore the budget, but also keeps the best interests of the students, faculty and staff at the center of his/her decision making.

5. Vice President’s Report

Vice President Shapiro thanked the many individuals who have volunteered to serve on Faculty Senate Committees. Most committees are now either at or near full complement, but there are still 2 vacancies on EPPC and 3 on CATA. These are very important committees and they should be fully staffed. Anyone interested in serving on either committee should send a brief statement of interest and a CV to senates2@temple.edu. Shapiro noted that CATA does not meet often in person, but its work is very important since it is responsible for nominating faculty members to searches.
6. Student Feedback Forms

Senior Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies Peter Jones presented a report regarding the status of the Student Feedback Forms (SFF) Committee’s work on student course feedback.

Jones detailed several of the changes that have been made to the forms as a result of the committee’s work. These include: changing the name of the forms to switch emphasis from evaluation to feedback; development of four different forms for different kinds of courses; reducing the number of questions; eliminating questions that produced useless or duplicative information; changing the wording of questions; altering their order; and changing the way data from the forms are processed and reported. He noted that some changes counteract artificial impressions of precision, while others address the problem of “peaking” of responses close to the norm, so that small variations in response potentially produce large variations in scoring. Reports now group overall results for individual course sections into three categories – upper, middle, and lower – and the criteria for each category are structured to reduce the risk of a large swing in outcome from a small number of responses. Jones emphasized that all these changes have been grounded on empirical research.

With these changes in place, the current issue is whether to move to on-line administrations of SFFs. Jones reviewed the experiments with on-line administration that have been conducted over the past academic year. The results show no significant deviations in result (when comparing on-line versus paper administration for the same course sections and instructors), but they do show a drop in student participation. Experience with on-line administration at other universities suggests that the drop in participation can be partly remedied by providing incentives for students to complete the forms. Jones reviewed the ideas the committee has advanced for encouraging greater participation at Temple, including enlisting support from student government and giving students who fill out SFFs in all their courses on-line access to SFF results. Jones also stressed the important role faculty play in encouraging their students to complete SFFs.

Jones reported that the SFF committee has proposed a two-year experiment with university-wide on-line administration of SFFs in all courses. The committee originally projected implementation this semester. Based on feedback from the EPPC and the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, the committee now proposes that the on-line administration in all courses begin with the Spring 2012 term.

After Jones’ report, he was joined by several committee members* in order to respond to faculty questions and comments.

The following items were raised.

• Several faculty members asked about whether there should be “sticks” as well as “carrots” to encourage student participation. Some suggested that completion of SFFs should affect timing of when students receive their grades. Committee members responded that actions perceived by students as negative consequences might distort feedback results.

• There were questions about what will happen this semester. With a few exceptions the administration will all be on paper this semester, even for those who in the past had volunteered to try on-line administration.

• The switch to on-line administration across the country is being driven largely by cost considerations. Jones acknowledged that cost was a consideration here, but he also noted that on-line administration will enable more prompt dissemination of results.

• Concerns were raised about the drop in the number of narrative comments faculty receive when feedback goes on-line. Committee members responded that the number of narrative comments may go down, but that overall quality of the narrative comments may actually go up.

• Questions were asked about variations in outcome by college and school, or subunits within a school. Committee members responded that the experiments done so far have been too small to permit such comparisons. They hope a university-wide experiment will allow such comparisons.

• Concerns were raised about potential consequences for evaluation. The Committee has proposed that additional means of teaching evaluation be developed. Faculty responded, however, that in practice the SFFs will be the sole method used.

• There were questions about differences in result for tenure-track versus non-tenure-track and adjunct instructors, as well as difference based on whether the class was large or small, whether instructors had heavy or light loads, and the like. Studies elsewhere have shown such variances. The answer was that there may be such variances and results will have to be contextualized when used to evaluate teacher performance.

• Some faculty members expressed skepticism as to whether decision-makers will engage in the requisite degree of contextualization. The emphasis will always be on improving overall SFF numerical results.

• One important factor in the success or failure of on-line administration will be what students understand regarding the purpose and use of SFFs. Students need real and not artificial incentives to participate.

• There will be a need for adequate instruction on how to administer and use the SFFs when they go on-line. Committee members responded that there will be instruction sessions in each school and college, and that the Committee members will be available for further discussion with faculty.

At the conclusion of the discussion, Jones said that the Committee will arrange a time and place later this semester to meet with faculty for further discussion. President LaFollette thanked the Committee for their hard work and for coming to meet with the Senate on this issue.

7. Provost’s Report

Provost Richard Englert began by noting several positive developments: Professor Joseph Schwartz (CLA) received the 2011 David Easton Book Award for his 2009 book, The Future of Democratic Equality: Restructuring Social Solidarity in a Fragmented America; Medical School Professor Kamel Khalili received a substantial NIMH grant for his work on neurologi-cal diseases associated with AIDS; faculty members from each school and college were honored at the recent University Service Brunch; and FSBM recently held a ceremony honoring several faculty members for outstanding teaching and research.

On a more sober note, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania’s revenue deficien-cies may lead to interim budget cuts for this year, as well as further cuts in next year’s appropriation. There could also be cuts in Commonwealth capital funding. Temple recently hosted a very successful hearing on camp-us by the Pennsylvania Senate Appropriations committee, but the outlook for support from Harrisburg continues to be bleak.

Englert reported that a faculty-administration task force on workload has been meeting this semester. Its recommendations will be important, particularly in light of the continuing budgetary pressures.

Englert met with the FSSC in an October retreat to discuss issues of reor-
In the response period that followed, the following items were raised:

- Aside from the issue of Commonwealth appropriations the university’s support from donations is extremely low for a university of its size and profile. Improving our numbers in that category should be a high priority.

- The Research Policies and Programs Committee (RPPC) has experienced cuts in funding that have reduced the Committee’s ability to support promising faculty projects with seed money. The RPPC budget was reduced from $75,000 to $60,000 this year, forcing the committee to cancel its fall evaluation of project proposals. Englert responded that annual appropriations for the RPPC have remained constant, but that supplementary funds from the Provost Office were reduced this year. He offered to meet with the RPPC about this situation.

- Englert was asked who is serving on the workload task force. He will send the names of the committee members to President LaFollette for distribution to the faculty over the Faculty Senate listserv.

8. Old Business:

There was no old business.

9. New Business:

There was no new business.

10. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted.

Mark C. Rahdert
Secretary