A Year’s End Miscellany

It isn’t a time for grand declarations. I for one have grading to do, dissertators to meet with…. But I couldn’t let the opportunity pass without a few brief comments, kudos, and promissory notes:

--An unusually large number of our colleagues are retiring this year. We hope that the list we got from Human Resources mentions everyone, and if not we hope to hear from you or your colleagues, and publish an addendum. Please let’s take the opportunity to thank our fine colleagues for their many years of service and collegiality.

-- Kudos to TAUP and the administration for working out a contract -- on time!

--Thanks to Provost Englert for staying on through December to provide us with leadership continuity – and for letting us know now.

--We will have a new editor, Steve Newman (Dept. of English, CLA), who will take over in January. Look for a proper introduction in one of the fall

GenEd Responds to Restructuring: An Open Letter

By The General Education Committee

Dr. Englert,

As the University moves to improve undergraduate access to excellence, retention and persistence, General Education hopes to be at the center of those efforts. However, we fear unintended consequences may undermine the successes GenEd has accomplished since the program was launched in Fall 2008 and may position GenEd on the periphery.

We find two principles from the March 15, 2012 white paper problematic and encourage you to reconsider these in light of possible implications for undergraduate education at Temple University. The statements regarding the importance of faculty governance and the devolving authority to deans may undermine the gains observed in the short time that General Education has functioned.

Shared Faculty Governance Critical to GenEd Success

With regards to faculty governance, the paper reads, "Considerable time is spent on internal governance matters. This is time not spent on our core mission." Time spent on matters of internal governance, particularly university-wide, interdisciplinary committees such as the General Education Executive Committee (GEEC), reside at the heart of the University's core mission-access to excellence.

From Intellectual Heritage to Mosaic: A Retrospective

By Kime Lawson, Assistant Editor

Since 1986, Temple's core curriculum has required students to complete two three-hour courses in the Intellectual Heritage program. Few universities have programs like it. In conjunction with the First Year Writing program, for nearly three decades IH has provided Temple undergraduates with a shared foundation in selected texts intended to inspire critical styles of close reading and self-reflection often associated with a "Great Books" education. IH relaunched itself as "Mosaic" in Spring of 2008, with a new curriculum reconfigured to the needs of the GenEd program. Four years later, Faculty Herald has asked Mosaic faculty and students to offer a retrospective of its transformation.

Who Will Be Next President of Temple? Guess it Right — Win Lunch on Us!

The Editor is pleased to offer lunch at the Diamond Club (and a lifetime subscription to the Faculty Herald) to the faculty member who correctly guesses the identity of the next president of the university.

Please also send us (facultyherald@temple.edu) a date when you think the new president will be announced. (In case of multiple correct answers, the entry closest to the actual date of the announcement will be declared the winner.)
Report of the Faculty Senate Budget Review Committee Academic Year 2011-2012

During this academic year, the Committee has met a number of times with President Hart, Provost Englert and other senior administrators in order to discuss the University’s current financial situation and explore potential solutions.

The Governor’s budget for the next fiscal year has projected a substantial reduction to the Commonwealth’s appropriation for the next academic year. Since March, the Committee has been meeting this with the Provost, and a group of Deans and senior administrators to consider ways of dealing with this reduction in next year’s budget. These meetings will continue until the 2012-2013 budget is finalized.

The Chair also met with the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and another faculty group during the spring semester to analyze, explain and discuss the University’s budget for 2010-2011.

Respectfully submitted,
Rafael A. Porrata-Doria, Jr., Chair

Personnel Committee Report 2011-2012

The Personnel Committee's heaviest work came over the summer, when we were asked to weigh a faculty disciplinary case in June. This proved problematic, as the Committee is, by TAUP contract, allowed 45 business days to respond, and several members of the committee (including the chair) were out of the country doing research.

We filed for an exemption, which TAUP granted, and held a committee meeting as soon as the semester started. The written results were given to the President, TAUP, Counsel, and the faculty member.

A second faculty member asked if the Personnel Committee would look into a complaint against an administrator, again over the summer. By September, a third faculty member withdrew his complaint.

A third faculty member is currently weighing a complaint against an administrator, but I suspect that the faculty member will also withdraw this complaint. He has been reminded that he would have to make this complaint in time for us to meet as a committee and form a response before graduation.

We had no complaints about promotion or tenure cases.

Respectfully submitted,
Jane Evans, Chair

The Faculty Herald Editorial Board Year End Report, 2011-2012

Board Membership: Frank Friedman (CST-chair), Rebecca Alpert (CLA), Kime Lawson (CLA - Assistant Editor), Jo-Anna Moore (TYL), Richard Orodenker (CLA), Michael Strover (TUSM), Gregory Urwin (CLA), David Waldstreicher (CLA-Editor), David Watt (CLA), Bill Woodward (Law), Phil Yannella (CLA)

The Board met six times this year with the Editor and Assistant to the Editor of the Herald. Again this year, we worked closely with the Herald Editor to identify of major issues of community concern, including topics such as the 20/20 plan, Student Feedback Forms (electronic versus paper), shared governance, budget cuts, budget analyses, and the size of the Temple administration.

We also focused a good deal of attention on the issues related the budget and, specifically, on material provided in Herald articles written by Phil Yannella and Marina Angel. Special concerns were raised about 1) the 2011-2012 $37 million dollar contingency fund, 2) Temple's recent annual budget surpluses, 3) the continuing administration penchant for budget cutting, and 4) the administration's unwillingness to enter into meaningful discussions with the faculty concerning budget issues. Carried over from last year were concerns about faculty participation in University governance, especially as related to Senate and other governing committees. Efforts to solicit articles on these and other issues were outlined and several members of the Board (and the FSSC) contributed their own letters and articles. Concerns were also raised about the small faculty representation (2 faculty out of 15 members of the committee) on the search committee for the new President and the secrecy surrounding the search process.

Kime Lawson presented his report on the readership of the Herald for 2011-12. A report of this was attached. The number of unique visitors has nearly doubled, with articles by Phil Yannella and Marina capturing a large segment of readership.

Respectfully submitted,
Jane Evans, Chair

Student Awards Selection Committee – End of Year Report, 2011-12

The Student Awards Committee has two main responsibilities: (1) to interview and select the University Commencement speaker and (2) to evaluate and recommend student for University-wide memorial awards. The Committee generally meets 3-4 times in March and completes both of these activities.

This year, the process to select the Commencement speaker brought about much discussion, but we selected (and the Board of Trustees approved) an excellent student with a fascinating background, varied experiences and a wonderful presenter. Our selection process for the Memorial awards was challenging as always, as there were many deserving candidates.

I have chaired the Student Awards Committee for the past two years and as a member for a couple of years before that. I will be leaving the committee as I have served for several years. Next year's Chairperson will be Edward (Ted) Latham.

Wendy Urban, Chair
From Intellectual Heritage to Mosaic: A Retrospective
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Enlightenment, Romanticism, Revolution, Colonialism, and the modern novel. Students read excerpts or anthologies of "classical" texts for class discussion, toward the goal of putting ideas together in synthetic college-level essays. In 2006, however, GenEd asked Intellectual Heritage to restructure its courses pedagogically to stress skill-building rather than coverage, and to utilize a thematic approach over the traditionally chronological one. Mosaic was formed and fully approved for the classroom by Spring 2008.

Mosaic differs mostly from the old Intellectual Heritage curriculum in the respects that the IH "canon" was opened to include more cross-cultural readings, class enrollment caps were lowered to 25, and the two new courses were divided into four thematic modules each. The new curriculum was also retooled for skill-building, stressing critical thinking, discussion, writing and time management. GenEd (and former IH) director István Varkonyi explained the difference between IH and Mosaic, saying "The IH courses in the old Core curriculum morphed over time into a content-driven Western civilization course. The emphasis was on more content knowledge and the ability to give back that knowledge on a test. In the Mosaic courses there is an intentional pedagogical approach built into the curriculum to analyze, extrapolate, and ultimately apply the ideas from the various texts in diverging historical, cultural, and social contexts." Or, as Instructor Richard Orodenker put it, Mosaic stresses a "transference of knowledge" across disciplines and encourages students to be comfortable with the fluid relationships between texts that inform all contemporary intellectual pursuits. One does not need be trained as an economist to cultivate good financial skills, but being a sharp reader and a critical thinker will help, for instance.

Mosaic I includes the themes of "Journeys," "Self and Others," "Community," and "Ways of Knowing." Mosaic II is arranged according to "Science," "Money," "Power," and "Environment/City." Before Mosaic was implemented an instructor might have used as many as twenty separate texts from an anthology over a semester, but Mosaic has narrowed this reading list to eight books per semester to encourage deeper readings. For each module instructors must use the anchor text selected by the department, but may also select an ancillary text from an approved list for each module. And because Mosaic is no longer writing intensive, instructors can have more time to create discussion or experience-based assignments although writing is still a cornerstone of the Mosaic curriculum.

Overall, reactions to the changes in Mosaic from faculty and students have been mostly positive. The most prevalent criticisms from teachers and students who have experienced the transition is that the selected texts for Mosaic often do not fit the thematic modules well, and that the old IH curriculum was better because it at least preserved a chronological framework. Senior English major Jennie Burd noted that the new Mosaic "seemed like a relatively random attempt to provide cohesion in a course that was more of a survey in practice," and others pointed out that More's Utopia may not be the best "Money" book or that perhaps The Iliad would be better placed with Journeys. Associate Professor Richard Libowitz, however, remarked that teaching texts that would not have fit the old IH curriculum, such as Jane Jacobs' The Death and Life of Great American Cities, has been rewarding for both him and his students. Richard Orodenker stated that the Mosaic texts are by no means set in stone tablets, and that an internal committee perpetually evaluates the list of ancillary texts to offer suggestions to better streamline the curriculum or to put better editions of assigned texts in students' hands.

Although the general sentiment of Mosaic faculty seems to consider the relaunch successful, or at least as workable as the old IH curriculum, the program faces some challenges. Since 2006 Mosaic has employed no tenured faculty: its nearly ninety faculty members (39 full-time NTTs plus 50 or so adjuncts) live with short term contracts and uncertainty. In addition, increased workloads have stretched faculty's time and energy as each instructor now must find shortcuts in order to teach one more class with a net increase of twenty five more students per year. Many of the faculty have taught there for years, but in the past five years since Mosaic's launch the program has had three directors. The program will also have a new director next year. Assistant Professor Noah Shusterman noted emphatically, however, that "no director has left the program because they failed" and "they've all done good jobs." Other sources pointed out, however, that decisions regarding the directorship of Mosaic are typically made from above with little input from inside the program. Moreover, since Mosaic has no tenured faculty other than the director and no internal promotion track, new directors inevitably are imported from other departments.

Despite these instabilities, Mosaic offers an opportunity for all Temple instructors to participate in and augment a shared learning experience with Temple undergraduates. Whether a Temple student is majoring in computer science, business, liberal arts or hard sciences, he or she must have grappled with at least eight prescribed texts that have maintained an enduring discourse across disciplines. So many more opportunities for relating new knowledge to what students had already encountered would be possible if only Temple faculty were more aware of Mosaic.

A Year’s End Miscellany
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issues of the Faculty Herald.

--We are interested in the experience of faculty of color on campus, for a reflective article on race at the “diversity university,” to be published during the Fall semester. Please contact the editor if you are interested in discussing such an article and/or are willing to be interviewed, on or off the record.

--We will report on the Senate leadership’s self-study as the Steering Committee and Senate take up the matter of our governing procedures, as the Provost recommended recently. We will also report on the ongoing effort to reform Collegial Assembly guidelines to ensure faculty voices and participation in the colleges.

Have a restful, stimulating, productive summer! 

Faculty Herald Readership Almost Doubled

Since this time last year, Faculty Herald has nearly doubled the number of unique visitors to the website from 448 to 914. Total annual unique readership is up to 3713 from last year's total of 2514, an increase of 47.7%, and this year an average of 728 unique readers accessed each issue. We would like to thank our loyal readership for making this year great and to encourage you to keep reading!
In fact, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) praised the existence of GEEC and recognized the positive impact of faculty decision-making bodies. In their visit accreditation report, MSCHE wrote “…the establishment of participative committees to address academic initiatives, such as GenEd and learning outcomes assessment, appear to foster a positive, collegial environment” (16).

Faculty committees that create, oversee and maintain quality academic programs are central to the University's business and consider matters at the broadest possible levels—the entire student body. To assert otherwise negates the various initiatives and efforts to establish standards and criteria for the common undergraduate experience.

The current General Education program grew from a highly collaborative and consultative process involving faculty, deans, associate deans, staff and students. This process facilitated a ambitious program of student learning focused on the development of student's abilities in several key areas.

The value of such shared governance efforts in GenEd has been proven in a number of ways as we suggest below. Numerous assessments and evaluations by external and internal entities demonstrate the program has "made good" on its objectives.

For example, student response rates from the latest administration (2011) of the National Survey of Student Engagement indicate first-year students and seniors report increasingly higher levels than respondents in previous years (2009, 2007, 2005) for the following mental activities:

- analyzing,
- synthesizing,
- making judgments and application.

Additionally, respondents from Temple University report engaging in these mental activities with significantly higher frequencies than their counterparts at our urban peer institutes, other mid-East public universities, and schools within the same Carnegie classification.

The gradual increase in self-report rates from 2005 to the present suggests General Education and its focus on active and experiential learning to develop intellectual competencies are central to students' perceptions. Assessment projects conducted by General Education in the last three summers mirror students' self-reported data and provide direct evidence of student learning and achievement in the following competencies:

- critical thinking,
- communication skills,
- contextual thinking and civic engagement.

Devolving Authority to Deans May Weaken GenEd

Success

In part, many of these successes may be tied to the intense collaborative efforts between faculty and administrators throughout the university. The collective effort grew from truly open discourse that focused on the health and vitality of the University's undergraduate curriculum. We fear that the placement of all decisions regarding class size and GenEd resource deployment with the deans will chip away at these collective successes.

In the collaborative planning that developed GenEd, we carefully considered where and how we could have the most impact on developing competencies. Collectively, we focused attention on the Foundations and small, intimate classrooms where students in the earliest stages of their academic careers would find seminar-style classrooms with personal attention and powerful individual feedback on some of the most fundamental elements (critical thinking and communication) for a successful academic career.

We asked for and received generous and dedicated support for the General Education Foundational courses and in return, recognized colleges would need to offer a mix of small, medium and large lecture courses to supplement the higher instructional costs associated with seminar-sized sections.

Our strategy to focus on individualized attention and instruction in the earliest Temple experiences has been successful. A longitudinal assessment of students' progressions through Analytical Reading and Writing and the sequenced Mosaic courses demonstrates a moderate and positive impact on student performance in upper-division writing courses.

Additionally, results from the ETS Proficiency Profile administered to Temple University first-year and senior students who would have completed the aforementioned sequence indicate our students performed better than 60% of participating institutions on writing skills and higher than 70% of the same institutions in critical thinking.

The early process of decision-making balanced the needs of the individual colleges with the goals and objectives of General Education. As resources have dwindled, schools and colleges have been forced to prioritize. Rightfully, deans and academic departments historically act in the best interest of their respective units; however, the General Education program has observed some troubling trends.

We have seen course sizes double and triple and discussion sections eliminated to reduce instructional costs. We have observed fewer and fewer tenure track faculty teaching in General Education and increased reliance on non-tenure track faculty. We have more adjunct faculty teaching more and more students. And, we have seen colleges and departments cutting or in extreme instances eliminating GenEd offerings.

We empathize with the deans who have to make decisions that, while in the best interest of their students and their majors, are potentially limiting to the remainder of the undergraduate student body. Unfortunately, we envision their choices becoming more and more difficult as resources continue to diminish.

In the absence of checks and balances in the form of a dedicated voice or an advocate for the undergraduate body, fragmentation and specialization will follow and our accomplishments will be undone. We raise our concerns and objections to suggest the possible consequences of discounting the importance of faculty governance and the critical role university-wide committees, such as the General Education Executive Committee, serve.

We take comfort in the University's shared commitment to access to excellence and the invitation to respond to restructuring. We simply ask that decisions regarding faculty governance and devolution of authority in matters affecting the General Education program be delayed until we have filled vacancies and interim officers with long-term successors.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Istvan Varkonyi
Director

Dr. Julie Phillips
Associate Director

General Education Executive Committee (GEEC)

James Cooke
Dr. Cynthia Folio
Dr. Peshe Kuriloff
Mike Puppolo
Dr. Rickie Sanders
Dr. Thomas Wright
Dr. Steven Fleming
Dr. Mary Anne Gaffney
Dr. William Miller
Dr. Terry Rey
Dr. Catherine Schiffer

General Education Area Coordinators (GAC)

Dr. Daniel Berman
Dr. Eli Goldblatt
Dr. Anthony Hughes
Dr. Wilbert Roget
Dr. Ralph Young
Dr. Jane Evans
Dr. Alistair Howard
Dr. Tricia Jones
Dr. Susan Varnum
Open Letter to Governor Tom Corbett from the Faculty Senate Committee on the Status of Faculty of Color

By The Faculty Senate Committee on the Status of Faculty of Color

Dear Governor Corbett:

It is outrageous and shortsighted that your proposed 2012-13 state budget allocates $2 billion to corrections/probation and parole yet offers only $1.4 billion to higher education. It is education—not incarceration—that will yield long-term individual benefits to our children and our economy.

As the Committee on the Status of Color of the Faculty Senate at Temple University, we consider matters that concern faculty, staff, and students of color at Temple University. Thus, we are obliged to comment on your proposed budget cuts to higher education. We recognize that change is inevitable and change is good, but we are concerned with the issues in and around next year's proposed budget, specifically for Temple University.

Many of our students are the first to attend college in their families and come from underrepresented populations. Temple University provides educational opportunities to those who could not otherwise afford higher education.

An educated citizenry is good for the economy. Educated citizens foster innovation, create new technologies and provide the highly skilled labor that Pennsylvania businesses need to thrive and grow. Thriving businesses and higher employment will substantially increase Pennsylvania's tax base and revenues.

There is nothing more important than education. The safety and security of the Commonwealth depend on educational opportunities available to its citizens. You said we must reduce the costs of the criminal justice system; your proposed cut to education will produce exactly the opposite effect.

Severe budget cuts will substantially affect the economy and security of the Commonwealth. Moreover, your proposed cuts will severely limit access to higher education opportunities for low-income and first-generation college students. We would like to partner with you and the legislature to find ways to moderate next year's proposed budget cuts, and to promote education and support the longstanding commitment of Temple University to first-generation and underrepresented students.

At this critical point in history, you have the opportunity to make a substantial contribution to the future generations of our Commonwealth. You can either invest in education, or continue to see a drain on our economy and our human resources.

We thank you in advance for your speedy response to our invitation to work with you and the legislature on this most important issue: providing affordable higher education for our children.

Thank you for your attention,

The Faculty Senate Committee on the Status of Faculty of Color
foc@temple.edu

Faculty Senate Status of Women’s Committee Proceedings 2011-12

The committee met three times since the end of 2011. The attending members for all three meetings were Dr. Nune Sarkissian and Dr. Armine Darbinyan from Health Sciences Center. Upon recommendation of Joan Shapiro, I became the Chair of the committee, because there was a need to explain to the new members the many accomplishments of Temple University women who participated in this committee in the past. I am very happy to have met two great colleagues through this committee in 2012.

Sadly my term is ending, and I will not be able to join until after one year. Therefore I recommend Nune Sarkissian to be appointed as the new Chair of the committee. A new and interested member’s name was brought up as well. Her first name is Tintin; she is from Neurology. I am planning to get in touch and invite her to join the committee before I leave for summer.

It is my conviction that we need to recruit more effectively, and invite new members to this important committee. Please help us get re-organized and continue our great work.

During our meetings we spoke about many issues. A motion was developed about having another conference in Spring 2013 in order to raise consciousness about women’s need to take vacation time, and return to work “refreshed,” both bodily and mentally.

Some of the conclusions which were brought up by Armine and Nune were as follows:

“Quality work can be accomplished by men and women who have time to take time off for themselves, and their loved ones. The best time to accomplish this task is during “vacation time,” which is a given right of the employee. But fewer individuals decide to use their vacation time. Instead they go on work-related business. The safety and security of the Commonwealth depend on educational opportunities available to its citizens.”

“Vacation time improves life quality.”

“Feeling of guilt has to be eradicated; employers should encourage vacation time usage by their employees.”

“Employees should be encouraged more firmly to take time off. Each fiscal year should begin with the planning of vacation time.”

“A conference can be organized—which will feature a keynote speaker, and a panel. The conference should also tally the attendees’ responses about the necessity and importance of vacation time. This survey should be sent via the list serve to all faculty members, but particularly to women.”

Thank you for your attention,

The Faculty Senate Committee on the Status of Faculty of Color
foc@temple.edu

End of year report 2011-12

The Lectures and Forums Committee awarded the following funds during the 2011-12 academic year:

- Dr. Paul D. Toth - $500 for a lecture by Bill Van Patten
- Dr. Srdjan Weiss - $350 for a lecture by Ms. Sarah Oppenheimer
- Prof. Tracy Cooper - $350 for a lecture by Dr Bronwen Wilson
- Dr. Naomi Schiller - $500 for a panel discussion with Dr. Andrew Mendelson and Dr. Patrick Murphy
- Dr. Robert Blackson - $500 for a panel discussion with James O’Keefe and Chase Whiteside, moderated by Tom Ferrick.
- Dr. Benjamin Seibold - $300 for a lecture by Prof. Michael Shelley.
- Dr. Gerald Silk - $400 for a lecture by Dr. Joan Marter.
- Dr. Karen Palter - $500 for a lecture by Dr. Jeffrey Kahn.
- Dr. Ashley West - $400 for a lecture by Dr. Maryan Ainsworth.
- Ms. Rea Tajiri - $350 for a lecture by Ms. Cathy Crane.
- Dr. Marcia Hall - $500 for a lecture by Prof. Paul Barolsky.

The Committee spent $4650 of an annual budget of $5,000.

Eran Preis, Committee Chair

Faculty Senate Status of Women Report continued on page 9
End of Year Report on President's Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics

The President's Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics met this year to receive extensive reports on Temple student-athletes' academic performance and overall academic progress, NCAA rule changes, facilities updates, in particular Pearson/ McGonigle, and Temple's Academic Progress rates (APR). In addition, the Committee viewed the student-athletes' video submission to the Atlantic 10 conference and a video created under the direction of Betsy Leebron Tutelman entitled “A Day in the Life of a Temple Student Athlete.” (This video was the result of the recommendations made at the President's Town Hall on Intercollegiate Athletics held Spring 2011.) The Committee has undertaken an effort to create a faculty mentor program for each athletic team, under the direction of Erin McNamara and Justin Miller, director of the Student Athlete Academic Advising and Support Center. Faculty members of the Committee are:

Eleanor Myers (Faculty Athletics Representative and Committee Chair)
Lynne Andersson - (2013)
Michael Sachs - (2013)
Michael W. Jackson - (2012)
Tom Marino - (2014)

Committee on the Status of Faculty of Color End of Year Report

Members of FOC participated in the Graduate Symposium in the Fall, and have initiated relationships with IDEAL and TLC.


Forging an on-going relationship with Paul Gluck, General Manager of TUTV, three of our four Chat-in-the-Stacks panels have subsequently aired on the Temple University Television Station.

In previous years, FOC carried over funds for programming and professional development. Funds that had rolled over from the previous year to support an event in honor of Professor Emeritus Sonia Sanchez, recently named Poet Laureate of Philadelphia, were somehow, anonymously absorbed and reallocated, presumably, by the university in response to budget cuts and streamlining. For this reason, that program has been pushed back until further notice.

This year we saw increased enrollment in FOC membership and participation.

Committee on the Status of Faculty of Color:

Kimmika Williams-Witherspoon (SCT), Co-chair
Yasuko Kanno (COE), Co-chair
Sonia Peterson-Lewis (CLA)
Dr. Michael McIntosh (CHP)
Donna Marie Peters (CLA)
Karen M. Turner (SCT)
Michael D. Brown (CHP)
Jackie Tanaka (CST)
Raymond Habbas (CST)
Nikki Keach (CHP)
Rafael Porrata-Doria (Law)
John Street (Advisor)

EPPC Final Report, Academic Year 2011-2012

Members of EPPC: Catherine Schifter, Chair, Alissa Abruzzo and Zach CET-lin student representatives, Suman Batish from Biology, Bruce Conrad from Math, Eli Goldblatt from English, Judith Flaxman from Accounting, Rob Drennan from Risk, Insurance, and HC Management, Nilgun Anadolu-Okur from African American Studies, Keya Sadeghipoor of Engineering and Teresa Soufas of CLA as Dean’s representatives, Karen Turner from Journalism, past president of the Faculty Senate, Chris Dennis, Michele O’Connor, and Peter Jones from the Vice Provost from Undergraduate Studies, Wendy Kutchner, the Registrar, Kathleen Richards from Financial Aid, and Anar Khandvala from Academic Advising.

This committee met 10 times prior to submission of this report, with 2 meetings still scheduled. The committee was regularly updated by Jodi Laufgraben regarding Banner implementation issues, including asking for input on language used in soliciting faculty mid-semester review comments to students, prerequisite checking process/development, and the grading policies. Specific topics discussed this year were:

- National Park Service course credits with Peter Jones
- Academic Calendar with Wendy Kutchner
- Residential Living experiences relative to the academic calendar with Natalie Birdsong
- Online Learning Program and guidelines for online and/or blended courses with Dominique Kliger
- Putting SFF’s online with Peter Jones
- Review of Writing intensive courses with Lori Salem

Issues of the math placement tests with Bruce Conrad

- Diamond Scholars and CARS program with Emily Moer "Sustainability Certificate program with Sandy McDade, Vicki McGarvey, and Lynne Andersson"
- Impact of new financial aid rules/policies on academic programs with Kathleen Richards
- Support for International students being recruited through new initiatives with Eli Goldblatt
- Dismissal Policy with Peter Jones
- Academic Recovery Proposal with Peter Jones
- Distance Learning Guidelines Committee with Catherine Schifter
- Residential Life course for Residential Life advisors with Lucinia Kaliber

- Academic Community Engagement transcripting with Carol Shapiro
- Non-credit technology requirements for Fox School with Vicki McGarvey
- Sophomore seminar review with Michele O'Connor
- Alternative ways to gain college credit (CLEP, other exams) with Michele O’Connor

Minutes of these meetings will be available through the Faculty Senate Website.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine C. Schifter, Chair

2011-2012 GenEd Report

Members: Istvan Varkonyi (Chair), Julie Phillips (Co-Chair), Cynthia Folio, Rickie Sanders, Steven Fleming, William Miller, Mary Ann Gaffney, Peshe Kuniloff, Terry Rey, Thomas Wright, Catherine Schifter, Michael Puppolo (grad. student), James Cooke (undergrad.)

During the academic year the committee was focused on three matters concerning the GenEd Curriculum:

1. GenEd Course Re-Certification
2. Moving GenEd courses to the online learning environment
3. Maintaining fidelity to GenEd policy principles as they pertain to changes in colleges and their resultant effects on GenEd courses
Honoring our Retirees

In recognition of their service and in appreciation of their many contributions to Temple University, we record here the names of those who have or will be retiring during the 2011–2012 academic year.

Niyi F. Akinnaso, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, Anthropology
Philip A. Alperson, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, Philosophy, Professor Emeritus
Saul Axelrod, PhD, College of Education, Curriculum, Instruction, and Technology in Education, Professor Emeritus
Gary Baram, PhD, College of Science and Technology, Computer and Information Sciences, Associate Professor Emeritus
David W. Bartelt, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, Geography and Urban Studies, Professor Emeritus
Joseph Bongiovanni, JD, Fox School of Business and Management, Legal Studies
Brian Butz, PhD, College of Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Professor Emeritus
Ashwin J. Chatwani, MD, School of Medicine, Obstetrics, Gynecology, and Reproductive Sciences, Professor Emeritus
Philip Cho, PhD, Boyer College of Music and Dance, Vocal Studies, Professor Emeritus
Jimmy Collins, PhD, School of Medicine, Biochemistry, Professor Emeritus
Jeffrey M. Cornelius, EdD, Boyer College of Music and Dance, Choral Activities, Professor Emeritus
Alan Cowan, PhD, School of Medicine, Pharmacology, Professor Emeritus
Martha Davis, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, Greek and Roman Classics
Thomas N. Daymont, PhD, Fox School of Business and Management, Human Resource Management
Margaret Devinney, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, French, German, Italian, and Slavic
William J. Donnelly, MFA, School of Communications and Theater, Advertising
Steve Driska, PhD, School of Medicine, Physiology
William C. Dunkelberg, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, Economic, Professor Emeritus
Julia A. Erickson, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, Sociology, Professor Emeritus
Harriet P. Freidenreich, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, History, Professor Emeritus
William Fullard, PhD, College of Education, Psychological Studies in Education, Professor Emeritus
Thomas E. Getzen, PhD, Fox School of Business and Management, Risk, Insurance and Healthcare Management, Professor Emeritus
Thomas E. Hanson, PhD, College of Science and Technology, Biology
Sharon S. Harzenski, JD, Beasley School of Law, Law, Professor Emeritus
Richard Heiberger, PhD, Fox School of Business and Management, Statistics, Professor Emeritus
James W. Hilty, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, History, Professor Emeritus
Philip N. Hineline, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, Psychology, Professor Emeritus
Laurinda B. Hoffer, PhD, College of Health Professions and Social Work, Health Information Management, Associate Professor Emeritus
Giorgio P. Ingargiola, PhD, College of Science and Technology, Computer and Information Sciences, Associate Professor Emeritus
David M. Jacobs, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, History
Luke C. Kahlilch, EdD, Boyer College of Music and Dance, Dance, Professor Emeritus
Susan E. Klepp, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, History, Professor Emeritus
Kenneth Kopecky, PhD, Fox School of Business and Management, Finance, Professor Emeritus
John A. Lent, PhD, School of Communications and Theater, Broadcasting, Telecommunications, and Mass Media, Professor Emeritus
Michael Libonati, JD, Beasley School of Law, Law, Professor Emeritus
Elaine Mackowiak, PhD, School of Pharmacy, Pharmacy Practice, Professor Emeritus
Stephen L. Mikochik, JD, Beasley School of Law, Law, Professor Emeritus
Gary L. Milisark, PhD, College of Health Professions and Social Work, Communication Sciences and Disorders, Associate Professor Emeritus
Stuart Neff, PhD, College of Science and Technology, Biology, Professor Emeritus
Nathaniel Norment, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, African American Studies
Charles T. North, PhD, College of Health Professions and Social Work, Rehabilitation Sciences, Associate Professor Emeritus
Arvind V. Phatak, PhD, Fox School of Business and Management, Strategic Management, Professor Emeritus
Harry Rappaport, PhD, College of Science and Technology, Biology, Professor Emeritus
Paul Rappaport, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, Economics, Associate Professor Emeritus
Ronald N. Rubin, MD, School of Medicine, Medicine, Professor Emeritus
Arthur Schmidt, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, History, Professor Emeritus
John W. Shank, EdD, College of Health Professions and Social Work, Rehabilitation Sciences, Professor Emeritus
George Titus, PhD, Fox School of Business and Management, Strategic Management, Professor Emeritus
Harvey Wedeen, MS, Boyer College of Music and Dance, Keyboard Studies, Professor Emeritus
Eugene J. Whitaker, DMD, Kornberg School of Dentistry, Restorative Dentistry
John R. Williams, PhD, College of Science and Technology, Chemistry, Professor Emeritus
William Woodward, JD, Beasley School of Law, Law, Professor Emeritus
Robert Yantorno, PhD, College of Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Professor Emeritus

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

To the Editor:

As the Artistic Director for the SCT Department of Theater and as the director of our recent production of Charles Smith’s freely adapted stage version of Mark Twain’s 1895 novel, Pudd’nhead Wilson, I am compelled to respond to the article by my esteemed colleague, Dr. Karen Turner, also from SCT, regarding our production, published in the latest edition of the Faculty Herald.

I completely respect Dr. Turner’s personal response to the production, as theater is, after all, an art form and audience members are perfectly entitled to whatever response they genuinely have. Why Dr. Turner (a professor of journalism) felt compelled to air her objections in print rather than engage in a substantive collegial discussion with me personally is, of course her prerogative. Why the Herald chose to publish her remarks nearly two months after the fact without providing me as an artist or my department at large with the opportunity to respond in kind simultaneously is in my view wholly irresponsible from a journalistic perspective.

Playwright Charles Smith is a seasoned, distinguished, nationally celebrated playwright and director, an Associate Artist in residence at the Goodman Theater in Chicago. The play was originally commissioned and produced by the nationally recognized ‘Acting Company’ and toured nationally, playing successfully to general public, college and secondary school audiences across the country.

Dr. Turner’s objections include criticism of the mode of presentation, the portrayal of some of the characters and the use of racially offensive language (taken almost verbatim from the Twain novel), along with objections to some of the story elements which are completely consistent with the novel.

Charles Smith as the playwright/adaptor made creative decisions that were theatrically strategic, intentionally provocative and, in my view, highly effective regarding his insistence on specific racially inverted casting, conflated plot modifications, and the use of character dialects, dialogue and language taken directly from the novel. The directorial theatrical framing device of employing live minstrelsy was not only historically accurate (as was the theatrical concept of ‘black-face’ in the period setting of the story) but intended to theatrically objectify the transparency of racial identity based not solely on skin color but on maternal blood lines—a concern that led Twain to write the novel, as well as his response to the disturbing institution of post-Reconstruction Separate-but-Equal laws in the early 1890’s. Smith’s stage version fabricates an archetypal cautionary “tall tale” set in a fictional southern Missouri town in the 1850’s told by a narrator/raconteur who is also immersed as a character of consequence in the story. Calculated to be theatrically strategic, intentionally provocative and, in my view, highly effective regarding his insistence on specific racially inverted casting, conflated plot modifications, and the use of character dialects, dialogue and language taken directly from the novel.

Charles Smith as the playwright/adaptor made creative decisions that were theatrically strategic, intentionally provocative and, in my view, highly effective regarding his insistence on specific racially inverted casting, conflated plot modifications, and the use of character dialects, dialogue and language taken directly from the novel. The directorial theatrical framing device of employing live minstrelsy was not only historically accurate (as was the theatrical concept of ‘black-face’ in the period setting of the story) but intended to theatrically objectify the transparency of racial identity based not solely on skin color but on maternal blood lines—a concern that led Twain to write the novel, as well as his response to the disturbing institution of post-Reconstruction Separate-but-Equal laws in the early 1890’s. Smith’s stage version fabricates an archetypal cautionary “tall tale” set in a fictional southern Missouri town in the 1850’s told by a narrator/raconteur who is also immersed as a character of consequence in the story. Calculated to be theatrically strategic, intentionally provocative and, in my view, highly effective regarding his insistence on specific racially inverted casting, conflated plot modifications, and the use of character dialects, dialogue and language taken directly from the novel.

Charles Smith as the playwright/adaptor made creative decisions that were theatrically strategic, intentionally provocative and, in my view, highly effective regarding his insistence on specific racially inverted casting, conflated plot modifications, and the use of character dialects, dialogue and language taken directly from the novel. The directorial theatrical framing device of employing live minstrelsy was not only historically accurate (as was the theatrical concept of ‘black-face’ in the period setting of the story) but intended to theatrically objectify the transparency of racial identity based not solely on skin color but on maternal blood lines—a concern that led Twain to write the novel, as well as his response to the disturbing institution of post-Reconstruction Separate-but-Equal laws in the early 1890’s. Smith’s stage version fabricates an archetypal cautionary “tall tale” set in a fictional southern Missouri town in the 1850’s told by a narrator/raconteur who is also immersed as a character of consequence in the story. Calculated to be theatrically strategic, intentionally provocative and, in my view, highly effective regarding his insistence on specific racially inverted casting, conflated plot modifications, and the use of character dialects, dialogue and language taken directly from the novel.

That said, like it or not, the production was the work of our entire department, featuring a faculty- supervised and mentored cast and crew of talented undergraduate students, an MFA student design team, as well as comprehensive team-based production dramaturgy—including an impressive and comprehensive lobby display articulating background research on all of the salient issues surrounding the material—created by our capstone undergraduate World of the Play class). The project provided a terrific comprehensive pedagogical opportunity for our students, and indeed it did encourage a lively and substantive dialogue in the classroom, and among both the production’s participants and many audience members who, by and large, found the experience quite provocative, controversial, and entertaining as well as others, like Dr. Turner, who found it too disturbing or offensive or who just didn’t connect to it and simply found it lacking. To my mind the production succeeded in generating a lively, healthy and open dialogue among those who actually had the chance to see it—as it was largely sold out during its brief 12 performance run in our 85 seat theater.

Regrettably, the production did not work well for Dr. Turner, and, as I stated above, I am certainly sensitive to her concerns and respect and accept her objections, as I am quite sure she is not alone in her negative reaction to the piece. This is, however, an institution of higher learning, and our production program is the hub of our pedagogy. Freedom of artistic expression which includes the ability to take creative risks is paramount to the integrity of the academy, as is the need to preserve and promote the opportunity for open, constructive criticism and debate. The Herald, of all institutions, should uphold these values by providing a stable, journalistically balanced platform for ‘meaningful dialogue.’

Respectfully yours,

Douglas C Wager
Artistic Director and Head of Directing
SCT Department of Theater

The delay in publication of Prof. Turner’s op-ed derived from the Herald’s publication schedule. Our pages are always open to faculty opinion, but we do not contact individuals who might feel criticized by anything in our pages so they can offer a rebuttal. To do so would certainly be an unusual journalistic practice. As we make clear in each issue, we publish letters to the editor between issues, usually within days, as we are doing in this case.

-- The Editor

To the Editor:

My name is Alexander Fraser and I was an actor in Temple’s production of “Pudd’nhead Wilson.” I’m very disappointed with the critique of the show in the current volume of the Faculty Herald. Let me first be up front with my assumption that the choice to run this story during a time when race relations in this country are tense seems quite calculated. I think the choice to publicly disown a production that appears on the surface to be racist reeks of an attempt to polish Temple’s image from possible scrutiny during these troubling times. However, I will admit that that is my own presumption and I cannot prove it.

Karen Turner called our production “outrageous, insulting, and embarrassing” which coincidentally are all fine descriptions of the period of American history depicted on stage. How else can one show the egregious events that faced “banjo players being custom- ing” which coincidentally are all fine descriptions of the period of American history depicted on stage. How else can one show the egregious events that faced “banjo players being custom-

That said, like it or not, the production was the work of our entire department, featuring a faculty- supervised and mentored cast and crew of talented undergraduate students, an MFA student design team, as well as comprehensive team-based production dramaturgy — including an impressive and comprehensive lobby display articulating background research on all of the salient issues surrounding the material — created by our capstone undergraduate World of the Play class). The project provided a terrific comprehensive pedagogical opportunity for our students, and indeed it did encourage a lively and substantive dialogue in the classroom, and among both the production’s participants and many audience members who, by and large, found the experience quite provocative, controversial, and entertaining as well as others, like Dr. Turner, who found it too disturbing or offensive or who just didn’t connect to it and simply found it lacking. To my mind the production succeeded in generating a lively, healthy and open dialogue among those who actually had the chance to see it — as it was largely sold out during its brief 12 performance run in our 85 seat theater.

Regrettably, the production did not work well for Dr. Turner, and, as I stated above, I am certainly sensitive to her concerns and respect and accept her objections, as I am quite sure she is not alone in her negative reaction to the piece. This is, however, an institution of higher learning, and our production program is the hub of our pedagogy. Freedom of artistic expression which includes the ability to take creative risks is paramount to the integrity of the academy, as is the need to preserve and promote the opportunity for open, constructive criticism and debate. The Herald, of all institutions, should uphold these values by providing a stable, journalistically balanced platform for ‘meaningful dialogue.’

Respectfully yours,

Douglas C Wager
Artistic Director and Head of Directing
SCT Department of Theater

The delay in publication of Prof. Turner’s op-ed derived from the Herald’s publication schedule. Our pages are always open to faculty opinion, but we do not contact individuals who might feel criticized by anything in our pages so they can offer a rebuttal. To do so would certainly be an unusual journalistic practice. As we make clear in each issue, we publish letters to the editor between issues, usually within days, as we are doing in this case.

-- The Editor

To the Editor:

My name is Alexander Fraser and I was an actor in Temple’s production of “Pudd’nhead Wilson.” I’m very disappointed with the critique of the show in the current volume of the Faculty Herald. Let me first be up front with my assumption that the choice to run this story during a time when race relations in this country are tense seems quite calculated. I think the choice to publicly disown a production that appears on the surface to be racist reeks of an attempt to polish Temple’s image from possible scrutiny during these troubling times. However, I will admit that that is my own presumption and I cannot prove it.

Karen Turner called our production “outrageous, insulting, and embarrassing” which coincidentally are all fine descriptions of the period of American history depicted on stage. How else can one show the egregious events that took place during the Antebellum Era without including the dirty details of blacks being called “niggers” and “black-faced” banjo players being custom-

As an actor, I would remind Ms. Turner of how disheartening it is to see your work marginalized, in a University wide publication no less, as stereotypical or a “cross between” anything unless those two things were positive. We’re your students and should not feel singled out negatively when working on something that was meant to be collaborative.

My final point is in defense of my director, who as an artist should not be required to explain his work in the event someone may misinterpret it or be offended. Do painters at the Tyler School of Art have to explain themselves on something that was meant to be collaborative.

My final point is in defense of my director, who as an artist should not be required to explain his work in the event someone may misinterpret it or be offended. Do painters at the Tyler School of Art have to explain themselves on something that was meant to be collaborative.

Letters continued on page 9
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to explain themselves if their productions have moments that are overtly sexual or provocative? Why are actors and directors forced to justify their art when what we wanted was to enliven debate?

I believe Ms. Turner desired to see a version of American History that was either edited or strictly academic depicted on stage. I find it ridiculous that I would even have to mention that neither of those versions constitutes art.

I feel obligated to request that if Doug Wager is asked to explain his work his response should be published with equal editorial value as Ms. Turner’s critique.

Sincerely,
Alexander Fraser

Dear David Waldstreicher,

As a student of the School of Communications and Theater and an extremely active member of the Temple University Theater Department, I would like to thank you and Professor Karen Turner for publishing the article: "Pudd'nhead Wilson: a Botched Opportunity to Engage Our Community in a Meaningful Race Dialogue." I, and many members of the theatrical community, embrace her response as a treasured opinion and an inspiring reminder that theater, like any other art, still has the capacity to make audiences question and ponder.

If any of these subjects conflict with Professor Turner's definition of what is "appropriate" for art, she may want to refrain from seeing the production, as the students of Temple Theaters wouldn't want to cause her any more alarm or upset than we already have inflicted.

If you or Professor Turner have any further questions about the art produced at Temple Theaters, I can speak comfortably for my colleagues in saying that we as a collective invite you to reach out to us for intellectual discussion.

Sincerely,
Candace Shirk
Theater Student, Top Girls ASM

To the Editor:

In her critique of Temple Theater’s production of “Pudd'nhead Wilson,” Professor Karen Turner articulates exactly what she found offensive and inappropriate in the production. In recent letter’s to the editor, colleagues in theater have defended another perspective, arguing that the play intentionally provokes this response, demanding that we wrestle with the historical and social wrongs depicted.

What has been lost in the debate is Turner’s argument that the play provided an opportunity to engage the campus community in a meaningful discussion of race. She suggests a series of questions that might have been entertained by performers, staff and audience at the conclusion of each performance. “Why was there a blatant use of stereotypes and offensive language”, for one? As Director Doug Wager notes, the things that most offended in the play were intentional decisions made by the playwright. There was a window here to have an unsettling, inconclusive and rich discussion of “Why?” There are colleagues on campus – in TLC, IDEAL, HR, African American Studies, and History to name a few --who are well-equipped to facilitate these dialogues.

As a Philadelphia theater-goer, I love the occasional “talk back.” Instead of analyzing the play over drinks with friends, I get the benefit of the director’s and actors’ ideas. This particular play, performed in an educational institution, was the perfect opportunity for that theater tradition. I suspect some of us would have left convinced it was inappropriate and irredeemably offensive. Some of us would have left convinced that it was a valuable provocation. Some of us would have left uncertain about where we stand. Piaget argues that we learn from “disequilibrium and discrepancy,” the challenge of accommodating new phenomenon and new ideas. It would be worth structuring formal opportunities for such perspective sharing in the future.

Pamela E. Barnett, Ph.D.
Associate Vice Provost & Director
Teaching & Learning Center
Graduate Faculty, Psychological Studies in Education

Faculty Senate Status of Women’s Committee Proceedings 2011-12

The committee decided to create some sample questions for the survey, such as:

- Do you think vacation time is important for you?
- How important is it?
- If you think it is important, what should the role of the administration be in implementing this right?
- How often do you take vacation time?
- Do you use it at intervals?
- State some of the reasons you take vacation time?
- State why you do not or cannot take vacation time?
- Do you believe resting helps restore general health of the individuals?
- Is there anything you want to tell us about your experiences about “taking vacation time?”

The committee will not meet until Fall 2012.

Respectfully submitted
Dr. Nilgun A. Okur, CLA, AAS
University Faculty Senate Minutes, December 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 1:52 PM.

2. Approval of the Minutes:

The minutes of the May 4, 2011 University Faculty Senate meeting were presented for approval. Prior to approval, President LaFollette explained one matter. The minutes presented for approval say that after the vote on the proposed amendment concerning adding librarians to the membership of the Senate, one faculty member said the voting lists for the electronic ballot on constitutional changes should be revised to include librarians. President LaFollette said in the meeting that would be done. That is an accurate report of what transpired at the meeting. However, LaFollette later realized that his statement at the meeting was incorrect, since the change to add librarians had yet to be approved. As a consequence, the voting list was not revised.

With that clarification, the minutes were approved.

3. Presentation by Student Government Officers:

Colin Saltry and Elliot Griffin, the President and Vice President for External Affairs of the Student Government Association, spoke to the Faculty Senate regarding two important student initiatives to occur during the spring term. The first will happen on January 31, 2012, when students from Temple will join students from other state-related universities in Harrisburg to speak with state legislators regarding the importance of Commonwealth support for state-related institutions of higher education. The second event will be a “Cherry and White” day in Harrisburg, set for March 27, 2012, when Temple students along with students from other related universities in Harrisburg will meet with legislators to speak specifically about the importance of state support for Temple. Students participating in these events will be contacting their professors to request excused absence from classes on those days. The SGA expressed the hope that faculty members will be flexible and supportive of these student efforts on the University’s behalf.


Provost Richard Englert began his report by thanking all for a good semester and wishing all a good semester break. There is no additional news out of Harrisburg regarding state appropriations, except that state revenues continue to fall short of projections, enhancing the likelihood of a mid-year cut in appropriations. As reported at the last Representative Senate meeting, the annual capital appropriation has already been reduced by 50%.

Englert expressed condolences to the family to the family of Trevor Sewell (COE emeritus), former Dean of the College of Education, whose son passed away recently.

Englert announced that he will be releasing a White Paper on the general subject of school or college reorganization within the coming week. The White Paper has been in formative stages for some time. Originally it was projected to be released in August, but at the request of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee (FSSC), the Provost delayed its release until after he was able to meet with the FSSC in a retreat. That occurred in October, and the Provost has also met during the fall with the University Deans. The paper he will release contains ideas he has gathered from many sources. The Provost met with the FSSC during the past week to discuss a semi-final draft of the White Paper, and he has invited them to submit written comments to him as well. The final version will be distributed to all faculty electronically, and there will be many avenues for faculty response both during the winter break and next semester.

Englert stressed that the Paper contains many ideas and has many parts. Some of the ideas are already being implemented; others can be accomplished relatively quickly. For those changes that would require approval by the Board of Trustees there is a timeline that calls for formulation of proposals by the end of February, in advance of spring break. Englert will attempt to establish a website address where faculty members may register comments, both signed and anonymous.

One recommendation that need not wait is to commence a search for a new Director of Libraries. That will begin in January. Another that is already under way is to strengthen interconnections between the Library IT staff and facilities and Computer and Information Services. The White Paper also mentions an ongoing project regarding faculty workload, which is being studied by a Presidential task force, and the distribution of teaching assistants, which is being addressed by Senior Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Education Ken Blank. These are sure to be controversial topics.

The White Paper is built on three main guiding principles: 1) improving the quality of the student experience; 2) streamlining administrative processes and services; and 3) positioning the curriculum for the future. The White Paper also discusses some options for possible realignment of schools and colleges, and it considers some revenue enhancement strategies.

The Provost indicated that he is open to meeting with faculty members as individuals or in groups as we go forward with the White Paper’s recommendations.

In the Q&A session that followed, the following matters were among those raised:

•The Provost was asked about the timing of reorganization, given that there is an active search for a new President. Many faculty members expressed concern that we should not rush to judgment, especially on the more fundamental changes being considered. Englert replied that we need to keep moving forward and cannot wait until new senior leadership is in place.

•There were questions about the decision timeline. Englert replied that the timeline for decision necessarily varies depending on the type of decision and what levels of approval are required. Some can be implemented this semester, while others will take longer to develop. It is necessary to strike an appropriate balance between moving too fast and moving too slowly.

•Englert was asked whether he could distinguish between primary options that are most likely to go forward and secondary options that are less likely or less urgent. He responded that it may be premature to do so at this point.
University Faculty Senate Minutes, December 9, 2011
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Some representatives noted that most faculty members have not been part of the discussions to date and hence have no context for evaluating the White Paper. It would be helpful to include specific motivations for specific options, along with specific information about their practical effect on faculty. It would also be helpful to know whether any of the options contemplate reductions in force, increases in workload, consolidation or elimination of academic programs, or other substantial changes affecting faculty. Englert responded that those sorts of implications cannot be fully identified in advance but will emerge as we move forward. He reiterated his intention to meet with the most directly affected faculty members to discuss practical implications as plans develop over the semester.

5. President’s Report

President LaFollette reported on several matters (in addition to consultation regarding the Provost’s White Paper) that have occupied the attention of the FSSC over the fall semester and/or are likely to come before the Senate during the spring. These include the following matters:

• The FSSC has been meeting with the Provost, Senior Vice Provost Peter Jones, and the Student Feedback Forms (SFF) Committee to discuss the proposal the Committee has developed to move to university-wide online administration of SFFs. The FSSC has raised a number of questions and concerns about this proposal. Further consultation is likely during the spring semester, and the matter is likely to require further discussion by the Senate.

• The FSSC has been discussing the issue of Collegial Assembly bylaws, which are supposed to be undergoing revision by each school and college. There has been little progress on this issue, and the FSSC would like to begin moving the process forward.

• There have also been meetings between the FSSC and the General Education Executive Committee (GEEC). This is the year that GenEd is due for a thorough evaluation. The FSSC has authorized the formation of a joint liaison committee with GEEC to ensure that the Senate is involved in and apprised of the process.

President LaFollette invited Senate members to contact him directly if they are aware of other important issues that will need Senate attention during the spring term.

6. Vice President’s Report

Vice President Shapiro reported that her work focuses on the activities of the Senate’s 30+ committees. Several committees, both elected and appointed, have vacancies, and Shapiro is constantly searching for potential new members. One committee that is of particular concern is the Committee on the Status of Women, which is an important committee but is in need of substantial repopulation. The Committee has a new acting chair but needs new members, both female and male.

With David Waldstreicher, Editor of the Faculty Herald, Shapiro is working on a letter that will soon go out to all committee chairs asking for reports on committee activities during the year. Rather than waiting until the end of the year, the Herald will be publishing committee reports as they come in. The aim is to develop a more streamlined and useful committee reporting process.

Shapiro also noted that the Herald plans to put out a special issue devoted to discussion of the Provost’s White Paper. For that purpose, the Herald is soliciting written faculty responses to White Paper suitable for publication in that issue. The hope is that the issue will help to focus faculty discussion and response.

Shapiro concluded her remarks by thanking all faculty members who have volunteered to serve on Senate committees this year. She noted that thanks to the efforts of FSSC member Michael Jackson (STHM) we have begun what we hope will become a tradition of honoring individuals for university service. We need to continue building that tradition of service this spring.

7. Old Business

There was a question on the status of Senate efforts to engage with University administration over the University budget. LaFollette responded that efforts of the Budget Review Committee have been frustrated by difficulty in obtaining detailed information on the current budget. He noted that there are proposals before the Commonwealth General Assembly to make state related universities subject to the Pennsylvania Right to Know Act. In LaFollette’s opinion faculty members should support those measures.

One member raised concerns about the increase in teaching by contingent faculty, coupled with a decrease in teaching by tenured and tenure-track faculty. This is a matter the Senate will need to address.

Other members raised further concerns about on-line administration of SFFs, observing that there do not seem to be adequate plans in place to ensure an acceptably high level of student response, or to develop other means for evaluating teaching. It seems as though we ought not to go forward with university-wide on-line administration until those plans are firmly in place. Senior Vice Provost Jones responded that he and the SFF committee will be scheduling an open meeting concerning the SFF proposal in January, at which committee members will be present to answer faculty questions and concerns. Jones also noted a recent item in the student newspaper stating that students presently feel “disenfranchised” if they happen to be absent during the class in which SFFs are administered. Many students do not take the present system seriously, so there is the possibility that we may actually get better responses with an on-line system. We may also get more insightful written comments if students can compose them on-line.

8. New Business

A member registered concern about difficulties that students are encountering in traveling between the Main Campus and the Health Sciences campus. LaFollette stated that he would follow up on this issue with appropriate administrative staff.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark C. Rahdert
Secretary

For an archive of Faculty Senate Minutes, go to:
http://www.temple.edu/senate/minutes.htm
Audio Recordings of these and other Senate Meetings may be found at:
http://www.temple.edu/senate/Apreso/FacultySenateApresoRecordings.htm
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University Faculty Senate Special Meeting, February 8, 2012
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Attendance
Representative Senators and Officers – 37
Ex-officio – 0
Faculty, Administrators and Guests – 47
Total attendance – 84

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 11:35 a.m.

2. President’s Statement

President LaFollette began the meeting by reading the following statement:

The FSSC has been in conversation with the Provost about this White Paper for many months. Throughout that time, we have asked for concrete proposals to solve concrete problems accompanied by careful, fact filled analyses of these proposals. It is the position of most of us that without a thorough understanding of the short and long term costs and benefits, and the intended and unintended consequences to our mission, our students, and the health of our institution, we cannot choose between nor support any of the proposals in this paper, including the restructuring of schools and colleges.

Most of us would not remodel our kitchens without first evaluating the usefulness of the new design, the cost of the project, and the effect on the market value of our house. We believe that the same principles should apply to any redesign of Temple. Without this kind of analysis, we are simply discussing the re-arrangement of the department chairs and ignoring the iceberg.

We are here today to discuss the question as to whether, beyond failing to support, we should actively oppose, the specific proposal to create a new school for the arts.

This question is complex, and in order to consider it in detail, today’s conversation needs to be a focused discussion. I am, therefore, going to present some fine-structuring for the agenda, and adhere to the timelines therein, and generally conduct the meeting more formally than I usually do.

3. Discussion Agenda

President LaFollette outlined the following agenda for the meeting, set in consultation with the Faculty Senate Steering Committee (FSSC):

11:30-11:45 Introductory remarks
11:45-12:15 Reports from Boyer, SCT, Tyler, and Education
12:15-12:45 Discussion of the proposal to create a combined school for the arts
12:45-1:15 Discussion of the proposals involving the College of Education
1:15-1:45 Discussion of other aspects of the White Paper
1:45-2:30 Formulating a response and possible action

4. Presentations

Boyer

Jeffrey Solow spoke regarding Boyer’s response to the White Paper. The collegial assembly of the Boyer College of Music & Dance held a special meeting on February 1, 2012 to discuss the White Paper. At the meeting two motions were passed unanimously, and their contents were transmitted to the Provost, along with a request to meet with him on the issue. He has responded and a meeting has been scheduled for February 26.

The essential content of the motions was the following:

• In the first motion, the collegial assembly expressed that the Boyer faculty do not agree that the benefits suggested in the White Paper would be achieved through reorganization, nor do they understand the timeline outlined in the Paper. Additionally, the faculty does not understand the reason for such a timeline given the ongoing search for a new president. They want to be sure that any reorganization, if undertaken, does not occur in an untimely way, nor undermine the prerogatives of the new president.

• In the second motion, the collegial assembly concluded that because (1) questions raised by the Paper have yet to be answered, (2) the timeline appears to be recklessly hurried, (3) Boyer faculty concerns expressed to the Provost about two years ago appear to have been forgotten or ignored, and (4) those concerns appear not to have been considered or answered in the White Paper, the Boyer faculty is opposed to the ideas promulgated in in the White Paper regarding a reorganization of programs at Temple University, particularly those centered on the arts.

Additionally, the minutes of the Boyer collegial assembly noted that faculty at Boyer expressed “grave concern” that a group of Boyer faculty had met with the Provost about two years ago “and raised virtually every one of the concerns raised today, yet not one of these concerns has been acknowledged in the White Paper.”

Solow also observed that the Boyer faculty are concerned about what they perceive to be a lack of attention to academic quality issues in the White Paper, an equal lack of attention to potential impact on faculty experience, a lack of inquiry into the current impact of having one Dean serve as head of two distinct arts schools (Boyer and Tyler), and a failure to identify what additional cost savings (if any) could be realized by further consolidation of arts programs.

SCT

Andrew Mendelson presented on behalf of SCT. He observed that chairs of 6 SCT departments met with Dean and Associate Provost Stroker to present a unified set of reasons why those departments believe they should remain united in a distinct school or college, rather than being merged into a larger unit. A letter to that effect has been sent to the Provost. The SCT departments are not opposed to change but believe it can be better accomplished in the existing structure than in a model that involves incorporation into CLA. Since the White Paper gives no financial information, the SCT letter focuses on programmatic concerns. Most SCT programs have characteristics that would make them a poor fit in an integrated arts college, but they would risk a loss of impact if merged into CLA. Their educational models are different from those in nearly all CLA departments, and the disciplinary standards for tenure and promotion also do not fit well with CLA practices. Linkage with Education would make no sense, because of the lack of any disciplinary connection. Rather than merger with another unit, the best option would be to expand SCT programs into a freestanding College of Communications.

Mendelson noted that two SCT departments, Theater and Film and Media Arts, have signified in a separate letter to the Provost that they are interested in exploring closer integration with other arts programs in the University.

Tyler

Stephanie Knopp gave a presentation on behalf of Tyler. Tyler’s faculty has not yet had an opportunity to meet collectively on this issue, either as a collegial assembly or with the Dean. Knopp’s comments are therefore based on conversations she has had with other faculty members at the school.

Tyler welcomes greater collaboration with other arts programs in the Uni-
The faculty are also concerned about the lack of detail in White Paper on many important factors that would bear on the success or failure of a merger. Issues of administration, allocation of space, funding for undergraduate and graduate programs, and myriad other issues that would arise in restructuring have not been addressed. Without knowing the specific financial implications, programmatic implications, and criteria for success or failure, it is difficult to argue either for or against any of the various possibilities that the White Paper outlines.

Education

Ken Thurman, chair of the College of Education’s (COE) collegial assembly, reported that the COE has drafted a response to the White Paper that was unanimously endorsed by the collegial assembly. The COE faculty have scheduled a meeting with the Provost that will take place in the coming week. The COE fails to see how combination with another unit would result in any significant budgetary savings or accomplish any of the other goals set out in the White Paper. The COE currently operates with financial surpluses, and it is in the process of developing and implementing new programs to increase enrollment and enhance efficiency. Consequently, it is not clear what value would be added to the current undertakings by combination with another unit.

As with Tyler, COE programs enjoy strong national reputations and rankings, and it is clear from a review of peer institutions that nearly all of the highly ranked programs nationally are freestanding schools or colleges. Other universities have experimented with combining education with other schools or colleges, and many institutions that have done so have since reverted to freestanding administrative structures. Temple should investigate the experiences of these other institutions before it goes down that same road. Additionally, the COE faculty believe that any decision to undertake fundamental restructuring should be preceded by careful, thorough, and data-supported analysis of the potential costs and benefits. The White Paper does not include that kind of content.

5. Discussion of Art Reorganization

In the discussion of the arts reorganization proposals in the White Paper, the following observations were among those made:

• The White Paper rightly emphasizes the importance of student experience, but it offers no positive arguments for reorganization on that score. Instead it relies almost entirely on an assertion of potential gains in efficiency that are not particularized or quantified.

• There are numerous arts programs at other institutions in the Philadelphia area, and some of them have been combined. For the most part, the experience has not been successful. The best programs in the city are those that have retained an individual identity.

• It is a mistake to view the arts programs at Temple as interchangeable, fungible, and moveable units – as so much “chum” that can be indiscriminately “spread on a Temple sea.”

• Temple should be studying the results of recent program mergers, such as the recent merger of Social Work into the College of Allied Health Programs. In many ways that merger has worked out, but there were some real costs, such as Social Work’s loss of an individual academic identity, loss of dedicated representation in university matters, loss of a unique faculty listserv, and the like. Before we embark on new reorganization ventures we should take time to learn from our own past experience.

• The positions taken at Boyer represent the views of some, but not necessarily all faculty members. There are other Boyer faculty who hold an opposing view, some of whom were unable to attend the meeting at which the Boyer motions were discussed.

• The issue of merger was considered and discussed at length by SCT faculty a year ago, and the faculty came up with detailed responses supporting the view that it was not a good idea. The issue seemed to disappear after that. It is surprising the White Paper neither mentions nor responds to the matters that were raised in that earlier discussion.

• Theater, as well as Film and Media Arts, are in a different posture from other SCT departments. Their needs would support a bottom-up, rather than top-down discussion of what form of organization would best serve their programs. One good possibility would be to form a separate new school of Theater, Film, and Media Arts. Faculty in those departments share many of the concerns that have been raised about the White Paper’s lack of supporting detail, but current arrangements have created significant barriers for successful development of these programs.

• Tyler was also approached about merger in the past, approximately 3 years ago, and it gave a detailed response at that time. Tyler faculty were interested in developing some type of umbrella structure to coordinate arts programs at the university and enhance their visibility, but they were opposed to merger. As with SCT, there was neither a response from the central administration nor any further discussion.

• There should be careful consideration of the nature of the arts. Artistic expression has many different definitions and venues, so it would be a mistake to assume that all programs can be lumped into a single model. Diversity is critically important in the arts, and it is supported by allowing diversity in programs, method, and instruction.

• The White Paper sets out an extremely tight timeline for decisions that fails to allow adequate opportunity for deliberation and planning. The danger is that we will embark on major change without knowing what we are doing or why we are doing it, and without any measures to determine success or failure. That approach risks a reshuffling of “academic chum” that produces few discernible benefits but risks sustained loss in educational quality.

• The White Paper has an appendix listing schools that have merged arts programs. The implication is that they represent a positive model. But there has been no inquiry to determine why those programs have been structured that way or whether the structure is a success. Faculty at Boyer who have served in other schools organized on those lines report that Deans always tend to emphasize one set of arts programs (usually the one the Dean hails from) to the detriment of all the others.

• Several years ago the Dance department was merged into Boyer. No one seems to have studied that merger to see what worked and what didn’t. We should examine our own experience with reorganization before acting on the current proposals.
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6. Discussion of Education Reorganization

The meeting turned to discussion of the White Paper proposals regarding reorganization of education. The following observations were among those submitted:

• To the extent the White Paper offers criteria for reorganization, it identifies three categories: excellence, efficiency, and economy.

Every specific proposal should be tested against those criteria. But the White Paper does not do that. Instead, the sole mover seems to be economy. The administration should be obliged to justify any move on the basis of all three factors. In turn, those factors should be measured in terms of impact on both schools or departments being moved, and schools and departments that receive them. There is no indication that is being done. For example, most faculty in CLA seem entirely unaware that merger with COE is being contemplated.

• The White Paper fails to consider many issues in CLA that could pose barriers to a successful merger with COE. CLA is very big and spread out as it is. Its administration is already stretched too thin. It has financial issues, concerns with the number of NTT appointments, battles over tenure-track appointments, and a range of other knotty internal issues. Adding new layers of complexity through merger would compound the existing challenges.

• The Department of Environmental Design, housed at Ambler, was merged into CLA 2 years ago. The experience has been unsatisfactory on several fronts. The main problem is that Environmental Design’s needs get very little attention from the CLA administration, yet the program lacks autonomy to attend to them on its own. In fact, administrative staff at CLA are often unaware that they have any responsibility for the program. The move has also cut the department off from its prior connections to other faculty and programs at Ambler. It is another internal lesson on the difficulties of accomplishing a successful merger.

• Reorganizations tend to erode the faculty and staff on the front lines, interfering with their sense of connection, their desire for high performance, and their sense of empowerment. Centralization of authority inevitably leads to centralization of resources, diverting them from the base to the administrative center. Reallocation of resources to individual schools, with the autonomy to set their own destinies, could produce fascinating possibilities. The White Paper seems to be pushing things in the wrong direction.

• The White Paper focuses on restructuring the University’s tendency to multiply layers of administration and create distance between faculty and executive decision makers. There is a danger that any efficiencies realized at one level will be offset (or more than offset) by new costs at another.

• There are departments at the University that have been “reorganized” multiple times, with various successive college affiliations. With rare exceptions, the changes have been harmful. They usually entail a loss of identity and a “loss of way” for the affected programs and faculty. If mergers occur, someone should commit to protecting the merged departments, whose resources are at risk of being plundered by their assigned merger partner(s), and whose needs are at risk of being ignored. Temple almost never puts those kinds of protection in place.

• It’s a mistake to think that organizational structures produce collaboration or interdisciplinary exchange. That happens at a personal faculty-to-faculty level. It also cannot be planned. It depends on the development of a personal connection.

• The White Paper view of arts leaves some things out—e.g., poetry and creative writing. The point is that any administrative structuring scheme will necessarily be artificial and incomplete.

• The merger of Dance with Boyer illustrates the kind of merger mistake that can be made. In terms of facilities, what dancers need most is positive dance space, but in the merger their space needs were neglected. Music, on the other hand, needs rehearsal space, but this too was shortchanged. The problem is that an administrator a few square feet here or there seems of minor moment, when to the student and instructor it can prove to be critical. Opera and Theater need space for sets. These things all cost money. If merger came with an infusion of new funds, everyone would be in favor of it. But if it is done on a financial shoestring aimed at budgetary reduction there are bound to be educational losses.

7. Discussion of White Paper in General

The meeting turned to a more general discussion of the White Paper, during which the following observations were offered:

• One source of legislative resistance to funding state-related universities appears to be tied to their exemptions from state laws regarding disclosure. Nondisclosure of salaries is a particular source of irritation. If disclosure rules were changed, the university might meet less resistance to its requests for financial support.

• To the extent the White Paper is motivated by funding issues, it is difficult to assess because of the lack of transparency at the University regarding the contents of its budget. It is impossible to draw connections between budgetary strains and what is being proposed.

• Presumably, the Board of Trustees has access to detailed budget information that we cannot access. Our lack of information makes it difficult to respond to the White Paper in any way that has a chance of being heard.

• We should not assume that the White Paper is driven by budget constraints. Rather, we should take it at its word that academic excel-
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It is unclear who is the prime mover behind the White Paper – the University administration or the Board of Trustees. It may be that the Board is really pushing this discussion.

Reorganization is likely to have an impact on the reaccreditation of academic programs, yet the White Paper does not consider this issue.

The reorganization issue has been under discussion in the FSSC since last summer. The FSSC has repeatedly asked for criteria and has stressed that the case for reorganization should be made in terms of academic progress, not just money. The FSSC has also maintained that any monetary savings are unlikely to be substantial. The FSSC was repeatedly assured that the push toward reorganization is motivated by a desire for academic excellence, not just monetary savings. Yet there has been no effort to demonstrate any academic advantages to the proposals. This has produced suspicion that the real driving force behind the proposals is not being disclosed.

The timing of this proposal seems very odd given the vacuum of academic leadership at present. It seems as though whoever will be leading the University next year ought to have a voice in the process. The fact that the decision is being pushed now makes it feel as though the decision has already been taken, despite assurances to the contrary from the Provost.

The Board of Trustees is likely to be more influenced by students and alumni than by faculty. The most directly affected schools should mobilize their students and alumni to weigh in on the reorganization proposals.

In light of actual and pending cuts in state appropriation, devoting so much attention to reorganization seems to be a huge mistake. The administration either has plans for budget cuts in the works or it doesn’t. If it doesn’t that is a sad commentary on our leadership. If it does, it should be sharing the particulars with the faculty. If it resists doing so, the Faculty Senate should be making a strong statement about it. We should also support making explicit budget information public.

Resolved: The Faculty Senate of Temple University cannot support the proposals involving the restructuring of existing schools or colleges, or the creation of new schools or colleges, which appear in the Provost’s recently presented White Paper, without a cost-benefit analysis and an analysis of the effects of any proposed restructuring on Temple’s mission, our students, our faculty, our reputation, and the impact on the University in general.

After further discussion and a call of the question, the resolution was approved unanimously.

9. Old and New Business

Since this was a special Faculty Senate meeting, there was no consideration of old or new business.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark C. Rahdert
Secretary

Representative Faculty Senate Meeting, March 16, 2012

Attendance:

Representative Senators and Officers: 50
Ex officio: 1
Faculty, Administrators and Guests: 17
Total Attendance: 68

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:47 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the February 21, 2012 Representative Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

3. President’s Report

President LaFollette reported that shortly before Spring Break, members of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee (FSSC) and the Budget Review Committee met with various University administrators and Deans on the University budget and state appropriations issues. LaFollette noted that the Provost has sent an announcement to all faculty regarding on-line administration of Student Feedback Forms (SFFs), the President has released a draft faculty workload policy, and the Provost has released a memorandum detailing further developments emanating from the White Paper on reorganization. To maximize opportunity for discussion, after a brief report from the Vice President, the bulk of the meeting will be devoted to exchange with Provost Englert regarding these developments. Since the SFF matter has been previously discussed at some length, LaFollette recommended that exchange with the Provost concentrate on the workload and reorganization issues.

4. Vice President’s Report

Vice President Shapiro began by stressing the need, especially during times of transition and rapid change, for faculty members to have a meaningful voice in setting the direction of the University. Temple’s recent history has involved faculty ceding many matters to the University administration, probably because of increasing demands for teaching and scholarship. The effect has been to create a void that has been filled by administrators. To reverse this trend, we need to work, among other things, on repopulating and reactivating Faculty Senate committees. To do this effectively, Representative Senators need to identify and personally contact individuals in their schools and colleges whose talents and interests make them well suited to serve on particular University committees. We also need to approach less
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experienced colleagues and convince them of the personal and institutional value of University service. An updated list of committee vacancies has been distributed with the agenda. It has also been sent out by email.

Shapiro urged Representative Senators to place the list on their faculty listserves, and to do whatever they can personally to encourage volunteers. For elected committees, there is a tight timeline, since statements of interest and CV’s or biographical statements must be submitted by March 20 in order to be in time for placement on the ballot. Faculty should bear in mind that participation on these committees both supports the University’s mission and contributes to achieving its strategic plan.

Englert has accepted the recommendation of the SFF Committee to move to SFFs. Responses are due by April 8.

The President has circulated a proposed statement on faculty workload. The document has been distributed to all faculty members. It is also available on the website of the Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. A link has been previously distributed. No other nominations were submitted by the deadline set for officer nominations, so the Nominating Committee’s nominees will be the candidates that appear on the ballot.

5. Provost’s Report

Budget and Appropriations

Provost Richard Englert began his report with an update on the University budget and state appropriations. The Governor has proposed a 30% reduction in appropriations, which amounts to a $42 million cut. This is on top of a projected gap of $38 million between revenues and expenditures, producing an overall revenue gap, if the Governor’s recommendation is adopted, of approximately $80 million. Filling that gap will require striking a balance between tuition increases and reductions in expenditures. The University is actively pressing the state legislature to restore some of the proposed cuts in funding. University representatives have met with House and Senate appropriation committees, and the sessions were essentially sympathetic to the needs of higher education. In his testimony, Englert stressed several items recommended by the FSSC, including 1) that Temple has a high number of first-generation college students, 2) that the University has been a model for cost containment among institutions of higher education, and 3) that our principal concern in asking for support is not for ourselves but for our students. Englert reported that appropriations committee members, while sympathetic to higher education, made it clear they think it is important that faculty members “share the pain” of budget cuts; he assured them that is the case.

Englert observed that the budget process is a long one, and he urged faculty members to continue to use TALON and any personal contacts they may have to urge legislative support for higher education funding. Englert also noted that the Governor has formed a commission on post-secondary education. It will look not only at higher education, but at other forms of post-secondary training. The commission report is expected sometime this spring.

Englert will be meeting with Deans of each school and college to discuss specific implications of the budget cuts for each academic unit.

Faculty Workload

The President has circulated a proposed statement on faculty workload. The document has been distributed to all faculty members. It is also available on the website of the Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. A link has been created to receive faculty comments, which can be either signed or anonymous. Responses are due by April 8.

SFFs

Englert has accepted the recommendation of the SFF Committee to move to university-wide on-line administration of SFF forms. However, he has decided to delay implementation until Summer 2012. Having the first adminis-
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• Englebert was asked about the statement near the end of the Report calling for streamlining faculty governance. Did he have any specific changes in mind? Englebert replied that he did not have a specific set of proposals, but rather wanted a careful evaluation of the best use of faculty time and energy. Noting that faculty time spent on governance is not being spent on other matters, he raised the possibility that we might have fewer FSSC members, a more streamlined committee structure. Similar attention to streamlining governance ought to be occurring within schools and colleges. The report formally asks the FSSC to look into these issues.

• One member suggested that a way to streamline governance would be to have fewer faculty “town meetings.” Another noted that faculty time devoted to governance is over and above the time we all give to teaching, research and scholarship.

• It was observed that the creation of a new administrative superstructure for the arts will probably lead to a proliferation of administrative positions, given Temple’s past practices, and that this will eat into any potential savings from reorganization.

• It was also observed that people tend to support particular arts programs, not the arts in general. Englebert responded that the information he has received from Institutional Advancement suggests that the opposite is true.

Englebert was asked how tenure decisions and processes will be handled during the reorganization, especially for faculty who are currently in the tenure pipeline. Englebert responded that these are among the most important issues that will have to be addressed, and he agreed that it is important to safeguard the legitimate expectations of current tenure-track faculty.

• It was observed that NTT faculty have not been participants in discussions, regarding either workload issues or SFFs, and that their views need to be incorporated into the process. Several faculty members noted that some of the workload guidelines applicable to NTTs seem inconsistent with the actual reality of what NTTs actually do at Temple. Englebert replied that the proposed guidelines substantially track the TAUP contract, and that Deans will continue to have discretion over faculty workload matters. Regarding workload, some faculty observed that it would be helpful to faculty to know the range of issues that were considered by the task force. Englebert responded that it was up to the task force to decide what information to share about its deliberations.

• Englebert was asked why specific proposals regarding reorganization had been sent only to particular schools and colleges. Englebert replied that he has no objection to other faculty seeing those documents. He sent them to the faculties he thought were most directly interested.

• Asked for particulars about cost savings from reorganization, Englebert replied that the issue is covered in the specific proposals that went out to particular schools and colleges.

• It was noted that some of the changes contemplated by the proposed reorganizations may require bargaining with TAUP. Englebert replied that this might be the case, but we are still a “long way” from reaching any such issues.

Some faculty members expressed concern that the statement in the Provost’s report regarding service could be read to downgrade the importance of faculty service to the University. Englebert responded that we should all affirm the value of shared governance, but that is not inconsistent with a desire to do things better. We need to be more efficient and strategic. Englebert stressed that in his view nothing in any of the documents should be interpreted to say that faculty do not work hard, or that they should be working harder. The question is rather how best to direct faculty energies and how to get the most benefit from them. He also noted that the workload guidelines have been posted for comment, and that individual faculty members may comment on them up to April 13.

6. Old Business

Frank Friedman (CST) reminded the Senate that the Faculty Herald review board is still looking for a new editor.

7. New Business

None.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark C. Rahdert
Secretary

Faculty Herald Staff

Faculty Senate Editorial Board 2011–2012
David Waldstreicher, Editor, College of Liberal Arts
Kimie Lawson, Assistant Editor, College of Liberal Arts
Frank Friedman, Chair, College of Science and Technology
Jo-An Moore, Tyler School of Art
Richard Ordenker, College of Liberal Arts
Michael Sirover, School of Medicine
Gregory Urwin, College of Liberal Arts
David Watt, College of Liberal Arts
William Woodward, School of Law (on leave)
Rebecca Alpert, College of Liberal Arts
Philip Yannella, College of Liberal Arts

Faculty Senate Steering Committee 2011–2012
Paul LaFollette, President, College of Science and Technology
Joan P. Shapiro, Vice President, College of Education
Mark C. Rahdert, Secretary, Beasley School of Law
Karen M. Turner, Past-President, School of Communications and Theater
Charles Jungreis, School of Medicine
Bruce Rader (Alternate), Fox School of Business and Management
Nora Alter, School of Communications and Theater
Doug Wager (Alternate), School of Communications and Theater
Joseph Schwartz, College of Liberal Arts
Adam Davey, College of Health Professions and Social Work
Joan Delalic, College of Engineering
Deborah Howe, School of Environmental Design
Michael Jackson, School of Tourism and Hospitality Management
Tricia S. Jones, College of Education
Stephanie Knopp, Tyler School of Art
Michael Jacobs, School of Pharmacy
Jim Korsh, College of Science and Technology
Nima Patel (Alternate), School of Pharmacy
Laurie MacPhail, Kornberg School of Dentistry
Jeffrey Solow, Boyer College of Music and Dance

Faculty Herald

Secretary

Mark C. Rahdert
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