From the Editor

This is my last of my twenty-two issues (!) as editor of the Faculty Herald and I have a few thank-yous that need saying:

--To Lewis Gordon, my predecessor: thanks for your vision, your example, your brilliance, and your confidence in us. We were graced by your presence. Zei gezunt.

--To Steve Newman, my successor: already running while receiving the baton, I more than suspect you will make a good thing better.

--To Aaron Sullivan and Kime Lawson, hired as assistant editors to handle technology beyond my capabilities: they proved to be excellent editors and writers who improved every issue of this publication.

--To the Faculty Herald Editorial Board and especially its chair, Frank Friedman: for wise counsel and never ducking a tough question.

--To the provosts and my dean for making it possible for me to do this job, and my department for not objecting, either.

--To the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, 2008-12, for its unstinting support and appreciation— but more even for modeling collegiality and collective intelligence in its deliberations. More than anything else during the last four and a half years, this group made has made me proud to be a member of the Temple faculty.

Great Teachers Awards at Temple: Surveying Womens’ Success

In celebration of the receipt of Great Teachers awards by three women faculty members, the Committee on Status of Women Faculty at Temple University developed a survey intended to bring out the nature and reasons for their successes. The Herald is delighted to publish their responses.

Joan Poliner Shapiro, Professor, Educational Leadership

1. What classes have you taught over the past 2 years (if applicable)?
   Gender Issues in Education and Ethical Educational Leadership

2. What is your research focus (if applicable)?
   My scholarship works well together with my teaching. Having co-directed the Women’s Studies Program at Penn, for a number of years, I still have a deep interest in gender issues. But over time, I have expanded my work to include not only women’s and girls’ studies, but also men’s and boys’ studies. I co-authored a book, with Alice Ginsberg and Shirley Brown, entitled Gender in Urban Education: Strategies for Student Achievement, published by Heinemann, and I try to keep up my scholarship in this area.

   Ethics is a very special topic of my work. Years ago,

Joan Shapiro

On Responsibility Centered Budgeting, a.k.a. Revenue Centered Management, at Temple

In light of Provost Dai’s presentation on the move to Responsibility Centered Budgeting at the last Faculty Senate Meeting, we decided to ask several faculty members who have expressed an interest in, or had some background thinking about, this model for their reflections on its possibilities for Temple. Perspectives from Terry Halbert, Forrest Huffman, Douglas Wagner, and Jonathan A. Scott are included in this article.

Terry Halbert, Professor of Legal Studies, FSB

Our university will begin a multi-year process of transitioning to a new budget system. Temple’s appropriation from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has been shrinking. The number of high school graduates from the regions where Temple recruits has been decreasing. These pressures threaten the university’s central “access to excellence” mission. We are moving to a new budget model in order to deal with that pressure, and to sustain our ability to provide high-quality education at an affordable price.

Under a decentralized budget model, the schools and colleges will receive the tuition revenue they generate and from that revenue pay both direct expenses (faculty/staff

Terry Halbert
Report of the CLA Ad Hoc Interdisciplinary Studies Committee

This Report of the CLA Ad Hoc Interdisciplinary Studies Committee assesses the impact of changes made in the status of five separate programs after one full year: American Studies, Asian Studies, Jewish Studies, Latin American Studies, and Women's Studies/LGBT Studies. It was submitted to the Dean of CLA and the CLA Executive Committee in April 2012. In October 2012, the Executive Committee included the report for discussion at the Collegial Assembly, when it was made available to all CLA Faculty. The Report is reproduced here in full.

Report of the Ad Hoc Interdisciplinary Studies Committee
College of Liberal Arts
Temple University
21 April 2012

Committee Members:
Rebecca Alpert, Religion
Julia Ericksen, Sociology
Robin Kolodny, Political Science
Peter Logan, English (Chair)
Charles Weitz, Anthropology
Gabe Wettach, English

1. Introduction
a. On April 7, 2011, the College of Liberal Arts announced its decision to integrate five independent interdisciplinary studies programs into existing departments: American Studies merged into English, Latin American Studies into History, Jewish Studies into Religion, Asian Studies into Critical Languages, and Women's and LGBT Studies into Sociology. Directors for all of the programs lost the release time and/or stipends associated with those positions. Two full-time staff positions charged with administering the curricular and other needs for the programs were retained. In response, one program director immediately quit, some undergraduate students staged protests, an unflattering article appeared nationally in Inside Higher Education, and members of the faculty objected at the following Collegial Assembly.

b. To address this situation, Dean Soufas and the CLA Executive Committee formed the Ad Hoc Committee to advise the Dean on the reorganization and to assess its academic impact on the five programs and the departments with which they were matched. The members of the Committee agreed to serve at the request of the Dean and appointed Prof. Logan as chair. The Committee began meeting in April 2011 and continued to meet over the next twelve months.

c. In August, the Committee met with the Dean to discuss her planned statement detailing the formal relationship between each program and its new receiving department. This was a productive meeting leading to a consensus with one exception: the Committee believed that program directors needed release time to manage their responsibilities, while the Dean believed they did not.

d. To evaluate the effect of the changes, the Committee reviewed data on all five programs. In Fall 2011, we interviewed the past directors for all five programs, the current directors for four out of five programs, the chairs of the five receiving departments, and other people. On December 9, 2011, the Committee met with Dean Soufas to discuss our questions. On February 8, 2012, the Committee gave a report on its progress to the Dean and the CLA Executive Committee.

e. In the following report, the Committee provides basic information characterizing the individual programs. It summarizes its findings on the effects of the changes on the five programs. And it makes general recommenda-

Where Global Becomes Local: the Global Temple Conference

By Kime Lawson, Assistant Editor

Intentionally coinciding with the Department of State and the Department of Education’s "International Education Week," the Seventh Annual Global Temple Conference hosted around six hundred at the Howard Gittis Student Center on November 14th. Nearly 125 Temple faculty and students displayed their cutting-edge international initiatives in teaching, learning and research to largely positive reviews from the attendees.

The Hon. Peter S. Watson kicked off the conference, assessing by continent the international policy challenges the Obama administration will face in the next four years in his keynote address, "President Obama's Greatest Global Challenge." Watson's plenary covered the all-too-familiar players in American strategic discussions like Iran and China, but added that the State Department needs to focus on long-term goals in places where US leadership has been eroding, like Asia and the Pacific. After the convocation, the conference broke out into a full day of panel discussions, documentaries, presentations and roundtables.

Teachers familiar with interdisciplinary approaches often stress the concept of cross-cultural competency to students, and the idea is central to Temple curricular programs like Gen Ed. Yet there is no real professional scale to measure a student's progress. Dr. Janice Laurence from Adult and Organizational Development, with Nicole Pumphrey and ChiT Tironi, presented their research on developing and implementing a scale to quantify students' cross-cultural competency in "Global Competence: Through the Looking Glass (and What Students Found There)." Understanding an unfamiliar culture is one thing, but being able to perform a culture is an entirely different experience. Measuring understanding with performance together within one analytical metric had not been done. Dr. Laurence, whose specialty is in organizational psychology, has piloted a theoretical framework and designed a scale to account for both sides. Working with Dr. Laurence, Pumphrey (International Programs) and Tironi (Full-time MBA Programs) led a year-long study among forty Fox Business School students, for the purposes of increasing cross-cultural competency in their study abroad programs and building networking skills in their local MBA program. Their testing, based on a 360˚feedback model, tracked significant changes in students' performance over eight separate competencies and promises to be a baseline for more ground-breaking research.

Another panel, "Perspectives on Internationalized Education," addressed the pedagogical and cultural challenges international students may face at Temple. Elvis Wagner of Teaching and Learning and Janice Duenas-McKnight from the International Teaching Assistant Program each discussed the added cultural work International Teaching Assistants (ITAs) must do to become attuned to teaching in American classrooms. Most of Temple's ITAs have to master the various tropes of American college classroom culture in mere weeks. About 75 incoming ITAs face this problem each fall semester. Without a scale to measure cross-cultural competency, the ITA program can rely only on TOEFL scores to judge an incoming ITA's initial classroom proficiency. To train ITAs in skills that TOEFL cannot quantify, the International Teaching Assistant Program runs a training course (ITA 5221) to assist ITAs in learning the nuances of American classroom culture. ITA 5221 focuses on building classroom tools like improvisational discussion or using practical classroom technology like Blackboard, while also familiarizing ITAs with expected classroom norms. All ITAs must test out or take ITA 5221, while no additional test or course is required to evaluate native English speaking teaching assistants. Two other presenters in this panel, Benhee Lee and Lina Je, also highlighted different sides of the experiences of Korean students in the United States and studying abroad. Benhee Lee, a Ph.D. candidate from Psychological Studies in Education, introduced her research investigating the motivations of Korean college students choosing to study in the United States from an expectancy-value perspective that explores students' expectations of future value while framing students' motivations within their native cultural contexts. Lina Je,
American Studies at Temple?

By Philip R. Yannella and Miles Orvell

Note: Following the reorganization of interdisciplinary programs in Spring 2011 by CLA Dean Teresa Soufas, many of our colleagues have continued to ask about the situation with American Studies. The Program has continued to offer courses and to serve its remaining majors and minors. But in May, 2012, we proposed to the Dean that it be terminated. On October 1, 2012, we responded to the Dean’s request that we write a formal termination memo (see below for a slightly redacted version of what we submitted). Since then, we were called once to meet with the Dean and the Chair and Undergraduate Chair of English to discuss alternatives to termination. Recently, the Dean’s ad hoc committee examining the reorganization published its report (see elsewhere in this issue of the Faculty Herald – The Editor). That report also included recommendations.

Miles Orvell, Professor of English and American Studies
Philip R. Yannella, Professor of English and American Studies

BACKGROUND: Founded in the early 1970s with a major grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, American Studies at Temple was meant to be a small undergraduate major that stressed interdisciplinarity and the rigorous pursuit of knowledge. It has been noted for its commitment to the teaching of undergraduates, and three or its core instructors (Robert Weinberg, Philip R. Yannella, and Miles Orvell) received Temple Great Teacher Awards. Orvell and Yannella have been continuously involved with the Program, and each of them directed the Program for many years.

Many of the Program’s courses were cross-listed with the Honors Program. Many students who were not majors or minors took two or three American Studies courses as electives. The number of majors in American Studies ranged from a low of 11 to a high of about 40. There were 35 majors in Fall 2004, 34 in Fall 2005, 28 in Fall 2006, 24 in Fall 2007, 26 in Fall 2009, 24 in Fall 2010, and 18 in 2011. While the number of majors declined over these years, the number of credit hours generated by the Program increased, peaked, and then decreased. There were 2550 CHGs in 2004-05, 4279 in 2008-09, 3517 in 2010-11.

In recent years, the proportion of Program teaching done by Presidential Faculty declined significantly. More courses were taught by adjunct faculty, many more by NTT faculty, and fewer by Presidential faculty. Part of the cause of this trend was the increasing unwillingness of Departments to release faculty to American Studies. It also became more difficult – it had never been easy -- to attract Presidential faculty to take up the Program directorship.

REORGANIZATION: In Spring 2011, Dean Soufas reorganized American Studies, announcing that the Program per se would no longer exist, that the major and minor would be folded into the Department of English, that there would no longer be a Director, and that the fulltime faculty in the Program would be constituted as an American Studies Steering Committee with a volunteer to serve as Chair. American Studies was one of several programs to be so reorganized.

AMERICAN STUDIES IN 2011-12: There were significant faculty losses during the year after reorganization. Bryant Simon (History), who was Director from 2005 to the reorganization, declined to participate in American Studies after June 2011. In December 2011, Lisa Rhodes, an NTT faculty member who for several years had been a central figure and mainstay of the Program, resigned from the University. In March 2012, Margaux Cowden, who had served for two years as an NTT with half of her teaching in the Program, announced that she had accepted a position at Williams College. Following the resignations of Rhodes and Cowden, it should be noted, the Dean authorized a search for a fulltime NTT position in American Studies.

In the reorganization, American Studies was described as having been “folded into” the Department of English. Unfortunately, many casual readers and listeners, students and faculty alike, misinterpreted the “folded into” as “folded.” Since the Spring of 2011, Orvell and Yannella have had to attempt to correct the perception of the Program’s death. While American Studies courses continue to run, there have been only a few declarations by majors and minors in the past year or so.

The American Studies Steering Committee was chaired by Orvell from June 2011 to January 2012 and by Yannella from January 2012 to June 2012. In May 2012, Orvell and Yannella were unable to further volunteer as chairs because of their teaching and research obligations. Consequently, administr...
Report of the Ad Hoc Interdisciplinary Studies Committee
Ad Hoc Committee continued from page 2

f. This report concludes the work of the Ad Hoc Interdisciplinary Studies Committee. We want to thank Dean Soufas for her time in meeting with us, and to thank the many members of the staff in the Dean’s office for their complete cooperation in providing us with the information we needed for this investigation.

2. The Five Programs
a. American Studies. The American Studies program at Temple has 15 majors and 3 minors. The number of majors has decreased 20% from last year (18 vs. 15), and enrollments are down 16% (3517 vs. 3045 CHG). The directorship of the program is divided between two faculty members in the English department, Miles Orvell and Phil Yanela, who alternate semesters running the program. The directors have asked to close the program, claiming it is no longer viable. The steering committee has not met on a regular basis and has not offered significant support to the directors (though they have not been asked to do so). One long-standing NTT in the department has resigned and it is unclear who will replace her teaching contributions to the program. There is currently one tenure-track faculty member, Seth Bruggeman, who holds a joint appointment in American Studies and History.

b. Asian Studies. With 40 majors and 12 minors, Asian Studies is the largest of the five programs but has the smallest budget. It continues to grow, up from 37 majors last year. Enrollments are up from last year by 35% (2290 vs. 3081 CHG). The program is run by the program director. Its steering committee rarely met or worked with the director before the transition and this pattern continues under the new system. Asian Studies has approximately 25 affiliated faculty; there are two joint appointment tenure-track faculty members (Roselyn Hsueh, Political Science, and Marcus Bingenheimer, Religion), as well as NTTs with joint appointments.

c. Jewish Studies. Jewish Studies has six majors and is the smallest of the five programs. Course enrollments this year dropped 20% from the year preceding the change (663 vs. 525 CHG). The director, Mark Leuchter, has a productive relationship with an active steering committee. The program has one tenure-track joint appointment shared with History, Lila Berman. It also has one full-time NTT, a position partially funded by a three-year grant.

d. Latin American Studies. Latin American Studies has 22 majors, the same number as last year. Course enrollments have increased 14% this year over last (2564 vs. 2913 CHG). The program is now affiliated with the History Department. Jon Wells, the chair of history, hired adjuncts and finished building the schedule for the current and coming years with the help of undergraduate History advisor Jay Lockenour. Neither has knowledge of Latin American Studies curricular issues or needs. Wells met regularly with Colleen Knapp to go over the budget, and Lockenour handled the advising along with Ron Webb (NTT/former director of LAS). There is no LAS steering committee or director. The Dean asked Hiram Aldarondo (Associate Chair of Spanish and Portuguese, who has one course release) to oversee the LAS Spring Semester Program (LASS) for this year. Aldarondo did this and is also planning the LASS program for 2013 which requires a fair amount of advance planning. The Dean has informed the former members of the Latin American Studies steering committee that if they do not reconstitute and appoint a tenured faculty member as director the program will be closed. There is one assistant professor with a joint appointment in History: Mónica Ricketts.

e. Women’s Studies. The number of Women’s Studies majors has declined one-third from last year (24 vs. 15), but course enrollment has remained almost level, at 96% of last year (2482 vs. 2381 CHG). The program has two tenure-track assistant professors on joint appointments with WS (Judith Levine and Patricia Melzter), and one non-tenure-track assistant professor appointed to the program (Siobhan King). Marsha Cowden, an NTT with a joint appointment in American Studies and LGBT Studies, has left, and her position in LGBT Studies has been eliminated. King will add advising responsibilities for the LGBT minor to her existing duties. Her teaching load, however, will not be increased, as is the case for most NTTs in CLA. The director, Joyce Joyce, notes that, while “the position of steering committee chair is a lot of work, it is possible to do the work” because of the efforts of the Administrator and Coordinator for the five programs. The director states that the faculty members have stopped participating in the WS steering committee. In 2010-11, that committee included seven faculty members, in addition to those with dedicated positions in WS. This year, that number dropped to one. The current director is the only candidate for chair of the English Department next year, and it is unclear who might take over WS if that were needed.

f. LGBT Studies. LGBT Studies is closely tied to Women’s Studies but is in fact a distinct minor program, with five minors. Its courses this year are typically full and enrollments have increased by 50% (177 vs. 264) this year. One NTT held a joint appointment in the program last year, but that position has been eliminated.

3. Summary of Findings
a. Prior to the transitions, none of the five programs were in good condition. They operated predominantly as degree programs for undergraduates without a connected program promoting research in the field by faculty and interested doctoral students, a significant weakness. There is no question that their staffing and funding were, at best, minimal; external reviews for some programs characterized their support as inadequate and called the programs “unsustainable.” Other problems were the use of NTT faculty as program directors, the dependence on other departments for basic curricular offerings, and the instability caused by a dependence on adjunct faculty to offer core courses for the programs.

b. Without exception, both program directors and their receiving department chairs reported favorably on the cooperation between the programs and their new homes. Because of the staff support provided by the Administrator and Coordinator for the programs, the receiving departments did not feel unduly burdened by their new responsibilities. Most chairs expressed discomfort with being responsible for an academic program outside their discipline.

c. The Committee believes that the Dean’s goals have been largely misunderstood as an attempt to eliminate the five programs. The goal of the new administrative structure was to preserve them intact in the face of budgetary retrimmings, rather than eliminating any one of them, and in a financial sense it has succeeded. The elimination of release time and stipends for program directors and the reduction of staff support have both reduced the administrative costs for the continuing programs. Some NTT positions have been eliminated, resulting in further cost savings. If the new administrative structure was meant to strengthen the programs academically, it has not succeeded in its current form. Following the transition, all of the old problems persist, and new problems have now emerged. As a result, all five programs are in a weaker state today than they were one year ago. Four of the five are in such a precarious state of existence that their continuation is itself in question. The problems creating this situation fell under three headings: program administration, curriculum, and joint appointments.

4. Program Administration
a. The most dramatic difficulty is in finding any individuals willing to direct the programs under the new structure.

i. Latin American Studies has been without a director for the entire year and the program is being kept alive by the receiving department’s administrators.

ii. Women’s Studies went without a director for much of the Fall semester, and finding someone willing to take on the responsibility under the new structure required direct intervention by the Dean.

iii. No one was willing to direct American Studies after the transition; instead, two former directors agreed to split the position as a short-term solution and have since requested that the
A New Editor for Faculty Herald
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The Faculty Senate and the faculty as a whole are facing a range of issues, crises, and opportunities. Among the most important are what role faculty will play in deciding how Temple is to preserve its core mission in the face of what is almost certainly going to be decreasing funding from the state. We also need to think through the implications of the report issued in mid-November by Gov. Corbett’s Advisory Commission on Postsecondary Education (click here for a summary). Of course, it’s also important that Temple will soon be welcoming a new president and, before long, a new provost. These administrative changes offer us an opportunity to work together on implementing wisely the new fiscal model that President Theobald will be instituting. This will require frank but respectful discussions on how power and resources are allocated among faculty and administrators. For example, this new model raises the question of what role faculty should play in evaluating deans who will gain power in this decentralized system.

Another topic that will claim the attention of the Senate and The Herald is the administration’s recently unveiled attempt to move chairs out of the collective bargaining unit, which has serious implications for how our departments would function if their attempt is successful.

More broadly, there is the perennial matter of how to balance Temple’s entrepreneurial activity—evaluating and adapting the neighbor. Nasrudin answered, “Because it is the best way to keep high quality education accessible for our students.”

In Innovation, risk taking, and strategic management environment; however that need not be the case. The entrepreneurial aspect of RCM, one might suspect, would result in winners and losers as some schools outcompete others. One might also suspect that business schools might have an upper hand in such an environment; however that need not be the case. Innovation, risk taking, and strategic management of resources need not be solely the province of any particular academic unit. Nonetheless one might ask whether too much success by a single unit under a RCM system might be detrimental to the overall educational objectives of the academy.

Douglaston, 1811, 211

In my pre-Temple incarnation as a professional director, producer and artistic leader, I learned to embrace the notion that vision is destiny; this is the hope of the future. As the new Chair and Artistic Director for the Department of Theater, and FSSC representative of our newly minted Division of Theater, Film and Media Arts (TFMA) under the new Center for the Arts, I am no stranger to change.

Change is uncertain; we live it moment by moment, the hope being that, in retrospect, the tumultuous adventure of change will reveal itself to have been a cycle of positive growth.

Our current situation here at Temple regarding how we have had to react out of necessity to the rigorous financial, administrative and resource challenges reminds me of a Sufi parable I tell my students. A man named Nasrudin one day was outside his house frantically searching for something. A neighbor came upon him and asked “What are you searching for, Mula?” Nasrudin replied, “My key.” “Where did you lose it?” the man replied. “In my house,” said Nasrudin. “Then why are you looking for it out here?” said the neighbor. Nasrudin answered, “Because it is too dark in my house. I fear the darkness.” Fear the darkness and you will never find the key. As an artist, I have learned to embrace the dark; the
I team-taught a course at Penn with Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, a well-known feminist historian, and it focused on ethics and gender. I modified this offering over time, and it has become a required course in our educational leadership doctoral program. With Jacqueline Stefkovich, I wrote a book, called Ethical Leadership and Decision Making in Education, introducing the concept of the Multiple Ethical Paradigms of the ethics of justice, critique, care, and the profession, that is now in its 3rd edition. With my Temple colleague, Steve Gross, I wrote another book that adds his Turbulence Theory to Jackie’s and my framework. This book, Ethical Educational Leadership in Turbulent Times, is now in its 2nd edition. Both books include practitioner cases from the field and are published with Routledge.

3. What do you enjoy most about being a faculty member at Temple?

Currently, I really like getting to know faculty and administrators, from across the university, in my role as President of the Faculty Senate. Members of the Steering Committee of the Senate are amazing individuals willing to give so much to Temple. I am also especially fond of many of the faculty and administrators in the College of Education, whom I have known for a long time. Needless to say, I also truly enjoy my graduate students who are often not only students, but also tend to be educational leaders. They come with such varied backgrounds and truly highlight the diversity of Temple students.

4. What do you do for fun?

Whenever possible, I like to be a Granny, and play with Sophie, age five, and Ben, age eight. Sophie wants to be a kid’s doctor when she grows up, and Ben would like to be a scientist, as he says, like his Grandpa. They are great fun!

I also like to travel, and over the years, my husband, Irving, and I have visited many countries throughout the world. However, I find it so much more enjoyable if we know someone living there who can make our stay memorable. Because Irving and I work with faculty in other countries, our visits frequently combine both work and pleasure and are generally superb!

5. What do you hope to be doing in the next 10 years?

I would like to continue to work on my scholarship. I also want to carry on working with colleagues from all over the world in a movement, started here at Temple, with Steve Gross, called the New DEEL (Democratic Ethical Educational Leadership). This movement, focusing on citizenship and on progressive education, is a growing one. We have colleagues now in over 20 research universities as well as practitioners, writing and developing curriculum related to the New DEEL, throughout the U.S. Additionally, we are part of a consortium of universities in Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Hong Kong and Sweden. Visiting these different countries and being welcomed on diverse campuses has been a superb learning experience.

6. What does this award mean to you?

The Great Teacher Award was one reward I never thought I would receive. It was members of the Faculty Development Committee in the College of Education, who asked me to become a candidate for it. I was honored to be recognized by my colleagues. Probably that meant more to me than anything else, as I know I am in a college of outstanding teachers.

7. In what ways can and/or has this award inspire(d) young female faculty members and students?

Teaching, particularly in K-12 education, has always been a woman’s profession. Unfortunately, many of the leadership roles have gone to men. So, we have had a situation where women teach and men manage. The beauty of this award is that women can win it, and while it focuses on teaching, it is prestigious!

8. What advice do you have for young female faculty members at Temple?

My advice for tenure track faculty is to not see the three pillars of teaching, research/scholarship/creative achievement, and service as separate silos. If you can possibly do this, try to have them dovetail in some way. I know that not every faculty member is able to accomplish this, but it can really make a difference if these areas align. Although service is not recognized as much as it should be, I would ask young women faculty members to spend some time working on committees, hopefully that are of interest. Serving on various committees not only helps the university, but it also assists a faculty member to get known.

As for teaching faculty, needless to say, your focus has to be on instruction, but do try to publish from time to time and serve on committees when you can. I know a great deal is asked of you in regards to teaching, but it is important not to totally ignore scholarship and service so that you can develop a curriculum vitae that may help you for future university positions.

9. How can the status of women at Temple University be improved?

I believe that a woman can’t do everything alone. Women need to help other women move forward. Cooperation rather than competition should be a goal. That is why a group, such as the Status of Women Committee, is invaluable. Sharing concerns and trying to carry out joint problem solving can make a great difference in each of the member’s working and even private life. A support group, providing mentors and offering some meaningful discussions, can assist in making positive differences to the status of women at Temple.

10. What was your most memorable teaching moment?

Recently, I spoke at the University’s Convocation in my role as President of the Faculty Senate. The focus of my talk was diversity. I emphasized the importance of new students speaking to others who are different from themselves, and I discussed the informal learning that could take place in such interactions. In the sea of thousands of “fresh persons,” one student sent me an email. He said that my brief speech had genuinely affected him. The student stated that, because of my presentation, he intends to seek out others who are different from himself, although he knows this effort will be outside of his comfort zone. I could not be more pleased by this wonderful email! It appeared to be a teachable moment, at least for one individual.

Dr. Shohreh Amini, Associate Dean for Graduate Studies & Research

1. What classes have you taught over the past 2 years (if applicable)?
   Virology, Biotechnology

2. What is your research focus (if applicable)?
   Designing therapeutics against viral induced neurological Diseases

3. What do you enjoy most about being a faculty member at Temple?
   Students, specially undergraduate students who are so eager to learn

4. What do you do for fun?
   Walk in the park

5. What do you hope to be doing in the next 10 years?
   Teaching and continuing my research

6. What does this award mean to you?
   It means the world to me. Being awarded for what you enjoy doing is absolutely great. It is an honor.

7. In what ways can and/or has this award inspire(d) young female faculty members and students?
   I have heard from many of my female students that they use me as a role model in their career. This means a lot to me. The same has been true with younger faculty colleagues.

8. What advice do you have for young female faculty members at Temple?
   Stay focused, work hard and have confidence in yourself, and most importantly enjoy teaching/mentoring our fabulous students.


On Responsibility Centered Budgeting, a.k.a. Revenue Centered Management, at Temple

RCB continued from page 5

unknown – the place where your potential for highest creativity exists.

The advent of President Theobald and the implementation of a new University-wide shift to RCB (responsibility centered budgeting)/RCM (revenue centered management) augurs an era of creativity and change unprecedented in the recent history of this esteemed institution of higher learning. After hearing early rumors and then more substantive news of this impending change, and hearing President-Elect Theobald address a faculty assembly, I recently took it upon myself to acquire Edward L. Whalen’s book, Responsibility Centered Budgeting (1991), an insightful, candid, readable and detailed accounting of the basic principles and implementation process of RCB at Indiana University. It actually has energized me. I now think it is a terrific idea for Temple – the caveat being that the root of that word “terrific” refers to “causing great fear; terrifying” ; I also accept the fact that fear, doubt, confusion and resistance frequently accompany change and the exploration of the new.

Any management system can be mismanaged, but RCB/RCM is a powerful idea; it can empower academic leaders of colleges and schools to guarantee that their budgets will follow rather than lead their academic mission. By coupling responsibility with real meaningful and consequential authority, RCB can generate powerful incentives for deans and managers to accomplish their missions in ways that promote institutional objectives, rewarding success and creating strong incentives to think and operate entrepreneurially.

The success of the RCB/RCM model is predicated on the desire of a university to place the full force of its human and financial resource in the service of its academic priorities. The university must establish clear academic priorities and be willing to follow its academic priorities with its budget, not the reverse. It demands that the President and the central university administration effectively coordinate and support the work of all the constituent centers by designing a surgically mindful systemic allocation of available financial resources.

Most importantly RSB/RCM promises to bring critical decision-making power closest to the source; it places it squarely in the hands of those who know best, within each area of academic and professional study, what resources their individual discipline requires in order to enhance the student learning experience, to further research and to serve the community. To quote Whalen on the concept of proximity, “The closer the point of an operating decision is to the point of implementation, the better the decision is likely to be.” This is just one of a sequence of basic concepts endemic to RCB. “People play a better game when they own their own rules.”

Of course the central university administration will assess and tax responsibility centers for necessary general services, student support, facilities usage and the like. But it must combine these revenues with other sources of income/revenue such as state allocations, and other sources and disburse them in support of the academic mission to each constituent responsibility center. It must develop and implement a detailed taxation and reallocation process that is sensitive to the unique cost/revenue profiles of each and every center in support of academic programs that clearly serve the overarching priorities.

To make the budget process truly responsive to and supportive of our academic priorities will require strong, dynamic and visionary leadership – comprehensive vision and mission planning – active and ongoing long range/strategic planning at the university level and most critically, within each responsibility center.

A word of caution: this cannot be achieved overnight – indeed, according to Whalen’s account, it took nearly two years of detailed planning, negotiation, education and careful implementation to finally achieve a fully functioning and productive RCB/RCM climate at Indiana University twenty years ago. We, too, will require strong executive leadership as well as time; Temple deserves the benefit of undertaking a well-managed, guided process of educating faculty and staff; a transparent, methodical and unconditionally inclusive process of planning and implementation leading to a dynamic 21st Century economic operating system that sets an example for the growth of resilient, sustainable world-class quality higher education in America that will remain accessible and affordable to all.

Jonathan A. Scott, Associate Professor of Finance, FSB

When I heard about President Theobald’s decision to move Temple to a decentralized budget model, my first thought was “RCM (Responsibility Center Management) version 2.0.” Back in the mid-1990s, Provost England attempted to launch version 1.0 when I was acting dean of the School of Business and Management. At that time the literature on the subject was sparse, and ironically, my assignment was to speak with the dean of the Kelley School of Business at Indiana University about his RCM experience. I was skeptical of embracing RCM (much to the irritation of the Provost) for two reasons. First, it was not driven from the President’s office; and second, no one provided a convincing explanation for controlling the moral hazard problem of deans acting in their own interest at the University’s expense.

Since that time, a small cottage industry of literature arose around the topic that peaked in the early 2000s. If you undertake this search you will

Where Global Becomes Local: the Global Temple Conference
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an undergraduate Communication Sciences major, shared her learning experiences from studying abroad two different summers in Korea as a second generation Korean American. She discovered that her parent's homeland was not as familiar as she had assumed it would be, but expressed joy about being able to encounter it for herself and with friends through Temple's Education Abroad.

For the rest of the day twenty-six other sessions and eighteen exhibitors, too many to profile here of course, showcased the internationally oriented research of faculty and students from a variety of programs: Fox School of Business, Teaching and Learning, the College of Liberal Arts, and the School of Medicine. Latin American Studies, a program folded into the History Department by CLA, made a particularly strong showing in multiple conference panels. Overall, the conference was a success and did the important work of connecting Temple scholars who have international interests for yet another year.

Sponsored by Education Abroad, International Affairs and GenEd, the Global Temple Conference is an opportunity for Temple researchers at every level to network and to share their work with the larger Temple community since it was conceived eight years ago by the Faculty Senate International Programs Committee. Denise Connerty, Assistant Vice President for International Affairs and the primary point person for the conference, says that Global Temple is currently "for Temple and by Temple" but the organizers hope that in coming years the conference will open up to scholars outside of the Temple community. Among the universities in our Philadelphia consortium, Temple has unique advantages and opportunities in creating mutually beneficial initiatives overseas, just as Professor of Strategic Management Guntram Werther wrote in the Herald a year ago.  RCB continued on page 9
9. How can the status of women at Temple University be improved?
Through more active mentorship. If more senior faculty take the time to talk about their hurdles and share some of the challenges they faced and how they overcame such difficulties, younger faculty would tremendously benefit from it.

10. What was your most memorable teaching moment?
When a student came to me after class and said that she finally gets it!! everything they learned in introductory courses now has been put in perspective and it all makes sense.

Dr. Sarah Bauerle Bass, Associate Professor of Public Health

1. What classes have you taught over the past 2 years (if applicable)?
I teach both undergraduate and graduate public health classes. At the undergraduate level I teach a two semester capstone, writing intensive course that teaches community based public health intervention planning and evaluation through the mechanism of writing a grant. I also teach a one-week intensive AIDS and Society course. At the graduate level I teach Risk Communication, which focuses on how to respond and develop messages in the time of a high-stress crisis.

2. What is your research focus (if applicable)?
I am co-Director of the Risk Communication Laboratory. We’re using a number of methods to develop and test risk communication messages. I have particular interest in populations with limited literacy and how individuals process and understand messages.

3. What do you enjoy most about being a faculty member at Temple?
I truly enjoy Temple students. They come from every background and walk of life which makes the classroom interesting and constantly evolving. I would also say that being part of the Temple community allows me intellectual freedom of discovery in a microcosm of different cultures.

4. What do you do for fun?
With two daughters, most of my extra time is taking them from place to place! But if I have a minute I’ve become an extremely focused “Words with Friends” player. I also read and enjoy swimming.

5. What do you hope to be doing in the next 10 years?
I would hope that I continue to be a passionate advocate for public health, public health education and the education of our citizenry on the importance of public health. I would assume this will be as a continuing part of the Temple family, but whatever the circumstance I can’t see myself doing anything else.

6. What does this award mean to you?
This award is a very humbling honor; it is recognition of my teaching but more importantly recognition of my students and their ability to become passionate and engaged in the public health field.

7. In what ways can and/or has this award inspire(d) young female faculty members and students?
I would hope that young female faculty members and students see that all things are possible. When I started teaching I didn’t think about awards; I was happy if I got my papers graded and class materials done on time. But success in the classroom and as a faculty member in the academy is an evolving premise. Female faculty need to remember what is important to them and make sure that students know that too. This models for students, especially female students, that you can be successful and also have a family and a “life.” Often I have female students ask me how I made the decisions I did and how I’ve juggled my work and personal life. I usually say that if you’re passionate about both, you will be able to do both. It also helps to have a really supportive husband/partner!

8. What advice do you have for young female faculty members at Temple?
My biggest advice would be to be aware of what’s most important in life. If you do, and keep it in focus, you will succeed. Part of that is knowing when to reach out to others. Having other female faculty - who have navigated academic waters, who have survived the promotion/tenure process, who have been through changes in leadership - is invaluable. They know not only the context in which all these activities occur but have had to make similar decisions. They are an invaluable asset. One of the most important people in my life has been my academic-turned-colleague mentor. She was a “Great Teacher” herself at Temple and her guidance has been a cornerstone of my career. Don’t exist in a vacuum. Reach out and utilize the resources that are available.

9. What was your most memorable teaching moment?
My most memorable teaching moment occurred a few years ago when one of my students was tragically murdered about two-thirds of the way through the semester. As part of the two semester capstone course this group of students had been together for the entire academic year and losing a friend and fellow student was devastating for them. This opportunity really tested me as a teacher, who had to play the role of console but also of leader, attempting to create an atmosphere in which it was ok to mourn but also to go on. This challenge really instilled in me why what we do is so important and that the effect we have on our students’ lives can be tremendous.

Next Faculty Senate Meeting

University Faculty Senate Meeting
Friday, December 7, 2012 - 1:45 PM
Kiva Auditorium
Videoconference: HSC, 343 MERB – AMBLER, ALC301

Agenda
1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Minutes
3. President's Report: Joan P. Shapiro
4. Vice President’s Report: Mark Rabdert
6. Guest: Frank Friedman and Eleanor Myers, Institutional Integrity Task Force Report
7. Recognition of Retiring Faculty
8. Old Business
9. New Business
10. Adjournment
American Studies at Temple?

American Studies? continued from page 3

We believe that the major and minor in American Studies should be terminated for the following reasons:

1) The Program has insufficient Presidential faculty teaching in it. At best, Orvell, Yannella, and Seth Bruggeman (a joint appointment with History) contribute five courses per year. Offering a major almost totally staffed by adjuncts and by one remaining NTT faculty member (Kenneth Finkel, who teaches one advanced course per year) does not seem to us to be pedagogically sound, intellectually justified, or fair to students who need and deserve ongoing commitment from research-oriented Presidential faculty. Hiring other NTTs to replace the two who recently resigned would not solve the basic problem either, since it would place the program in the position of staffing a majority of its courses with just one or two faculty.

2) Given its current weakness, it is very unlikely that Presidential faculty from other departments can be attracted to teach courses in the Program. We appreciate Dean Soufas’ efforts to help in this regard by encouraging department cooperation, but it has been difficult for chairs to release faculty from their departmental obligations.

3) We do not believe that there is any likelihood that a sufficient number of undergraduates will be attracted to major or minor in American Studies, especially now that it has lost its identity as a free-standing program.

Our careers have been tied to American Studies. We have given much thought to what we might do to sustain the major and minor into the future. With much sadness, though, we have concluded that American Studies ought to be terminated. We do not think it is intellectually defensible to sustain a program where the majority of courses are taught by adjuncts.

On Responsibility Centered Budgeting, a.k.a. Revenue Centered Management, at Temple

RCB continued from page 7

find that there are many different flavors of RCM, with the motivations for public schools coalescing around how to maintain access, quality, and efficiency in the face of declining public funding. In my search I hoped to find some rigorous empirical evidence documenting the success of an RCM model. Alas, none was to be found except some correlations between budget and enrollments before and after implementation at one university.

With this background, what can we as faculty realistically expect from an RCM budgeting model? In recent years, Temple has implemented a number of steps towards a full RCM model: enrollment-based budgeting, decentralized summer school budgets to schools and colleges, surplus carryovers, and expanded auxiliary programs that stand on their own bottom line. To close the loop, all revenue (primarily tuition), indirect costs (e.g. space, computing), and the Commonwealth’s contribution to Temple’s operating budget need to be allocated to the “responsibility centers” (think schools and colleges). While these allocations are a non-trivial exercise, Temple has made these allocations of indirect costs for many years through the Full Revenue and Expenditure and Evaluation System reports (at least as far back as the early 1990s). Thus from a pure operational perspective, most of us are likely to see no immediate change.

However, the process for RCM implementation could have an immense influence on Temple’s future and thus should be of intense interest to all of us. An important principle for successful RCM implementation is good governance (e.g., see Kent State’s RCM Manual Web for an excellent example of RCM budget goals and principles). Practically speaking, good governance means an open process where the revenues, costs, and Commonwealth allocations for all units, including the methodology for calculating these numbers is very transparent. With this knowledge, we should have a vibrant, fact-based, and frankly messy, discussion of what Temple will look like in the next 10 years, which includes what public goods are valuable to us and how much they should be subsidized, and how the budget should support our academic priorities. If you are skeptical of this outcome, include me as well. Nonetheless, my hope is that our new leadership will use the RCM model to assist us in navigating what my colleagues and I characterize as the “post bubble” higher education future that confronts us.

With all the potential benefits of the RCM model, my concern about moral hazard still remains. Well-managed profit (and not-for-profit) businesses would not give division heads profit/loss responsibility without strict accountability for their results that ensures consistency with the larger organization’s strategy. As faculty we should be concerned about the effect of decentralized budget responsibility on academic quality, the student’s best interest, faculty deployment, and program subsidies (e.g., undergraduate to graduate) at the school and college level. Some of this accountability may already be in place, but it needs to be transparent and part of the RCM implementation conversation. Once again, my hope is that University leadership finds a way to balance the moral hazard costs of decentralized budgets with its benefits. If they can, Temple is likely to look very different 10 years hence.
program be closed.

b. The marked difficulty of finding voluntary directors for any of these three programs demonstrates their precariousness. No replacements are in evidence should any of the current directors step down. While the situation in Latin American Studies this year is worse in this regard than in the others, it also demonstrates a critical problem in the current administrative structure that all programs are experiencing. In that respect Latin American Studies is not so much exceptional as representative of an underlying problem in the new administrative system. This weakness has been temporarily masked by the effort of one person in other programs, but with no replacements readily apparent, all face the current predicament illustrated in Latin American Studies. In this light, the Dean’s 10 April 2012 communication to faculty affiliated with the program illustrates the fate all five programs are currently facing: “If by October 1, 2012, the Steering Committee is not formed with its members performing the appropriate service for the students, teachers, and curriculum, then the major will be discontinued.” The ability of any of the programs to survive the next three years under the current system is questionable.

c. The idea behind the reorganization rests on a reasonable premise. As the Dean explained to the Committee in August 2011, “My expectation is that the responsibilities will be shared among several committee colleagues instead of being the purview of one individual alone as has been the case.” The course reduction for the director would no longer be necessary under these truncated responsibilities. In practice, several critical problems emerged in this first year of the new policy. These were unforeseeable, in our view, because the practice has never been tried before, and our observations are a case of 20/20 hindsight. We offer them with that understanding in mind and in the spirit of articulating the lessons of this year’s experience with the new administrative structure.

d. First, many faculty members in previous years sat on steering committees because the position was advisory and did not carry significant service duties. These faculty members have normal service responsibilities in their own departments, and so far as we can tell, none of them had a corresponding reduction in service elsewhere. Thus the new structure rested on the willingness of faculty to take on an absolute increase in their existing service loads, and practice has shown that few people are able to do so. The problem is so widespread that it cannot be blamed on individuals or interpreted as a sign of their lack of commitment to the program; if that were the case, then the only conclusion one can draw is that no more than one or two faculty are committed to any of these programs, a conclusion that is contradicted by the history of the programs themselves. In addition, some of the most active members of steering committees previously, including former directors, were alienated by the implementation of the new structure and have stopped participating, leaving the programs without one of their most valuable resources. By and large, the active steering committees have become inactive, and inactive committees have not been reinvigorated. Instead, that burden continues to fall on the program director, as before, with additional responsibilities taken on by the (now half-time) Administrator and Coordinator for the programs, as well as by the receiving departments. Faculty who might normally be expected to take over responsibility for directing these programs are well aware of the new burden, making it difficult or impossible to find anyone willing to make the sacrifices the position now requires. This is a pragmatic response to a real crisis for the programs, and the four individuals who are working to keep them alive deserve all of our thanks. But it is unsustainable, in our view, and a different solution needs to be found if the programs are to continue.

e. An additional factor contributing to current problems is the decrease in staff support. The full-time administrator for all five programs was assigned substantial new responsibilities in November 2011, reducing time for work on the interdisciplinary programs by approximately 50%. Simultaneously, the directors of the continuing programs have needed greater assistance than previously; some directors were new to the position, and those returning had less time to administer the programs than previously because of the elimination of release time.

5. Curricular Issues

a. While they have been exacerbated by recent administrative changes, the curricular problems faced by all five of the Interdisciplinary Programs are long-standing, and are similar to those faced by small departments. The following are the most outstanding issues:

i. Attracting majors to the interdisciplinary programs has always been a problem. Novel solutions to this problem demand faculty involvement. But, such involvement has seldom been available, and is now almost totally absent.

ii. Under the new administrative structure, mounting the curriculum is problematic because of a disconnect between faculty in the program who understand the field(s) and administrators in departments who are tasked with assembling the schedules.

iii. Good advising is essential to help students deal with unforeseen difficulties, such as course cancellations, and to guide them through the bewildering variety of courses that can be used to satisfy major requirements. In addition, since individual students take different paths through the major, advising requires considerable time. In the transition, this service seems to be vulnerable because it falls to the same person who is also managing program administration. To the extent that this diminishes attention to individual students, retention and recruitment of majors is likely to suffer.

6. Joint Appointments

a. Faculty members in several programs were hired to teach half time in a home department and half time in one of the programs. Because the appointments involve considerations of tenure and promotion, problems in this area need to be quickly addressed and corrected. When one of its faculty members comes up for review or tenure, the interdisciplinary program is required to send a letter of evaluation to the home department about the merits of the candidate. While there was an administrative structure with time release for the program director, this system worked well. But several problems emerged this year, under the new administrative structure. One joint appointment received a letter written by the program director without steering committee consultation. In another instance, the program had no director, so the chair of the department with administrative responsibility polled the steering committee and wrote the letter for the faculty member. The chair rightly noted that they had no academic expertise on the topic, but this is a weakness in the recommendation process that can compromise a candidate for promotion or tenure.

7. Recommendations

a. The Committee agrees that something needed to be done to improve the programs if they were to continue. The Dean decided that all five would continue, but the changes implemented have weakened the programs further. If financial issues are the only concern, and no additional funding is available, then we recommend reconsidering the decision to continue all five programs and recommend instead focusing existing resources more effectively to sustain fewer programs. The current structure is clearly leading to a de facto decrease in the number of interdisciplinary programs, but it is being done without considering the actual needs of the College itself. The Committee was not asked to determine which programs CLA should support, but we do recommend that the question be studied—taking into consideration research faculty strength, student interest, the goals of the College, and the state of the interdisciplinary field nationally—and that a decision be made in the best interests of the College before any of the current programs are eliminated. The selected program(s) needs to have a director with the necessary release time to enable them to reshape the program, bringing it in line with current practices and integrating it with an active research component. It needs to be constituted as a free-standing interdisciplinary unit, either as a program or as a department.

b. The Committee further recommends that the study outlined above be a comprehensive assessment of all existing interdisciplinary programs in
Report of the CLA Ad Hoc Interdisciplinary Studies Committee

CLA Ad Hoc Committee continued from page 10

CLA, not just the five affected by the restructuring. At a minimum, this would include the Master of Liberal Arts program, Neuroscience Program, and Environmental Studies, and the proposed new Global Studies Program.

c. If the College nonetheless decides to continue all five programs without any additional resources and without release time for their directors, then we recommend they be converted into minors within compatible departments and managed by the departments directly, as the only sustainable course, short of eliminating them entirely. Appendix A outlines several options for this route.

d. The Committee also considered the idea of centralizing the operation of multiple interdisciplinary programs within a single umbrella organization, for example, as a new “Department of Interdisciplinary Studies.” The value of this option is, first, the establishment of a physical location for majors and minors to go to when they enroll or need routine advising, which would be an improvement over the current situation. Second, while it would not eliminate the need for directors of the individual programs, it could reduce the duties attached to the position if the new department itself had a Chair overseeing the management of all programs while relying on the program directors for disciplinary expertise and program direction. Third, the centralization could encourage interplay among the programs on the methodology of interdisciplinary work itself, if it were properly nurtured. And fourth, the Department could be charged with promoting research agendas for the programs, something that has been underemphasized previously. The current Coordinator and Administrator for the five programs would continue as staff for the new department. Large issues would need to be addressed by the Dean, particularly if and when to tenure to the new department. This option would not be budget neutral, but it would be a reasonable way for the Dean to minimize release time for program directors without eliminating the programs, as the current administrative structure threatens to do.

e. We recommend that the College eliminate joint appointments to the programs because of the precariousness of the programs and because of the problems it is creating for tenure and promotion candidates. Tenure for the faculty still in line needs to be removed from the interdisciplinary program and placed solely in the department.

Appendix A

Minor Option for Interdisciplinary Programs

1. Creation of six-course minors

2. Certificates would be administered by departments, whose responsibility would be to manage course offerings. In order to satisfy certificate requirements, it will be necessary to make sure that an appropriate number of courses are offered each semester. In order to reduce the work of departments in this regard, a streamlined list of courses could be developed by the current steering committees; and a two or three-semester sequence could be modeled.

3. CLA Academic Advising would be responsible for monitoring students’ progress toward degree completion, using DARS.

4. There would be no general Asian Studies minor. Instead, several Asian Studies minors would be administered by Critical Languages. At least two minors could be created immediately: “Japanese Language and Culture,” and “Chinese Language and Culture” – with a possible third: “Vietnamese Language and Culture.” Each minor would require one year of language in addition to four other courses. A single Latin-American Studies minor would be administered by the Department of Spanish and Portuguese. The nature of minor requirements (language requirement, advanced courses, topical course options, etc) would be determined by the current steering committee. Alternatively, the minor could be offered to students who complete a year of either Spanish or Portuguese and the Latin-American Studies Semester.

5. A single Jewish Studies minor would be administered by Religion; but remain an inter-disciplinary program. This minor might include a year of language and 4 other courses to be determined by the current steering committee.

6. One or two minors in American Studies could be created. The first would consist of a set of English courses administered by the English Department; however, the directors of this program have asked that it be closed, and that would need to be considered. A second minor might include courses in the humanities and the social sciences that would build on CLA’s existing work in comparative American Studies. If the second option is to be realized, interested faculty in the humanities and social sciences would have to determine the nature of requirements (introductory courses, advanced courses, topical course options, etc) for such a minor, and a departmental home would have to be found.

7. Similarly, Women’s Studies and LGBT Studies have no obvious, single departmental home, since it has affinities with English, History, Sociology, and others. However, without release time for a director, it is difficult to see how the program can continue in this state. Alternatively, the minor could be offered to students who complete a year of either Spanish or Portuguese and the Latin-American Studies Semester.

CLA Academic Advising would be responsible for monitoring students’ progress toward degree completion, using DARS.

5. A single Jewish Studies minor would be administered by Religion; but remain an inter-disciplinary program. This minor might include a year of language and 4 other courses to be determined by the current steering committee.

6. One or two minors in American Studies could be created. The first would consist of a set of English courses administered by the English Department; however, the directors of this program have asked that it be closed, and that would need to be considered. A second minor might include courses in the humanities and the social sciences that would build on CLA’s existing work in comparative American Studies. If the second option is to be realized, interested faculty in the humanities and social sciences would have to determine the nature of requirements (introductory courses, advanced courses, topical course options, etc) for such a minor, and a departmental home would have to be found.

7. Similarly, Women’s Studies and LGBT Studies have no obvious, single departmental home, since it has affinities with English, History, Sociology, and others. However, without release time for a director, it is difficult to see how the program can continue in this state. Alternatively, the minor could be offered to students who complete a year of either Spanish or Portuguese and the Latin-American Studies Semester.
Representative Faculty Senate Minutes, October 9, 2012

- Gregory Urwin (History, CLA) noted that in the 9/10/2012 representative faculty senate meeting President Englert talked about benefits of Big East membership. Urwin referenced a UConn ad in the 9/7/2012 issue of Chronicle of Higher Ed that suggests to Professor Urwin that Temple may not be as well resourced as some of the other Big East institutions.

- Provost Dai answered that he agrees this is a time where we need to find resources to strengthen faculty and the institution. In the last 3 months the Provost’s office has had new initiatives. He discussed each initiative briefly. (1) He reported on the scholarship and financial aid packages that are increasingly attracting top undergraduates. Temple is now offering full tuition through merit scholarship offerings. For students with higher than a 1400 SAT score Temple offers a full scholarship plus additional financial incentives to attract more merit scholars. (2) The Provost’s office is working with each college to approve search for 73 new tenure track faculty. There is $15 million in the start-up fund. This is probably unprecedented at Temple. 71 of our colleagues chose to take early retirement last year. State funding cuts starting in 2009 meant that Temple has lost $113 million in state funding since then. That impacted our ability to go full force in faculty searches. The Board of Trustees has bought into the idea that to build research we have to build support investment for faculty searches.

- Jim Korsh (CST) has trouble believing that undergraduates choose a university based on knowledge of the research at the university. Seems there are other things we could emphasize – like small class sizes, teaching quality, etc.

- Provost Dai agrees that to many students their first choice is based on choosing a campus and campus life options, and then they look at possible major. So research may not have a direct impact on student enrollment. But a better research profile for Temple might have indirect impact in terms of university rankings. Provost Dai noted that another factor is to graduate students that find jobs. For example, CST has its own job fair. Vanguard hired 22 CST graduates on the spot because they were looking for IT savvy students – like CST graduates. Companies want to hire people who can solve problems.

- Joe Schwartz (CLA) asked whether it is true that in the last 30 years we have been relatively weak in the hard sciences. He suggested that we used to invest on start-up projects and venues. Are we doing better with that? Can we do this without a larger endowment?

- Provost Dai responded that he believes Temple can grow if we take the right investment and strategy. In 2007 Temple’s College of Science and Technology had 6.7 million average sponsored research spending. 4 years later we were up to 17 million – a 140% increase in CST. With relatively small research dollars they make this happen. Provost Dai argued that we used money smarter. 35 years ago Temple ranked 67th in the US in research funding. Now we are at 178th. He told an example of a faculty member some time ago who lost a prestigious laboratory grant because the university under President Liacouras would not match costs. In 6 years as department chair he fended off at least a dozen raids on Temple faculty. We should be proud when our faculty are coveted by other institutions. We need to find reasonable ways to support our faculty.

- Joan Shapiro thanked Provost Dai for his valuable comments and encouraged faculty to contact the Provost if they had additional issues or comments.

5. Vice President’s Report:
Mark Rahdert, Vice-President of the Faculty Senate, gave his report. He covered three items. (1) He commented on the recent Faculty Senate Elec-
tions to committees. He thanked all the candidates who stood for committee service. And he thanked all faculty who voted. (2) He noted that we still need candidates for other elected committees. There will be a second election later in November. On the RPPC we have 3 vacancies, 1 elected and 2 appointed positions. On EPPC there is 1 elected position open. UTPAC has 2 vacancies limited to full professors with tenure. And, he reported that we need 3 new members on CATA. We especially need women and persons of color. CATA is about to be activated for the internal provost search. CATA recruits and vets faculty to be recommended for that committee.

6. President’s Report:
Joan Shapiro, President of the Faculty Senate, made a brief report in order to protect time for Vice-Provost Peter Jones’ presentation. She mentioned the resolution that Gregory Urwin had commented on, asking presenters to send summaries of their comments two weeks in advance of their presentation to the senate. She indicated that she appreciated the importance of having time in the senate meetings to allow faculty discussion and noted that in some cases it is difficult to expect guests to always adhere to the resolution – especially when they are reporting very recent events that are of interest to the faculty. However, she indicated that she will try to let folks know in advance what people will say.

She reminded faculty of the FRESH Brunch for Outstanding Faculty Service Awards and gave thanks to Michael Jackson and Cheryl Mack for their work on this important event. She noted that October 17th is the deadline for schools, colleges or divisions to identity honorees. Honorees for this year and last year will be lauded at event on October 30th in Alter Hall.

Joan Shapiro thanked David Waldstreicher, Editor of the Faculty Herald, for his hard work and consistently excellent efforts on the Herald.

7. Guest Presentation, Peter Jones, SVP:
Peter Jones gave a presentation on critical issues for undergraduate education at Temple. The thrust of his report was on issues of access and retention and some of the innovative approaches Temple is taking.
- He began with his discussion of access to university and clarified that access means both getting into and getting successfully through the university. Academic policies react to students usually only when they get into trouble – e.g. academic probation. Then action (like academic probation) is often too late and intervention is not as valuable as it could be. Support centers like the writing center and math center wait for students to self-diagnose need. He argued that we need more proactive responses and better ways to identify students in trouble. He noted that Temple is moving to those actions.
- He reported that Temple loses 15% of our students in their first year. 85% retention rate not bad for a large urban university, but we can do better. We lose another 15% in sophomore year. Our 4 year graduation rate is 37% and our 6 graduation rate is 67%. Average student debt at graduation is $31,000. These are key statistics.
- There are two things we are doing to be more proactive. (1) We are using a risk based model; analyzing characteristics of drop outs that predicts who is likely to drop out. Many risk factors are not academic. Looking at the top decile of at-risk students he reported that 34% of the top decile will leave Temple during the first year. The second decile has a 30% drop out rate. We are starting to invest in increasing the size of academic advising and developing a more professional group of academic advisers. We were losing a lot of the best advisers because there was no career option for them. The risk model was put into place 4 years ago and it was voluntary. All advisers in all units agreed. They were given list of students in top 1 or 2 deciles and they became high list case load. The advisers met with at-risk students at least 5 times a semester. Across the board, we are one of few universities that have seen an increase in freshman retention (1 of 9 large publics with increased retention – 85 to 89% in last three years). Each percentage point increase in retention is worth 2 million to the university. About 180 students are now making it into their second year that would have dropped out before. Temple is now developing same model for sophomore retention and junior transfer retention. He emphasized that this is a huge institutional culture change. We are definitely moving to more focused and strategic and proactive form of intervention. Some might even call it intrusive or aggressive advising.

(2) The second area of attention and innovation is time to graduation. He argued that we need to make sure students graduate in 4 years if possible. It used to be students coming to Temple did not have a map saying what they needed to take each semester to graduate. We now have that for every single major – an 8 semester grid. Our next step is to create a program called critical paths – CST is taking the lead – for each major that lays out for each of the first seven semesters critical markers that would indicate a student is not on track for a 4 year graduation. Every student should be tracked. We need to know who is off path and why they are off path. The adviser needs to respond as quickly as possible. We don’t want to be punitive. CST is only college doing this right now but the goal is to expand this to all other colleges and schools this year. He meets with students and parents every semester and their fear is often will the student get lost here. And the feedback to this on-path idea is very positive. We want to retain more students and get more students to graduate in 4 years. This is also really important for students who exhaust financial aid because of too long a time to graduation.

Two years ago Temple introduced a new ladder for academic advising. We replaced a one-size-fits all approach and moved to a 5-tier system for academic advising. These levels assure that we have good people coming into advising profession and they have a clear career path ahead of them. It is resulting in a decreasing attrition rate for advisers. We are down to a 5% attrition rate for advisers this last year.

The next big step is for us to have faculty working more closely with academic advising. We have to build collegiality between academic advising and faculty. This is not only within the college. We have 75% of our students changing majors during their time here. Many of these changes are across colleges and we need to build these relationships so professionals and faculty can span the boundaries so we can be building support for the students changing majors across colleges.

He told one anecdote about a 5th year student about to be dismissed. The student came in as pre-med and then changed major. Did OK but was never really invested. The parents spent $155,000 over five years. This becomes a situation of hardship that faculty and advisers can work together to prevent.

Chip Jungreis (TUSM) asked about a student having difficulty after 1st semester. Peter responded that they are on academic warning but that doesn’t stop them from options. We are now trying to flag them quickly and get them in touch with advisers.

Tricia Jones (COE) asked which risk factors were not academic and how these can be addressed. She also commented that given the number of adjuncts and NTTs teaching students in their first year we need to think about how to identify and support these faculty to be involved in the efforts that Peter Jones is discussing.

Michael Jackson (STHM) said that trying to get response from advisers is not always easy. We have 20 academic advising units.

Peter concurred that the current advising units are largely independent. Some units report to Peter. Most don’t. Some students got dismissed for less than 1/10th of a GPA score. They looked at all students in similar situation and looked at bringing them back, aggressive advising, and following them to see if they could get at least 4+ grades. If yes, they invited them back. We have done this for 2 semesters – purely voluntary. About 45 students were affected; they were offered a chance to come back. 33 accepted.

David Waldstreicher (CLA) asked how do you see the role of faculty advising majors (and presumably upper classmen). He is struck by how little advising is done by faculty. And he notes there is little in terms of course release or support. Faculty are also not receiving training or support for this advising work either. We
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...need much better faculty training, information and preparation.

-Peter Jones agreed there are multiple advising models in higher education. Imagine two triangles – professional academic adviser needs in freshman and sophomore years. The other inverted triangle applies as students move into their majors. As students move into junior year they should be thinking about how they develop themselves for their academic career. Model assumes there is a natural handoff from advisers from one triangle to the other. That is not the case.

Mark Rahdert, standing in for Joan Shapiro, thanked Peter Jones for his excellent presentation.

8. Adjournment:
It was moved, seconded and unanimously supported to adjourn the meeting at 3:21pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tricia S. Jones
Faculty Senate Secretary

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