Where are the Faculty?

It’s likely that you missed the Report and Recommendations of The Governor’s Advisory Commission on Postsecondary Education when it was released last November. But we faculty ignore it at our peril since it does not look to be one of those reports that will gather dust. Its proposal for performance-based funding figured heavily into Governor Corbett’s February 1st announcement on higher education funding. Although the Chair of the Commission (Rob Wonderling) and Pennsylvania’s Deputy Secretary for Higher Education (L. Jill Hans) have not yet responded to my queries about the status of its other recommendations, they seems likely to inform discussion on the Commonwealth’s stance toward post-secondary education. So for my inaugural column as editor of The Faculty Herald, I want to bring this report to your attention and use it to think through what our role as faculty at Temple could and should be. What the Report will mean for Temple isn’t clear at this point, and there is reason to hope our new president will deal productively and wisely with its effects. But faculty must do more than hope that administrators act rightly; we must be on the watch for proposals that emerge from the Report and insist that we have a role in addressing how they affect our university.

Confidence in Deans

By Mark Rahdert, Charles Klein Professor of Law and Government, and Vice President of Faculty Senate

Many years ago, I attended a banquet to honor one of Yale Law School’s legendary deans, Guido Calabresi. The principal speaker at the event was Yale’s then-President Bart Giamatti (whom non-Yalies may know better in his later role as the Commissioner of Baseball who banned Pete Rose from the game). Playing on the English language’s penchant for giving colorful names to collections of creatures (such as a “murder” of crows, a “gaggle” or “sklein” of geese, an “exaltation” of larks, a “crash” of rhinoceroses, etc.) Giamatti mused about what term to apply to a collection of deans. He suggested the term “confidence,” which allowed him to extol the many ways that Dean Calabresi’s skillful leadership of Yale Law School had earned the confidence of faculty, staff, students, alumni, and the university at large.

Giamatti’s remark catches something important about deans. They occupy a pivotal role between central administration and faculty. They must be effective team players at the central level, and effective enforcers of central university policy, but they must also be leaders and advocates for their individual schools and colleges (and centers and/or divisions), good assistants:

Three Key Issues Facing Temple

Steve Newman: First, I just want to thank you again for your time. I know how busy you must be.

Neil Theobald: Sure.

SN: The first question I have has to do with your delaying your inauguration till October, to wait until you’ve gotten a sense of what’s here. Are there particular issues that you have in mind that the faculty can help you try and answer. What are some of those questions? We are enthusiastic that

Students Behaving Badly...

By Karen Turner, Associate Professor of Journalism

These are representative scenarios experienced by Temple faculty, including adjuncts and teaching assistants:

You’re passing back papers. You notice a student has placed a hunting knife on her desk. You ask her to put it away. She does.

It’s time to begin class. You notice a student standing in the back of the classroom. You ask the student to take his seat. He doesn’t. You ask for an explanation. The student says, “I’m okay right here.” He continues to stand throughout the class period. The next class the student returns. He assumes his seat.

A student follows you to your office. He begins yelling because he doesn’t like the grade he received on an assignment. He blocks your office door.

More often than not, instructors gripe about such examples of student disruptive behavior in the hallways of our schools and colleges. Many feel ill-
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you’re here, and we want to know how we can help answer the questions you come in with.

NT: The question you’re asking is the reason to push it [my inauguration] back from April. I would hate to give a vision of Temple University in April and then after I’m around and talked to faculty and staff say, I don’t think I had quite had that right. You don’t get a mulligan: “Ignore what you heard last April. Get everyone all dressed up again and we’re going to this all again.” I come with a certain perspective. I was at the University of Washington for, gosh, 7 years, and then I was at IU for 20 years. But that’s not Temple University. So I have a context. But the specifics really matter in these kinds of things.

The issue in general that I always think of is: “How do we make this more affordable?” I mean if there is any major issue that we face as an entity—and that means all of us—the staff, the trustees, the faculty, the administration, everybody—the current trend in costs, not just in costs but in student debt, that’s not sustainable. And we can’t be part of an entity that says, well, they’ll just have to figure that out. Because it’ll get figured out—

SN—Whether we like it or not.

NT—And we’re part of it, what’s going to happen in the end. First, it’s just the right thing to do. There’s a practical sense to it. But there’s also simply a moral sense, that to send out a generation of students with 30,000 in debt, 40,000 in debt... This isn’t to say that college isn’t still a great investment. A question I’ve been getting a lot from alumni groups, and I’ve probably done one a day at least, I’m averaging more than one a day, is: Is this still as good of an investment? Should people do this? Absolutely. The answer is yes. Absolutely. And not just because I’m in this business and I want everyone to do this. There’s no doubt if you look at any kind of statistics, these guys... There is the corporate leader who will pay kids not to go...

"...so that’s part of what we need—that mission, especially with the medical school but also the university. What’s the story we want to tell, and how are we going to tell that story, and how are we going to make sure that people know about Temple University?" - President Neil Theobald

SN—Thiel.¹

NT: Incredible. I mean, I would love to know if he sent his own children to college, if he has any...²

SN: And, of course, he went to college.

NT: Yeah. This is unconscionable from where I stand. You just look at data. The cost—is it worth it? On average, yes. But we have to make sure that we make that cost as affordable as possible. We do that by containing costs, by fundraising so that we can provide financial aid, so that we make sure students have the financial literacy they need. How do you borrow money? How do you plan to pay it back? What is the labor market like? All of these kinds of things. That’s part of our role, to make sure people leave here ready for the real world. And know, “Ok, I’ve got a debt of $15 thousand, and I’m going to pay $150 dollars a month for 15 years...” whatever those numbers are, and how are you going to do that? I think we have to be part of that. Otherwise... we are morally responsible, and people are going to find alternatives. That’s a big one—the whole affordability issue.

SN: How are we going to contain costs.

NT: It’s really how are we going to contain debt.

SN: And what can faculty do to help you think through those issues.

NT: Exactly. What is it that we can do? And what can we control? I mean we can help them with their literacy, but what can we do to control costs by looking at how we do things, online education, all of these kinds of things. I’m not saying online education is the answer, just that we have to look at all the alternatives.

Clearly, another major set of questions facing us has to do with the medical school and the hospital. What is their role? Where is that headed? We’re in North Philadelphia, where the hospital ends up being the provider of public health services. What is that role? What is our mission there? Clearly we’re a health provider. What are the financial implications there? We need to think this through. That’s massive.

SN: I know a lot of faculty, whether we’re at the medical school or not, have been to presentations where we see how relatively low the bond rating is for the hospital, and we know a bit about the profound changes in the economics of healthcare delivery. On one hand, it speaks to Temple’s mission as we like to think of it. A lot of us who are here, we just feel lucky to have a job; if you’re in the humanities, you feel lucky to have a job. But many faculty stay here in part because we believe in the mission...

NT: Absolutely...

SN: And the mission has to do with accessibility to groups of folks who normally don’t have it. And in some way the hospital reproduces that model and yet that model doesn’t come without a price.

NT: And the price continues to grow. I think at one time when health care costs were at a level, we could say well, that’s just part of we’re going to do. But given what an open heart surgery actually costs today, to say that we’re just going to provide it. Well, you can’t just bankrupt the university doing that. And there has to be a real discussion about that issue.

The third major issue is deciding what story Temple wants to tell about itself. I was contacted for this position at the end of May or the 1st of June. What I have learned in my seven months about Temple University is what a fabulous place this is: the quality here; the really good people; the student response. The other night, before the holiday, I went over to the residence hall, just walked around the dining hall, talking to the students. I didn’t talk to a single student who wasn’t wildly positive about being here. It was a random group, and they didn’t know who I am. We need to let people know that. And not simply for PR purposes. If we’re going to recruit good students, they need to know that this gee this is really a top-notch place. If you look at US News and World Report, and there are many different opinions about those rankings, but I was just looking through them to see where Temple is on

¹ The venture capitalist Peter Thiel, who funds a program called The Thiel Fellowships, which gives students under 20 $100,000 to not go to college for two years to pursue their own entrepreneurial ideas.

² Thiel does not have children, but he did receive both a B. A. and a J. D. from Stanford.
MOOCs and Mirror Neurons

By Dan O’Hara, Professor of English and Inaugural Mellon Term Professor of Humanities

MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses) are all the rage in higher education these days. The idea behind them is simple: to deliver to the greatest number of students, including non-traditional off-campus students, the knowledge they want as presented by a leading figure in a field. Sebastian Thrun, a research professor in computer science, artificial intelligence, and robotics at Stanford, a Google Fellow, and the co-founder of Udacity (a company developing and promoting MOOCS), gave one such course recently to more than 50,000 Indian computer and engineering students from his base at Stanford.

However, Udacity is not only a commercial venture, at least as Thur sees it, as his webpage makes clear, “At Udacity, we are trying to democratize higher education. Udacity stands for ‘we are audacious, for you, the student.’ This is an audacious step, and it has been a thrill ride.” Although born and raised in Germany, Thrun expresses here the American Dream as if he were an Emerson or a Henry Ford. In 2011, he gave up tenure, and became a part-time professor, so that he could devote himself even more to Udacity and its mission.

My concern about MOOCS is precisely that, with the best intentions in the world, including making money (I have nothing against it, only wish I could have made more), the drive to democratize higher education, in this latest form, will not stop long enough to conduct, analyze, and reflect on studies of what this new pedagogy is achieving, and at what cost, perhaps, in terms other than those of the bottom-line mind-set.

Not to play the role of the old fogey too well, but when I began teaching at Temple, in the 1970s, the idea was, as far as possible, to bring to mostly first-time university students the riches of higher education and those riches’ best modes of delivery, their accompanying pedagogies, that the elites solely possessed for ages. Ideally, of course, this would mean most courses would be small seminars, conducted in the Socratic style, by a would-be Plato of our time. Naturally, that idealization, like all such youthful dreams, was not quite to be realized, but generally speaking at Temple, in the humanities at least, smaller courses have been the rule until recently. Why are such small classes, historically speaking, always the ideal?

I think the answer has to do with the physical presence of the teacher and that presence’s range of emotional effectiveness. Charisma would be but an extreme instance of what I mean here. For what makes me think so is the work of Giacomo Rizzolatti, noted discoverer of mirror-neurons in the brain that fire in sympathetic response to witnessing the behavior of others. Rizzolatti, and by now many other researchers, have established that mirror-neurons function most intensely, and with the most long-lasting, even brain-reshaping consequences, when the behavior witnessed is physically present. (See Giacomo Rizzolatti and Corrado Sinagiglia, Mirrors In The Brain: How Our Minds Share Actions and Emotions. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).

So what would MOOCS do with this complex of knowledge and feeling constituting “intellectual conscience,” that new “self” derived from tradition, as practiced in small groups by the best teachers and added to our psychic apparatus? It seems to me they would dispense with it almost casually, without a second thought, and in the name of a good end, further “democratization” of higher education.

It may be that financial expediency once again will trump all idealizations and good intentions, but if so, not only will higher education be able to cut thousands of non-tenure track faculty in the future, rather than resolving the complex dilemma such faculty underscore, and perhaps tenure-track faculty, too, along with their entire departments to be replaced by an array of MOOCS, but also in terms of the history of intellectual conscience, higher ed may just be cutting its own throat.

Students Behaving Badly...
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equipped and in many cases unsupported when dealing with difficult student situations. In an effort to highlight the seriousness of this problem, the Faculty Senate has formed The Disruptive Students Task Force. Its purpose is to work with the Dean of Students and others to address situations where faculty and students feel threatened by students behaving badly, but the behavior may not merit disciplinary action through the current Student Code of Conduct. The Task Force held its first meeting in November to begin to identify the issues. It’s clear faculty don’t know whom to contact when such situations arise and the procedures when a circumstance escalates. There’s also concern that complaining faculty, especially women, won’t be taken seriously. Also, non-tenure track, adjuncts and teaching assistant faculty, in particular, may not want to bring attention to such situations for fear they may be blamed for an inability to control their classes. These are serious workplace environment issues that impact instructors and students and should be treated as such. The Task Force plans to meet this spring with the Dean of Students and others to begin addressing these matters. We invite faculty to get engaged by contacting any Task Force member with your stories, concerns, and/or suggestions.

Karen M. Turner (SMC), Task Force Chair kturner@temple.edu
Scott Gratson (SMC) sgratson@temple.edu
Michael W. Jackson (STHM) pierre@temple.edu
Lois Millner (SSW) lmillner@temple.edu
Steve Newman (CLA) snewman@temple.edu
Michael Sachs (CHP) msachs@temple.edu
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I have to admit that I let the Report sit on my desk for a while, and it took some time to fight my way through it. Written in the sludgy prose you might expect from a document issued by a 31-member panel made up largely of managers, it is neither a quick nor a pleasant read. Yet although style is crucial to sense as I’ll demonstrate below, I don’t want to score cheap points by tweaking the report for its opaque phrasing—or at least, that’s not all I want to do. Nor do I want to seem ungrateful for the Commission’s considerable labors. It includes the presidents of Dickinson, Pitt, Penn State, and Penn, as well as Temple’s own Dick Engler, and the findings of such thoughtful and experienced leaders demand a serious hearing. Its announced goals are worthy, from “affirming opportunities for life-long learning” to “ensuring greater accessibility, affordability, and usability for post-secondary education” to helping the state compete economically. The report also identifies real and profound problems facing higher ed, including the unsustainable costs of higher education that threaten our mission by crushing our students and their families with debt. The Commission correctly notes the damaging decline in state support (6), a key driver of higher tuition in state systems throughout the U.S.; and it correctly identifies the arms race that diverts money from the academic core to provide ever more luxurious accommodations and other amenities to lure students and their tuition dollars (7). The report also pays significant attention to
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bosses for their staff, and great motivators of their faculty. These roles can at times conflict, and to do them all well requires both a delicate sense of balance and a lot of good judgment. To be effective representatives of the center, deans must enjoy the confidence of president, provost, their fellow deans, and other senior officers. To be effective in the school or college they must enjoy the confidence of students, faculty, staff, and alumni. For deans, confidence is what it’s all about. With it, they go far. Without it, they often end up going nowhere.

How do we know if our deans inspire that kind of confidence? For too long at Temple (at least as long as my 28 + years here) we have been content simply to guess. Deans have held their job at the pleasure of the president, but the president has had little more to assess the quality of a dean’s performance than the president’s subjective opinion, aided by equally subjective input from other senior officers, and occasionally supplemented by anecdote, rumor, innuendo and backdoor politicking. All too often, the prevailing attitude toward deans has been, “unless it is so broke you could see it from outer space, don’t fix it.” During the first years of President Hart’s tenure, Provost Lisa Staiano-Coico took some early steps toward instituting a more systematic approach to evaluating deans, but those efforts were very limited, and as far as I know they stalled when she left to become president of CCNY.

It doesn’t have to be like that. In this era of increased emphasis on assessment at all levels in higher education, we ought to have a more systematic approach for assessment of deans. Indeed, there is something amiss in having deans rigorously assessing their faculty when the deans themselves are not subject to meaningful performance review.

Other universities have an answer that we ought to explore. Their approach is to utilize what is called a “360” form of performance review for deans. Systems vary, of course, in their particulars, but they seem to involve these basics:

- The review period is set in advance. Usually it occurs on something like a 3-5 year cycle.

- It is conducted according to a pre-set and consistent set of evaluative criteria. The criteria are developed through a collaborative process that takes input from various sources, including especially faculty and staff.

- The performance review of a particular dean is coordinated by a team composed of faculty, administrators, staff, and in some cases students. At least some team members are individuals (including faculty) who do not report to the dean in question, and to whom the dean does not report. The team should be small enough to work quickly and confidentially.

- The team seeks information on the dean’s performance, according to the established criteria, from faculty, administrators, and staff at levels “above,” “below,” and “parallel” to the dean on the institutional hierarchy – whence the “360” designation. The team also seeks input from students and alumni/ae.

- The team also seeks information and personal self-reflection from the dean.

- Some of the information developed by the team may be quantitative (e.g., success at raising external funds, enrollment changes, graduation rates, or the like), but much of it is necessarily qualitative, since it involves things which cannot be measured numerically, like fairness, candor, prudence, motivational skill, and vision.

- To ensure candor, there must be strict rules against any kind of retaliatory action by the dean, especially in response to perceived criticism from below.

- Also in the interest of candor, there must be opportunity for both anonymous and identified assessment. Anonymous assessment allows those who might otherwise self-censor to register their concerns. Identified assessment enables the reviewing team to follow up on problems or issues that need further exploration; but those who do sign their names should be secure in the knowledge that their specific comments and their participation will be kept confidential. Surveys may be used, but there should also be opportunities for both written and spoken input.

- There should also be some opportunity for the reviewing team to engage in additional follow-up with individuals who are willing to elaborate on their views. This allows the team to identify and develop (or qualify, or dispel) apparent themes in the information they receive.

- Ideally, the review process should aim at both “formative” and “summative” assessment – formative to help good deans get better, and both formative and summative to identify struggling deans and reflect on what needs to change if they are to continue in that role. Formative and summative aspects of the review are sometimes separated from one another, coming at different time frames in the process.

- Finally, there should be an opportunity for the reviewing team to report its findings confidentially to the provost and president, along with opportunities for interaction with the dean regarding the team’s findings. There may also be some – usually quite limited – reporting of the team’s findings to different constituencies, although care must be taken to preserve the overall confidentiality of the process.

As we enter a new era at Temple, I’d like it to be an era in which we institute a method for ascertaining, building, and maintaining our “confidence of deans.” Our old approach has been hit-or-miss, with some magnificent (but I suspect fortuitous) successes, and (as those of us who have been around a long time know) some miserable and abject failures. I don’t think we should blindly adopt some other institution’s process. Rather, I would prefer for us to engage in a collaborative undertaking involving the central administration, the council of deans, and the faculty senate, to custom-design a 360 decanal review process that is dovetailed to Temple’s circumstances. Personally, I’d love to see Temple’s decanal success rate improve in the future. Developing our own brand of 360 review, aimed at producing a true “confidence” of deans, would be a great help toward building a positive future for Temple.
this is creating a business model that doesn’t currently exist. That, well, “We’re not here to generate profits.” Well, right now, you could take the most centralized system in the country—Penn State is a very centralized budget system. At Penn State University, they are not allowed to have more expenditures than they have revenue. That’s simply a reality at any non-profit, unless you have reserves, and that can only go on for so long. And then there’s, “Well, RCM means that we’re not going to have losses.” No, it works the same way. The big difference is that rather than those discussions going on in this building and being allocated out, they go on at the faculty and dean level. Everyone starts with a balanced budget. Ok, where do we want to emphasize and de-emphasize within that school? I have found it a much more faculty-centric model, a much more cost-effective model. Because generally, someone sends me something on, say, a new hire; Say that we need to hire another Chaucer specialist. You would have a better idea of whether that’s where the field is going. You are in a much better position. You get the decision making down to the people closer to the action. No, Chaucer is not the future, the future is Keats, or whatever. So that’s really the idea. It’s not a different outcome. The what is no different, the where is different. So rather than things happening centrally, things happen out in 17 schools.

Having said that, the mistake we made at IU, and we corrected it after 5 years, we actually started with no money in central administration, it all went out. Which sounds great in theory. But there are interdisciplinary initiatives, there are common good initiatives that we all want to have, but no one of us is willing to pay for all of it. You have to have a pool of money. So the way it has worked, and there are lots of different way to do it, but I’ve worked with people at Michigan and Ohio State that do this as well. We do it three different ways. But the Indiana model is all the money goes out so that everybody knows exactly who’s got what, but then we tax it back, but it doesn’t stay at the center.

SN: It gets re-disbursed.

NT: It gets re-disbursed, but it’s this: “Ok, let’s meet, let’s have budget conferences”—that’s what the budget conferences are about. What is it that liberal arts wants to do that would also benefit engineering? What is it that we all need? Those sorts of things. You need a mixture. Another thing I think is also misunderstood—you asked for one, but it’s hard to have only one—the biggest mistake we can make on this is being doctrinaire about it, that, “Oh, no, the purity of decentralized budgeting will not let us do that.” We set the rules. I just think we have to be pragmatic, that, maybe we want to say, “Well, there’s a difference between a graduate and an undergraduate course.” And someone says back: “Well, the beauty of RCM says, you can’t.” No. It isn’t as if we’re handing away our authority or handing away our decision making to some process, not at all. We set all of that. It’s really just to get it out to people who know more about it, to get them involved.

Faculty Review of Deans
SN: This leads me to some of the questions I have about this that are both mine and also because other people have asked me to ask them. This is obviously a system that gives power to deans—

NT: Absolutely, deans, and also faculty groups within schools and a piece that gets missing here is there really needs to be a strong campus faculty budget group as well. The money that comes back and then goes back out, there really needs to be not only at the school level—decentralized—but there has to be that central group. It’s critical.

SN: One question that’s been raised—it’s been raised at the Faculty Senate Steering Committee—is what possibilities are there for faculty input into the hiring and renewal of deans? Because on the evaluation side, it’s something that doesn’t seem to exist at Temple now and whether we like or love our deans and want to keep them or maybe are a little worried the directions our deans are going, there’s a sense that maybe we should think about building that in and I’m wondering if that was a tradition at IU or if you have any thoughts about it.

NT: Well, it’s a separate issue, and I’m not sure what the current process is. You absolutely need a review of deans, and every 5 years seems like a reasonable amount. You’re always fighting the last war. What I would say is in doing that in order to be fair to all parties—again, what we did poorly and what I think worked better. At one point there was just simply an anonymous survey and those data were—if you don’t know who and what the context was.

SN: There was no accountability.

NT: I’d get those data and I’m not sure what I knew when I had it. And so we moved to a much more transparent process, but, yeah, I clearly think, but that’s didn’t tied to de-centralized budgeting.

SN: It’s not necessarily part of it. But you could see why the question would be raised with more urgency because the sense is that RCM is great because the principle of proximity does seem to put more both responsibility and autonomy in the faculty’s hands, and yet, insofar as it also empowers deans, the question then becomes, well, if the deans clearly have a lot of say in who gets hired at the college, what say do we have in regards to hiring and renewing deans?

NT: Well, I think that the faculty would certainly be involved in dean’s search committees but also in the review of existing deans.

The proposal to take chairs out of bargaining
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Educating students from under-represented backgrounds, central to Temple’s mission. It avoids egregious recommendations like the one made by a parallel Florida commission that students majoring in fields like Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics be charged lower tuition than those in ‘useless’ majors like, well, everything else. Best of all, after two years of meat-cleaver cuts proposed by our governor, it happily suggests no cuts this year and then a $250 million increase to bring funding back to the average for the decade prior to Corbett, though not adjusted for inflation.

But that increase would be tied to a significant string—a yet-to-be-defined set of “performance metrics”—and it is only one of many disconcerting elements in the report. The most troubling of them isn’t any particular recommendation but rather the woeful lack of faculty participation. Among the 31 appointees, we find: 11 presidents of non-profit colleges and universities; 3 presidents of for-profit colleges; many corporate leaders, including the CEOs of QVC and a petroleum service company; and many officials from the state agencies overseeing higher ed. If we squint, we can spy a single student (from a private college, as it happens) and, yes, there, one non-administrative faculty member. Of course, it would be hard for any single person to represent the diverse faculty of Pennsylvania higher ed, but it is harder still for the representative the Governor selected—from Grove City College. In case you haven’t heard of this private Christian school, it has the dubious distinction of being the longest resident on AAUP’s censure list, placed there in 1963 for disregarding standards of academic freedom and tenure. In 1984, it began refusing federal money so that it would not be subject to that intolerable bit of the federal code known as Title IX, which bars gender discrimination at educational institutions. It is therefore no surprise that The Young America’s Foundation names it a Top Conservative College or that The Princeton Review lists it as the nation’s most LGBT-unfriendly school. Given all this, it is simply perverse that Grove City furnished the only faculty member on the Commission. In a similar vein, the Commission invited over 70 “Expert Speakers,” including many business leaders and administrators (and a few more students), but, again, almost no faculty—a grand total of two.

But how does this lack of faculty participation speak to the substance of the report? Let’s take up a few of the Commission’s specific recommendations to see what we can infer about their vision of higher education and the faculty’s role within it.

Distance Education. It is hard to be reassured by the Commission’s cryptic allusions to that part of the higher-ed enterprise known as teaching, which as I understand it still requires faculty. In a small masterpiece of ed-ocratic jargon, the Commission recommends that the governor “support learning innovations that improve outcomes with the same or fewer human resources, leveraging the extensive research on the efficacy of various curricular reforms for different types of students and situations” (7). Online education would seem to be among those “learning innovations,” except it’s not clear how this could be accomplished with “the same or fewer human resources,” since maintaining pedagogical quality in online education requires significant investment of “human resources”—faculty and staff, not to mention technological infrastructure. But perhaps the Commission has another model in mind. It recommends launching a Distance Education Pilot to be “administer [ed]” by Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency (PHEAA) “who will partner with relevant state and local agencies to consider workforce needs of the Commonwealth” (8). This would allow greater synergy between higher education and . . . wait a minute. What does it mean that PHEAA, an agency devoted to giving financial aid to students, would “administer” this new “program expansion”? This is one of those places where the muddiness of the prose really matters. On one hand, the Commission may simply be saying that PHEAA would provide aid to the students enrolled in this pilot. But this would leave unclear who would actually design and run this new enterprise. If some already-existing school, like Penn State, then why not say so? If they really do mean that PHEAA would actually run this pilot university, where will it find the expertise? The absence of any explanation and the absence of faculty involvement in the Commission invite unhappy speculation. Perhaps the state will pilot something like Western Governors University, which currently boasts 30,000+ students but aside from a small handful who teach a month-long course called Education Without Boundaries, those WGU calls faculty either mentor students OR they design and assess curricula. WGU has “unbundled the faculty role.” Its approach certainly requires fewer “human resources”; even if we count the advisors WGU calls faculty as faculty, their student: faculty ratio is twice Temple’s.

Transferability. A related frontier in the battle against pesky and expensive “human resources” is increasing transferability. The Commission recommends that the scope of the Transfer and Articulation Oversight Committee be expanded (5). I think most faculty would agree that unnecessary roadblocks should not be placed in the way of students seeking to transfer credits. When I was Director of Undergraduate Studies in the English Department, I was frequently consulted when specific questions arose as to whether or not a student’s CLEP exam—an exam not tied to any course—or the like should be awarded credit. (I didn’t find any of them worth granting credit.) Still, I worry about Temple’s being pressured in the name of streamlining to enter into transfer agreements that take curricular decisions out of the hands of the faculty. See the ongoing struggle by faculty members in the CUNY system to stop a new core curriculum from forced upon them and the emerging debate over whether colleges should award credit to students who have taken Massive Online Open Courses (MOOCs), where they are often one of thousands with little or no interaction with the instructor. I wonder if decisions might be made at the state level that would force Temple to grant credit for courses offered through, say, the Distance Education Pilot, or for the Composition course taught by Penn Foster, a for-profit school whose CEO is a member of the Commission. The website lists one “English/Social Science senior instructor,” who has an MA, and then eleven graders, more than half with only BAs. Perhaps there is more to their pedagogy, but what I could glean from their staffing, the promotional material, and the online discussion board does not inspire confidence. But at a cost of only $225 (less if bundled with other classes) the course does seem to be a win “human-resource”-wise.

Consolidation. One final recommendation for saving big on “human resources”—and the one that has the potential to affect Temple most directly—is “to sustain and enhance our rich postsecondary education system” by “convening a working group” that would in 12 months offer recommendations for “program delivery reform, to include, but not limited to consolidation and elimination of programs and/or institutions and their locations in the Commonwealth” (13). Lest we assume that Temple would be exempted from this, the Commission explicitly names the “state-related” institutions (Temple, Pitt, Penn State, Lincoln) and even private institutions as objects of assessment (14). Leaving aside the question of how cutting enhances the richness of our institutions, I would have more faith that such a working group really would include faculty points of view if the Commission’s report had said much of anything about other important factors contributing to soaring costs such as administrative bloat, or if the report had said anything about the deep and broad trend toward non-tenure-track and part-time hiring, which has produced a corrosively hierarchical system that disempowers faculty as a whole and threatens educational quality.

Or, most depressing of all, I would have more faith if the report even paid lip service to a vision of education that does not reduce it to job training in the narrowest sense of the term. On the first page there is a nod to “personal development,” but it is quickly replaced by “workforce development” and its cognates. No mention is made of the need for an educated citizenry in a democracy or the value of research outside its commercial applications.

A fuller analysis of the difficulties facing higher ed and a fuller idea of education might have emerged had faculty been significantly included. But we were not, and the question is, as it so often seems to be, what is to be done? It’s too late to lobby for changes in the composition of the Commission or in its report. But we can and should keep our eye out for policies that may emerge from it. More broadly and yet also closer to home, my aim is for The Herald to build on the excellent work of prior editors and contributors by offering not only sharp diagnoses of what’s wrong at Temple and in higher education as a whole but also presentations on what’s

---

An Interview with President Theobald, Part One

Interview with Theobald continued from page 5

unit

NT: No.

SN: One of the issues that’s come up—and, again, it might not be tied to RCM, but many faculty see a connection, was the proposal recently moved before you came here to take the chairs out of the bargaining unit.

NT: I’m ignorant of these things.

SN: Here’s a bit of background: When our union was first organized back in the early 70s, the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board weighed in on this and said that chairs are really not managers, they are primarily faculty at least at public universities and so they should be part of the bargaining unit. And for some time now for reasons I understand although I don’t agree with, the administration has wanted to take the chairs out of the bargaining unit, and we keep saying, well, “No, we don’t think that’s a good idea.” And so now Temple’s administration has filed a suit with the PLRB directly saying, “We, the administration, think that chairs’ responsibilities have changed to such a degree that we think that they should be out of the bargaining unit.” This has caused much consternation among chairs themselves, and some of them have contacted me saying, I don’t like that change, and even some faculty who don’t have all that much love for the union were taken aback.

NT: I know so little about that issue… ask me in six months.

SN: I didn’t know if you knew anything about it.

NT: No. I have a lot to learn.

Job Security for those not on the tenure track

SN: One of the other things that has come up with RCM at Temple specifically has to do with the union. Is the faculty at Temple unionized? I don’t believe so.

NT: Yes.

SN: One of the issues that’s come up—and, again, it might not be tied to RCM, but many faculty see a connection, was the proposal recently moved before you came here to take the chairs out of the bargaining unit.

NT: I’m ignorant of these things.

SN: Here’s a bit of background: When our union was first organized back in the early 70s, the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board weighed in on this and said that chairs are really not managers, they are primarily faculty at least at public universities and so they should be part of the bargaining unit. And for some time now for reasons I understand although I don’t agree with, the administration has wanted to take the chairs out of the bargaining unit, and we keep saying, well, “No, we don’t think that’s a good idea.” And so now Temple’s administration has filed a suit with the PLRB directly saying, “We, the administration, think that chairs’ responsibilities have changed to such a degree that we think that they should be out of the bargaining unit.” This has caused much consternation among chairs themselves, and some of them have contacted me saying, I don’t like that change, and even some faculty who don’t have all that much love for the union were taken aback.

NT: I know so little about that issue… ask me in six months.

SN: I didn’t know if you knew anything about it.

NT: No. I have a lot to learn.

Job Security for those not on the tenure track

SN: One of the other things that has come up with RCM at Temple specifically has to do with the union. Is the faculty at Temple unionized? I don’t believe so.

NT: Yes.

SN: One of the issues that’s come up—and, again, it might not be tied to RCM, but many faculty see a connection, was the proposal recently moved before you came here to take the chairs out of the bargaining unit.

NT: I’m ignorant of these things.

SN: Here’s a bit of background: When our union was first organized back in the early 70s, the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board weighed in on this and said that chairs are really not managers, they are primarily faculty at least at public universities and so they should be part of the bargaining unit. And for some time now for reasons I understand although I don’t agree with, the administration has wanted to take the chairs out of the bargaining unit, and we keep saying, well, “No, we don’t think that’s a good idea.” And so now Temple’s administration has filed a suit with the PLRB directly saying, “We, the administration, think that chairs’ responsibilities have changed to such a degree that we think that they should be out of the bargaining unit.” This has caused much consternation among chairs themselves, and some of them have contacted me saying, I don’t like that change, and even some faculty who don’t have all that much love for the union were taken aback.

NT: I know so little about that issue… ask me in six months.

SN: I didn’t know if you knew anything about it.

NT: No. I have a lot to learn.

Job Security for those not on the tenure track

SN: One of the other things that has come up with RCM at Temple specifically has to do with the union. Is the faculty at Temple unionized? I don’t believe so.

NT: Yes.

SN: One of the issues that’s come up—and, again, it might not be tied to RCM, but many faculty see a connection, was the proposal recently moved before you came here to take the chairs out of the bargaining unit.

NT: I’m ignorant of these things.

SN: Here’s a bit of background: When our union was first organized back in the early 70s, the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board weighed in on this and said that chairs are really not managers, they are primarily faculty at least at public universities and so they should be part of the bargaining unit. And for some time now for reasons I understand although I don’t agree with, the administration has wanted to take the chairs out of the bargaining unit, and we keep saying, well, “No, we don’t think that’s a good idea.” And so now Temple’s administration has filed a suit with the PLRB directly saying, “We, the administration, think that chairs’ responsibilities have changed to such a degree that we think that they should be out of the bargaining unit.” This has caused much consternation among chairs themselves, and some of them have contacted me saying, I don’t like that change, and even some faculty who don’t have all that much love for the union were taken aback.

NT: I know so little about that issue… ask me in six months.

SN: I didn’t know if you knew anything about it.

NT: No. I have a lot to learn.
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.

Letters to the editor should be emailed to Steve Newman at facultyherald@temple.edu.

Representative Faculty Senate Minutes, November 8, 2012

Attendance:
Representative Senators and Officers: 41
Ex-officio: 1
Faculty, Administrators and Guests: 8
Total Attendance: 50

1. Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 1:48pm. The minutes from the October 9, 2012 Representative Faculty Senate Meeting were moved, seconded and unanimously approved.

2. Approval of Minutes
Joan Shapiro, President of the Faculty Senate gave a brief report. She reminded faculty that there was a wonderful Fresh Brunch to honor Outstanding Service from Faculty in each of the schools and colleges. She acknowledged the leadership and effort of Michael Jackson and Cheryl Mack in making this happen and the generosity of Provost Dai in supporting these awards and the brunch. She indicated that this is the second annual service awards brunch and it is important that we continue this recognition process. Joan also mentioned the message that recently was distributed on the Faculty Senate listserver inquiring about faculty planning on retiring in January 2013 who have been officer, committee chair, etc. for faculty senate. We wish to honor those retirees at the December 7th meeting. Joan also mentioned that at the December 7, 2012 University Faculty Senate meeting we will have Frank Friedman and Eleanor Myers reporting on the Institutional Task Force on the Freep Report. She emphasized that this is a very important report and urged senators to encourage their faculty colleagues to attend.

3. Dialogue with Provost Dai:
Provost Dai once again thanked the senators for their work and discussed a number of issues:

- The Provost responded that we have a steering committee with representation centered budget systems. This will be a centerpiece of Theobald’s policies. In preparation for this, the Provost’s office and Anthony Wagner, CFO, has started the process. They have formed a committee with Faculty Senate representatives and are going to look at the current budget model at Temple and what would be an ideal responsibility centered budget model and how we best transition from the current budget model to RCB. There has been no substantial discussion yet. Today he would like to have conversation with faculty about what we would like to know.

Provost Dai started with explanation of RCB. Now TU revenue comes from tuition (a little less than 60%), state allocations (140 mil, 12%), and research (restricted monies $130 mil). Programs (operated by administrative or academic units) are mostly fee for service. There is a total $1.2 billion budget for Temple University, not including TUHS. Temple has appropriated a certain amount to the provost’s office for academic services. The Provost distributes to colleges and service units -- more a centralized model. In RCB (which Penn adopted about 20 years ago), each college is a budget unit (meaning that revenue goes to a college from research, tuition, fee for service/auxiliary programs and colleges then pay a tax to a central pool to maintain critical services). The central pool is usually housed in provost office. Deans are responsible for their budget. At Penn the Dean actually reports directly to the Board of Trustees on budget issues.

Provost Dai raised the question, “Why do we want to do this?” With RCB TU will become more motivated to get new revenues and be more fiscally responsible. His experience at Penn also suggested that RCB brings risks and can create unhealthy competition. Everyone wants to keep credit hours within their college. But we can definitely use changes to get more motivated. One example he gave concerned how to increase tuition paying graduate students in some programs. Right now our policy for acceptance into MA programs has grade point restrictions (e.g., 3.0 or higher) that chills people. International students have difficulty dealing with the unfriendly web application process where they get caught in a do-loop. Turnaround time on application for grad students is too long (2-3 months). In comparison, Drexel’s application timeline is 2 weeks. More than 30% of MA degree applications are incomplete but nobody bothers to check with students. He gave an example of MS in IT at CST and how his office gave 30K start up funds. He said that he hopes this will be the beginning of many discussions on RCB and asked for questions.

- Art Hochner (FSBM) commented there was a proposal to have RCB in 1996 and it was rejected by administrative decision and one of the issues then was that this model penalizes the colleges that have to smaller class sizes. Some colleges do not have the same ability to generate endowments or get research or attract hundred of students. He is concerned about shared governance that RCB will be a force to split governance and faculty focus have to be on building up their colleges.

- The Provost responded that we are partially college based RCB already. A critical question is how we give a cash value or a cash charge to services like the library or student affairs. We have to determine best answers to these questions. One technique is to benchmark by comparing to peer institutions. We then have a form of tax on colleges.

He indicated that he does worry about impact on individual colleges. We are now operating on a model that is historic – how it was done rather than how it should be done. We have just inherited the budget models. They may not make much sense now. He commented that RCB also raises the issues of charges for physical space. He’s worried that colleges like CST will be assessed heavy charges for space and facilities and they have no choice over this.

- Jo-Anna Moore (Tyler): We have counted on Provost as chief academic officer to protect the central academic charge. RCB focuses on cash value only and she is concerned about that idea. Maybe we should not looking for a Provost at all. Sounds like we need more finance experts. The entire purpose of a university education is challenged by RCB.

- The Provost noted the philosophical nature of this question. He agrees we need to take a view that we may not be operating optimally. We need to revisit these models. Do we build faculty that may attract more students and pay more for those faculty, or go a different way? In his conversation with the Trustees he learned they assume the Provost acts as a channel to the faculty to help support these issues.

- (unidentified faculty) History: What is the structure and process through which the discussion and decisions will be made? Is the structure posted somewhere and who do we go to talk with them if we want to?

- The Provost responded that we have a steering committee with representatives from the financial office, provost’s office, deans’ council, and faculty. Terry Halbert represents the faculty senate. The first phase is a study to look at each college’s revenues and expenditures. Second, we will look at other
universities using RCB (like Indiana University or Penn) to see how they are doing it. Then we will have deliberation and planning. The Steering Committee will probably have a mechanism to have input. It will be published and available. You can also reach out to Terry.

-Greg Urwin (CLA): We need to retain the idea of what a good research university looks like. We need to have a sense of our values and not let RCB sway us too much. We need to have Deans who are entrepreneurial. And we have Deans who do not know how to raise money.

-The Provost commented that whichever system is in place we need to have good people in place. RCB requires excellent deans who have vision. This is very important.

4. Vice President’s Report:
Mark Rahdert, Vice President of the Faculty Senate gave his report.

-Faculty committees: He reported the status of the Provost’s search committee; a memo from President Englert encouraged submission of over 30 candidates to CATA who vetted all and made recommendations according to criteria specified by President. That process went very smoothly.

There were many submissions from NTTs as well as TTs.

-Another set of committee elections is coming up. We have vacancies in EPPC, RPPC, UTPAC, and Sabbatical Committee. November 26th – is the week of scheduled election. If you are interested in being a candidate, please send statement of interest and CV to senate2@temple.edu.

Some committees have restrictions on eligibility so please review those on the committee listings on the Senate web site.

-We also have needs for some of the appointed committees. Mark mentioned it is difficult to be specific because we have had delays on the web site.

5. Discussion of Criteria for Provost:
There was an open discussion in the Representative Faculty Senate meeting of November 8, 2012 about what qualities a new provost should possess. The following is a bullet point summary of the faculty comments.

- Champion of academic achievement and faculty governance
- Supportive of the importance of strong collegial assemblies and the guidelines for assemblies developed by the Faculty Senate
- Values the faculty who serve primarily as undergraduate teachers; a provost who would not make these faculty second class citizens
- Willing to find ways to tenure teachers hired as NTTs; work toward tenure of clinical educator and NTT positions
- With the strength and resolve to help deans understand that they need to help encourage independent faculty voice rather than generating consensus through fear and intimidation
- Clear and forward-thinking about the need for correction mechanisms (especially for changes like Responsibility Centered Budgeting); able to set expectation that there will be checkpoints and benchmarking and that administrators need to assume these reviews will value a strong faculty voice
- Experienced and enthusiastic about support for university wide and interdisciplinary programs (especially in light of the RCB impacts on those programs); willing to make sure these efforts are protected under an RCB system
- A leader who encourages institutional reflection and learning/adopts a learning organization orientation
- Possesses a broad vision of the university; does not think primarily or only in terms of their previous home college or functional area
- Encourages thinking systemically and actively explores how things affect other parts of the system than their department or college
- An excellent communicator – giving the faculty the information we need; like budget information – open and above board and committed to open discourse and information sharing with faculty
- Understands the need for more staffing infrastructure support. A provost who can talk to people from complicated disciplines working in the field – like helping professions

6. Discussion: What Issues Should the New President Address?
There was an open discussion on what issues the new President should address.

The comments included the following.

-faculty governance is critical. We need collegial assemblies that operate according to guidelines.

-we need endowment and we have not been successful in raising one. A President’s most critical role is to attract new sources of funding and endowment to the university

-faculty governance; the new President needs to develop a positive relationship with TAUP.

7. Move to Adjourn
It was moved, seconded and unanimously approved that the meeting be adjourned at 3:15pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Tricia S. Jones
Faculty Senate Secretary

For an archive of Faculty Senate Minutes, go to: http://www.temple.edu/senate/minutes.htm
Audio Recordings of these and other Senate Meetings may be found at: http://www.temple.edu/senate/Apreso/FacultySenateApresoRecordings.htm
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 Steve Newman at facultyherald@temple.edu.

University Faculty Senate Minutes, May 1, 2012

Attendance:
Representative Senators and Officers: 56
Ex-officio: 2
Faculty, Administrators and Guests: 39
Total Attendance: 97

1. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 1:54 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the December 9, 2011 University Faculty Senate Meeting and the February 8, 2012 Special University Faculty Senate Meeting were approved.

3. Presentation
On behalf of the Senate and the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, President LaFollette presented President Hart with a citation reading as follows:

The Faculty Senate Steering Committee of Temple University wishes to acknowledge, with gratitude, the leadership demonstrated by Ann Weaver Hart, President of Temple University 2009-2012. We deeply appreciate her steadfast dedication in leading Temple University to excellence as an institution, and her role in creating and supporting significant faculty-centered processes and accomplishments, especially the Academic Compass. As the first woman President of Temple University, President Hart embodies our historically critical institutional value of diversity. We wish her continued success.

President Hart graciously accepted, expressing her thanks for the constructive relationship that has prevailed between the Senate and administration during her tenure. She stated that it has been an honor to be part of this faculty and this institution.

4. President’s Report
President LaFollette gave a report reflecting on his two terms as Faculty Senate President. During that time a lot has been accomplished. Much of the work has been done by faculty committees, which usually operate so smoothly that we give little attention to their work. With over thirty committees, the collective accomplishment has been tremendous. LaFollette thanked the many members of those committees for their work.

One of the hardest-working committees is the Faculty Senate Steering Committee. During 2010-2011, the FSSC invested a great deal of time and energy revising the Senate constitution and by-laws—the first comprehensive revision undertaken in many years. The FSSC also worked with the President to commence a study of the university’s climate for LGBTQ students, faculty and staff. A report of that study is due to be released shortly. The FSSC worked on streamlining and improving the tenure and promotion review process. It developed a statement of principles for the development of collegial assembly by-laws, which was adopted by the full Senate this year. Both last year and this year, the FSSC worked with the administration and the Budget Review Committee on budget issues related to reductions in appropriations from the Commonwealth.

In 2011-2012, the FSSC spent a great deal of time working with the Provost and President on issues related to the Provost’s White Paper on reorganization, the subsequent proposals for reorganization in the arts, communications, and education, as well as on the proposed faculty workload guidelines. The FSSC also dealt with issues involving on-line administration of SFIs, GenEd review, and the General Education Executive Committee’s (GEEC) response to the workload guidelines, which the FSSC endorsed. These are some of the more salient matters that have occupied the attention of the FSSC and Senate during this period.

President LaFollette asked the current members of the FSSC to come forward for recognition. He offered thanks to them, as well as to his predecessor Presidents of the Senate (especially Professors Karen Turner (SCT), Robert Aiken (CST), and Jane Evans (Tyler)) for the model they have set for commitment to university service.

At the close of his comments, President LaFollette officially handed the gavel to President-elect Joan Shapiro, who will assume office July 1.

5. Vice President’s Report
Vice President Shapiro began her report by thanking the chairs and members of the 30+ university faculty committees, whose work is critical to shared governance at Temple. She also reminded faculty to be constantly mindful of the voices of our students, who are the center of our institution.

There is still time for committee final reports to be filed. For inclusion in the Faculty Herald, they need to be in by Friday, May 4. Shapiro asked faculty members over the summer to give thought to colleagues who might be good candidates for service on particular university committees. Keeping committees fully staffed is an ongoing challenge. Right now, there are particularly acute vacancies on the Personnel Committee and the Faculty Herald Editorial Board. In considering potential candidates, it is always helpful to give particular attention to recruiting minority and women faculty members. Information regarding the committees and what they do can be found on the Faculty Senate website. Vice President Shapiro offered her thanks to Faculty Senate Coordinator Cheryl Mack, who devotes substantial energy to keeping the committees running smoothly.

6. Student Government Officers
President LaFollette introduced the incoming officers of the Student Government Association. They are: President David Lopez, Vice President of Services Julian Hamer, and Vice President of External Affairs Ofo Ezeugwu.

7. TAUP Contract
TAUP president Art Hochner (FSBM) observed that, as has been recently announced, the University and TAUP have reached an agreement to extend the current contract for two additional years. Information has been sent to all TAUP members. There will be informational meetings this week at Main Campus, the Health Science Center and Ambler.

8. General Education
Istvan Varkonyi, Director of GenEd, reported on GEEC’s activities in relation to the process for recertification of the GenEd program. There have been several meetings with the FSSC liaison committee. GEEC has developed a pilot program for recertification and expects 19 portfolios to be submitted by the end of the month. GEEC will use these pilot portfolios to iron out any kinks in the process over the summer, with full launch in the fall. During the Fall 2012 term, an additional 25-30 portfolios are expected. GEEC is also working on a student survey, which will go out to the first graduating student cohort to experience the full GenEd curriculum. GEEC has also discussed issues related to budgeting for GenEd programs, the impact of restructuring.
and other issues. The concern is that if GenEd is not “on the table” for these matters it will “fall through the cracks.” Of particular concern to GEEC is the contemplated transfer to full decanal authority over enrollment capacities in GenEd courses. Another concern is a steady shift in GenEd staffing from tenure-track to NTT and adjunct faculty, as well as a shift toward making all GenEd classes larger, rather than having a mix of small, medium and large-class offerings as had been originally envisioned. GEEC has drafted letters to the Provost and to the Senate setting out some of the issues that GenEd faces.

9. Provost’s Report

Provost Englert thanked all for their contributions to a great year. He briefed the Senate on several matters. Englert reminded the Senate that SFFs will go on-line beginning this summer. With regard to restructuring, the Provost has met with many individuals and groups in affected units, and there have been good and thoughtful discussions over the most important issues. The comment period on the proposals closed April 30, and the Provost has received over 60 online comments as well as over 50 comments from other venues. He plans to digest these comments and put together a set of final proposals. There have also been over 20 online responses to the proposed Workload guidelines, as well as comments coming in from other sources.

Englert saluted the recent faculty recipients of the Great Teacher, Lindback, Research and Creative Achievement, and GenEd teaching awards. The recipients are all outstanding in their own right. They also stand as representatives of faculty excellence throughout the university. Englert noted that the stipend for the Creative Achievement award has been increased to bring the amount closer to the other awards.

Englert offered his thanks to the Senate officers, the FSSC, other Senate committees, and GEEC for their contributions to the university. He also offered his thanks to our excellent student leaders who are always challenging, yet also fair and mature, with a deep commitment to Temple’s future.

By way of recent notable university events, the Provost mentioned Temple’s participation in the Disney Jazz Club at New York’s Lincoln Center, the Theater production of Top Girls, the upcoming awards program at the Library for student research, and the university Film Festival. Finally, Englert encouraged faculty to participate in Commencement.

In the question and answer session that followed these were among the items raised:

• The Provost’s report on the White Paper was issued shortly after Spring Break, and the time period for comments on that report recently closed. What is the timeline for releasing final detailed proposals regarding restructuring? The Provost responded that he hopes to have them ready for approval by the Board of Trustees in June. Faculty senators responded that this timeline makes no allowance for any faculty response to the details of the proposals once they have been formulated. This is of great concern to affected units, because some of the issues most important to faculty members, such as policies and procedures for tenure, departmental structure, lines of authority, school autonomy and governance, and budgeting have yet to be addressed.

• As noted at the previous Representative Senate meeting, Temple Times has cut back significantly on its reporting regarding faculty activities, and the Temple Bookstores do nothing to highlight faculty publications. These practices project the image that faculty activities are unimportant, and that is not an image we want to project. Englert said he would carry the concern to the responsible parties.

• A senator commented on two major issues over the past several years regarding the role of faculty. The first is the erosion of faculty govern-
right and productive ideas for asserting our prerogatives as faculty. By way of conclusion, let me offer some preliminary thoughts on strengthening faculty participation and a preview of some of the topics addressed in this issue and to be addressed in future ones. I apologize beforehand for all the shoulds and musts; of course, whether you agree or disagree, I am eager to hear your views on what we should and must do.

If we are to fight back against our perceived irrelevance, it will not do to say “no” in high academic dudgeon every time we are faced with significant challenges or alternative approaches to education. Looking forward to a later issue dedicated to undergraduate education, I suspect that most of us would profit from becoming more conversant with competency-based learning. It is a discourse at the heart of many new ideas about designing and assessing curricula, and it will not do to dismiss it as a sop to the Gods of Accreditation during their decennial visitation, or as a plot to replace real knowledge with mere instrumentality, as I have heard some colleagues suggest. We must raise the alarm about what could be lost in distance education experiments like MOOCs, as Dan O’Hara does wisely and pointedly in his column in this issue [link]. But we should also guard against reflexively damning distance education in its many varieties as necessarily corrosive to good teaching, and I plan to share in a forthcoming issue an emerging initiative led by faculty and administrators that sets high standards for distance learning at Temple while not encroaching on faculty autonomy.

If faculty are to claim our rightful place at Temple, we, especially those of us on the tenure track, must also take more responsibility for the problems facing us. For instance, we who have earned and enjoy the protection of tenure should allow knowledge that while we have been willing to have those on the teaching/instructional track free us to do more research and teach more advanced classes, we have been less willing to help them improve their working conditions and honor their many contributions in service and research as well as teaching. Another way we shirk responsibility is to neglect or denigrate service and then complain that we have no voice. Yes, many committees waste our time by ignoring the faculty or not following through. The proper response is to insist that they allow real faculty input and have real effects. Consider the Task Force on Institutional Integrity, which will feature in the next issue: When first announced it had only one faculty member; we insisted that it at least include one more, and that made a difference. Conversely, we should call attention to instances in which we are properly included, as in the Provost’s Search Committee. Acknowledging administrators when they truly work with us is not servile but rather a way to encourage more of the same.

Many of these challenges and opportunities converge in the new budgeting model President Theobald is introducing; see both my interview with him and the fruitful reflections from colleagues across the university in the previous issue. Though issued in a different context, I am reminded of these words by David Waldstreicher, the previous editor, a generous colleague, and a very tough act to follow: “As a student of political history, I can state that it is precisely in times of economic crisis that the rules of the political game are often reconsidered, with creative and positive consequences.” As President Theobald suggests, Responsibility Centered Management should be a chance for “creative and positive consequences.” It should be a more faculty-centered budgeting model, locating decisions closer to where the faculty live. Given that RCM also grants more power to deans, we must insist, as Mark Rahdert does in his column in this issue on 360 reviews of deans [link], that we have a voice in evaluating the leaders of our schools and colleges.

We should not be timid in raising questions about administrative inefficiency and overreach or in demanding that research and teaching be the first priorities for resources. But if we wish to be taken seriously, we should resist easy and self-serving impulses like “Fire all the deans!” In addition to seeking our own sources of revenue whenever it’s feasible and ethical, we should ask administrators to find the resources to realize our aims; but if the money isn’t there we also need to be ready to talk about what we are willing to give up for what we want most.

We must also reach out to our students, who may differ from us profoundly (they’re mostly younger, for one) but are our natural allies and the main reason we are here. To this end, I have entered into a discussion with the editors of our student newspaper about including in our paper and theirs a regular conversation between students and faculty. But faculty must also have recourse on the rare occasions when they encounter a rare threatening