Competencies and Their Discontents

The editor, assistant editor, and editorial board of The Faculty Herald wish all of you a restful and productive summer. If you have any response to what’s in The Herald or would like to contribute something, please email Steve Newman at sn Newman@temple.edu.

Given the tidal wave of stories, puff-pieces, jeremiads and just plain chatter, we might be inclined to dub Academic Year 2012-13 The Year of the MOOC. (For those unplugged from the media, MOOCs are Massive Online Open Courses, delivered online by star professors to thousands of students they never meet and whose work they never see.) I guess it’s propitious that this is also the year on the East Coast when the cicadas of Brood II emerge from the ground after 17 years gnawing on tree roots and assault our ears with their songs as they mate and die. Yet while cicadas are harmless (if noisy and a bit frightening to look at), MOOCs actually do represent a threat that probably outweigh their benefits, as Dan O’Hara and others suggest. While they may be useful supplements to real

Answering for Undergraduate Education

By Paul LaFollette, Associate Professor, Computer and Information Sciences

As an undergraduate, I knew little about the lives my professors led when I was not in class with them. I had little understanding of the academy, had no hint as to which were well-known scholars and which were not. And had I known, I doubt I would have much cared. What I did know (and care deeply about) was that one or two were pompous windbags, another was a petty martinet, and the rest were kind, caring instructors who always had time for another question, time to meet with me, and time to evaluate my work fairly and accurately.

I believe this to be the case with the vast majority of my colleagues here at Temple, but now I know how difficult it can be to express that kind of caring. I also realize that the demands of fairness insist that we treat our students thus. For our undergraduates place their own intellectual development directly into our hands for the time that they are with us. They call Temple their fostering mother, their alma mater. And their tuition pays the majority of Temple’s expenses. We owe them our best.

What Faculty Should Know About International Students

by Alistair Howard, Associate Professor (Instructional), Political Science, and Urszula Pruchniewska, Master’s Student, Journalism.

Language, communication, and participation

As you might expect, international students’ most common concern is effective communication—they want to comprehend what faculty are saying and convey their learning in their assigned work. Even fluent English speakers may have trouble understanding lectures, especially since many have studied British English and must adjust to American English and its idioms. Some may also be unfamiliar with concepts outside their majors, especially those who specialized before coming to Temple. And a few may simply have underestimated what’s needed to succeed in American liberal education. Whatever the case, lecturing clearly in understandable English will help international and domestic students. And we might also remember that international students have to work harder to get to the same results, because of linguistic and cultural barriers alike. Finally, it’s crucial that we not assume that non-native English speakers are somehow less intelligent for being that.

While foreign students may seem to lack local students’ public self-confidence, they’re very often quietly eager to participate. As is the case for local students, including international students in class discussion is vital to keeping them engaged and confirming that they’re understanding

Interview with Provost Hai-Lung Dai, Part I

This is the first part of my April 3rd interview with Provost Dai. The second part, which will address funding and administering research, the union and the place of chairs within it, international education and other issues, will appear in the first issue of next year’s Herald. I want to thank Provost Dai for taking time out of his very busy schedule, for his candor in addressing sensitive, complex, and important topics—and for his willingness to meet again and answer follow-up questions.

The role of the Provost and the challenges facing Temple

Steve Newman (SN): I appreciate your taking the time to speak with me.

First, I’d like to start generally. You were Interim Provost for one semester and now you’ve been the Provost for a few months, and thinking about what’s in your portfolio, what are the biggest challenges that you see facing Temple right now, perhaps with an emphasis on the issues most affecting the faculty, though it doesn’t have to be restricted to this. How are you hoping to change the conversation to move forward in addressing those challenges?

Hai-Lung Dai (HLD): First, I would start by asking: “What is my role as the Chief Academic Officer?” In my view the two masters of the university are the faculty and the students. I said this in the Faculty Senate. We are not
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a private corporation; we do have a budget, but my job is not to generate dividends to please stockholders, and here the stakeholders are the faculty and the students, and so you look at our purposes. For students, we need to deliver an education so that they can function as citizens and develop their careers. I think that among the many challenges facing Temple, there are two that stand out. The first is the quality of the education. I’m not saying that we’re not doing a good job. But I think we need to look at whether particularly at this time when we have a globalization-driven economy, are we preparing our students at a time when many other countries who were not our competitors are now our strong competitors. That’s the education part. Of course, to deliver this education, you need a well-supported faculty. So, here, the question is what do we mean by well-supported? And one of the things I have found at Temple is that we are relatively poor.

SN: Yes, our relative lack of resources is a major challenge.

HLD: We all know we are well-intentioned, we want to provide access, we want to offer the best scholarship, and we all want to be respected. But lots of things do need resources that will give us the ability to support faculty in different disciplines. If you are in science, you need matching funds; you need a well-oiled research service to help you go out and get grants. But even for non-sponsored research, we need summer fellowships; we need money to send faculty to present at conferences. All these things need resources . . .

SN: So where do they come from?

HLD: Right—where do they come from? This brings us to the second challenge, which is financial resources. Where do we get the financial resources to stay prosperous? So these are the two—quality of education and financial resources—that I view as the biggest challenges. In fact, you could say, I sound like a layman on the street. There’s nothing grandiose or new. I’m just telling you that this is the reality, and this is our intention. I’m a Confucian scholar, and Confucius said, “You work on the fundamentals, and when the fundamentals are properly set, the way naturally appears.” As I look at our university, our job is to provide the best education for students and provide the best environment for faculty to develop scholarship. That’s the fundamentals. I think we should focus on the fundamentals.

Faculty Review of Deans and the role of Faculty in Decentralized Budgeting

SN: I’d like to follow up on Confucius before the end of our interview, because I find your reference to him very interesting and what you said about fundamentals was certainly very clear. Before I began taping, you spoke of the importance of the faculty getting their voice out there, and so I’d like to ask a few questions about faculty governance and working conditions. In the Faculty Senate, one issue that has been bubbling up concerns the relationship between faculty and the administration and particularly between faculty and deans. With the coming of decentralized budgeting, the deans will become even more important players, and one of the questions that has arisen is: What role do faculty have, what role should faculty have in reviewing deans? In the first issue this Spring in the Faculty Herald, Mark Rahdert wrote a column envisioning what a real faculty role in reviewing deans would look like, not just people opining anonymously, shooting from their hips. I wonder if you’ve given this any thought and if you think faculty should have a role in evaluating deans, and, if so, what it would be? How could be get such a system installed? Do you have a timeline in mind? I know my readers would be interested.

HLD: Starting with the RCM model, the intention is let’s say that at present we have federalism and we want to empower the states, the colleges and schools. The idea is that once you have the private ownership locally, then people will work more. I used this example in the faculty senate: Look at China. I was there for the first time in 1990. At that time Shanghai was like a village. But if you go today, Shanghai looks tremendous. I saw a report that between 1990 and 2010, they built 4760 high rises. Shanghai now has an infrastructure bigger than New York City. Here is the question: How were they able to do this? We know that in the 1980’s China restored private ownership; they went from a very restricted, pure socialistic system to a system that is today more capitalistic than America. But then you can ask: “Why hasn’t this happened in other countries?” China is not the first to have private ownership. So the lesson here to me is that you really have to have the right person in charge. This brings us to your point. How do we make sure that we have the right deans in place? The dean will have more authority in guiding directly the finances of that college. And the dean is expected to be the leader of the entrepreneurial initiatives. At the same time we want the deans to do the right things, not just to make money. We want to see the fruits of initiatives, but these initiatives should be based on improving the quality of the education and the quality of our scholarship. Consequently, we have a better reputation as an educational institution . . .

SN: That’s good to hear.

HLD: Right, but not everyone has the same ideas to become better. I can easily imagine that a dean could say, let’s just teach more courses to generate more revenue from credit hours. That could be unproductive competition with other colleges. For any system to function well, it is very important to have the right person to be responsible. Of course it is also very important that we have the right president and provost, particularly in the current centralized model. In fact, I would tell you that if I am not the right person, I should be fired. In that spirit I am very happy to report to you that our president is very clear on this— to make sure the leadership like the deans is accountable. In fact, in his first months at Temple, this has been a topic of our discussions.

SN: A virtuous cycle gets created . . .

HLD: We’re already working on formulating a policy. The deans will have a finite period of appointments. Each term will be five years. Then at the end of five years there will be a formal review process, and the formal review will involve faculty, students—a 360 review. And then based on the review result, a dean will or won’t be reappointed another term or another finite period of time. This is something new at Temple. This reflects the president’s and my belief that we need the best people, and we need a system that will ensure people in those positions stay at their best. And because the review process will involve faculty, so the faculty’s observations will be reflected in this.

SN: I have to say that the last editorial I wrote was on how to build trust at Temple generally, between faculty and administrators . . .

HLD: That’s another very important issue, and this is what I want to emphasize. This is partly why I’m still doing research.

SN: You’re a faculty member.

HLD: Right, I’m a faculty member. I fully anticipate that once I complete my administrative assignment, I’ll return as a faculty member. Whatever policy I make today, I will enjoy or suffer tomorrow like everyone else. The other thing, I again emphasize, that we’re not a for-profit corporation. We don’t have stockholders to please. Our stakeholders are faculty, students, and staff. Whatever work I do, I do for the faculty and students.

SN: It’s service.

HLD: Right, it’s a service role. President Theobald is very clear on this. Every time I discuss something with him, his first response is what is the policy implications, and secondly, how we are going to implement these policies. We are working with the faculty members to make sure that these policies are implemented and that the deans are accountable.
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courses, there is reason to worry that those with visions of Economies of Scale and Education on the Cheap dancing in their heads will pursue them at the expense of real teaching and learning. It is good to see the faculty at Duke, Amherst, San Jose State, and other places raise fair questions about this delivery system—especially San Jose State, since it, like Temple, is among the hoi polloi who are the real market for these courses provided by our better-off relatives.

Yet although MOOCs may be a significant force in higher ed in the years to come, I suggest that this year would be better-named The Year of Competencies. Not as catchy, I know, nor gleaming with the be-still-my-heart virtual ‘presence’ of faculty from Stanford, Harvard, and MIT. But I would suggest that the emergence of MOOCs is predicated upon a broader and more consequential movement to evaluate students on the basis of competencies—the knowledges and skills that they can demonstrate. For a competencies-based version of education is in principle indifferent to whether a student meets the standard by way of courses designed, taught, and evaluated by faculty or MOOCs or more typical online courses or self-directed study at the Philadelphia Free Library. That is, this model sees no particular value in what the great many ways of us do.

Of course, a competencies-based approach has been with us for decades. What’s changed during this past year is the acceptance it’s gained from the institutions that regulate higher education. Following President Obama’s State of the Union, which devoted a couple sentences to the need to address the soaring cost of higher education, the Department of Education sent out a letter that opened the door for competency-based programs to be eligible for financial aid. Prior to this, it had been restricted to those who followed the century-old credit-hour model. Accrediting agencies have also started to approve these courses. Meanwhile, heavy-hitters in educational “reform,” the Gates and Lumina Foundations, are funding competency-based programs. And so we now have College for America, an offshoot of Southern New Hampshire University, which will offer an associate’s degree in general studies in which students will show mastery of 120 competencies divided up into “20 distinct ‘task families,’ which are then divided into three task levels.” Here’s an example of how they are to show mastery:

[Students are asked to study potential works of art for a museum exhibit about the changing portrayal of human bodies throughout history. To guide the students, Southern New Hampshire points them to a series of free online resources, such as “Smarthistory” videos presented by Khan Academy. Students must summarize what they’ve found by creating a PowerPoint presentation that could be delivered to a museum director.]

Completed tasks are shipped out for evaluation to a pool of part-time adjunct professors, who quickly assess the work and help students understand what they need to do to improve. Southern New Hampshire also assigns “coaches” to students to help them establish their goals and pace.

I have visited “Smarthistory,” and it is indeed a very impressive site, over-seen by two academics who have held positions at MOMA and The Pratt Institute and who have solicited contributions from experts in a range of fields. But “the body in art” is not a topic to be found among its intelligent essays and videos. And thus I’m not so sure that without an instructor to guide them through a thoughtfully-selected set of materials the great majority of working adults pursuing an associate’s degree would be able to “summarize what they’ve found” about a topic as vast and complex as “changing portrayals of the human body” in a way that would demonstrate much learning. Like me, you also may have blanched at “shipped out for evaluation to a pool of part-time adjunct professors.” Not because, as Paul LaFollette takes pains to remark in his column on undergraduate education, adjuncts are not good, dedicated teachers. But because their conditions of employment make it less likely that they’ll have the time to offer the most productive feedback.

This is part of what comes with “unbundling the faculty role,” to use an ugly recent coinage. It appears to be a point of pride among competency-based programs that they separate those 1) who design the course from 2) the “coaches” who answer questions from students as they wend their way through it from 3) those who evaluate the students. This, they say, ensures objectivity. This is what allows what its backers to revealingly call it “direct assessment”—no pointless mediation by those people we call faculty. Yet while we may agree that properly-trained outsiders should be able to gauge what our students have learned, is there no role for the more context-rich forms of evaluation that depend on being close to a course as the teacher of a particular course, even if you then grade portfolios from across sections, as our First Year Writing Program does? Then there is the question of how much time will be spent and by whom evaluating students when these competency-based projects ramp up to their wished-for scale. Right now, College for America is a small enterprise—only a few hundred students who must be employees of the college’s corporate and government partners; but the president’s goal is to enroll 350,000 students by 2018. The question is as its numbers swell whether it can maintain even its current minimal standards of assessment (including productive feedback). For a sense of this, we could turn to Western Governors University (30000 and counting) or Penn-Foster, whose less-than-reassuring way of assessing their very inexpensive courses I mentioned in my first column.

WGU is also useful as a model of the larger vision of public higher ed that attracts at least some of the boosters of competency-based education. This private university is opening branch campuses in Missouri and Tennessee, with the former definitely and the latter possibly receiving significant state funding. Meanwhile, in the past five years, Missouri has cut state funding per student by 29.7%, Tennessee by 30.1%. We might shrug our shoulders and say that WGU has simply found a better way to reach students who otherwise would not be reached. But while there is no doubt that there are millions of people in the United States who want higher education but for various reasons do not end up earning degrees, I am skeptical that programs tied to the rise of “competencies” will be able to educate these students in ways that will adequately benefit them as workers or citizens or people. But skepticism alone will not suffice, and we cannot responsibly write off competencies as a way to measure our students’ learning. This is not only because of the practical matter that competency-based education is almost certain to extend its reach. Northern Arizona University and the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, an urban research university not too unlike Temple, are among those getting into the competencies market. But we must also engage with competencies because it is fair and right to demand that we be explicit and thoughtful about what our students are learning to do in our courses. We have made ourselves vulnerable by teaching in ways insufficiently attentive to these questions. It is, I would also note that the students currently targeted most by this approach are the adult learners that Temple once understood—still understands?—as being crucial to its Convivial mission.) Competencies are already a central matter in departments and schools that must gain accreditation from professional bodies, such as engineering, business, and nursing, as Pamela Barnett of the Teaching and Learning Center reminded me in a recent discussion. I assume every other department has lists of competencies left over from the most recent accreditation of Temple as a whole, even if they’re now moldering in forgotten files. Whatever shape they’re in, though, there is much work to be done in making those competencies real for our students and ourselves. It will require that we talk with each other in departments and across departments and ranks and tracks, none of which will be easy. Some of this already happens at Temple, but all too rarely in my experience.

To help make it happen, we should seek out places at Temple where our colleagues have already given this a fair bit of thought. General Education springs to mind. As my interview with Provost Dai makes clear, we are in the midst of a close look at Gen Ed. Whatever emerges from that discussion—and I hope and trust it will be a transparent one driven significantly by

DEPARTMENT CHAIRS' RESPONSE TO TAUP'S “CHAIRS INTO MANAGERS”

By Arvind Parkhe, Professor and Chair, Strategic Management, Fox SBM and Rob Drennan, Associate Professor and Chair, Risk Management and Insurance, Fox SBM

On February 15, 2013, Temple Association of University Professionals [TAUP] circulated an email to the TAUP listserve, titled “Temple’s Move to Make Chairs into Managers – What is Going On?” In this email, TAUP urged faculty to “join the fight against the administration’s move.”

At issue is a Petition for Unit Clarification filed by Temple administration with the Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board [PLRB] in October 2012, to remove department chairs from the purview of the Temple-TAUP collective bargaining agreement.

We are department chairs at Temple, and we respectfully disagree with TAUP’s position, for reasons elaborated below. Inasmuch as the TAUP email stated that the impact of removing chairs would be to “weaken faculty governance,” we would like to quote former Indiana Governor Mitch Daniels, who wrote the following in a January 18, 2013 open letter to Purdue University, where he recently became president:

Shared governance implies shared accountability. It is neither equitable or workable to demand shared governing power but declare that cost control or substandard performance in any part of Purdue is someone else’s problem …… Participation in governance also requires the willingness to make choices. ‘More for everyone’ or ‘Everyone gets the same’ are stances of default, inconsistent with the obligations of leadership.

Below are some of TAUP’s key assertions and our responses to each.

1. “The current system of chairs as colleagues is not broken. Why change it?”

There are two basic flaws with this argument. One, the current system is not chairs-as-colleagues, but rather chairs playing the dual role of representing the administration’s views to faculty and faculty’s views to the administration. Chairs are the essential interface between administration and faculty, straddling both camps, facilitating dialogue, leading and motivating department faculty on one hand, and on the other, persuading the Dean’s office to implement necessary policy changes and resource allocation decisions that will lift up the department and the school as a whole. Put another way, the effectiveness of a chair will be severely compromised if he/she begins to represent either the administration’s views alone, or the faculty’s views alone, to the exclusion of the other side’s views.

Two, it is a fundamental mistake to argue that the current system appears to be not broken, therefore should not be changed. Temple University, like other institutions of higher education, is in the midst of unprecedented external changes, including demographic shifts, financial model reordering (reduced state support, capped tuition rates); intensifying competition from peer and aspirant schools in the U.S. and, increasingly, worldwide for students, faculty, and resources; and the deep impact of technology on teaching, research, and outreach. Such profound external changes cause, or should cause, an internal examination where status quo gives way to better practices that will enable us to effectively cope with external demands. Whether these better practices come from the corporate world, other well-run schools, management theory, task forces, or consultants, our end goals must be to deliver the best possible education for our students (knowledge dissemination), highest possible support for our research faculty (knowledge creation), and together, maximum value to society. As Governor Daniels observed in his email for anyone who was interested. We welcome letters in response from the authors of either column or from anybody else on the faculty.

RESPONSE TO PROFESSORS PARKHE AND DRENNAN

By Art Hochner, TAUP President & Associate Professor of Human Resource Management, Fox SBM

My Fox School colleagues Professors Arvind Parkhe and Rob Drennan responded to TAUP’s e-Bulletin from February, which went only to the TAUP bargaining unit. Many readers of the Faculty Herald never saw it.

(Read the piece, “Temple’s Move to Make Chairs into Managers – What is Going On?”)

They base their critique on three points from the e-Bulletin. I’ll mostly restrict myself to their points, although they neglect many other relevant issues raised in the e-Bulletin, especially about the faculty-chair relationship. In sum, they don’t make a convincing case.

First, Parkhe and Drennan find fault with TAUP’s argument that the current system is not broken. They say that chairs play a dual role and that this role is necessary, presumably whether chairs are in the bargaining unit or not. But they never explain what the flaw in our argument is.

The Temple University - TAUP collective bargaining agreement’s Article 16: Department Chairs acknowledges the dual role. What exactly do they want to fix?

They say higher education is in “the midst of unprecedented changes,” but never put their finger on how our current chair system impedes efforts to meet the challenges. They say we need to change “old, unbroken models” but don’t say how making chairs into managers will lead us toward our end goals. Of all the sources of “better practices” they mention, “the corporate world, other well-run schools, management theory, task forces, or consultants,” there is no mention of faculty. Indeed, this disregard for faculty views seems to have been anticipated by the administration’s decision: Temple management didn’t bother to ask the faculty if department chairs should remain in the bargaining unit. Parkhe and Drennan seem to assume that strong management is the answer, not shared governance.

Second, since TAUP’s message in February, we have learned a great deal about decentralized budgeting. The TAUP Executive Committee met in mid-March with Senior Vice President and CFO Anthony Wagner to discuss it. I spoke with Provost Hai-lung Dai in mid-April about it, too. One thing is clear now: The budget unit will be the school or college, not the department. Parkhe and Drennan thus misunderstand decentralized budgeting when they say that it “strengthens faculty power by putting decision making inside academic departments” if what they mean is that individual departments will be making budgetary decisions. Deans will likely pass down orders to departments aimed at enhancing the college’s budget picture, not that of departments. Thus, chairs, whether inside or outside the bargaining unit, would be working with the dean’s strategy for the school.

Making chairs managers would not strengthen faculty power under decentralized budgeting. Instead, it would tilt the dual role of chairs well over to the administrative side, at the expense of chairs as colleagues and faculty leaders. Among the many points that Parkhe and Drennan neglect to mention from TAUP’s initial email, departments now operate largely on consensus decision making, with chairs chosen through significant departmental faculty input. Chairs as managers would have no mandate from or real accountability to their faculty. Their mandate would be from and accountability to the dean. They would be less likely to operate by consensus and more on the basis of the dean’s vision. Removing chairs from the bargaining unit would change the dynamics of the faculty-chair-dean relationship and would strengthen the administrative hierarchy by giving deans more direct control over chairs. This is why, despite Parkhe and Drennan’s claim, there is nothing ‘counterintuitive’ about our concern over the effects of decentralized budgeting on faculty governance, especially if this new fiscal system is to be paired with the removal of chairs from the bargaining unit.

Third, they advocate metrics for evaluating chairs’ effectiveness, presuma-
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faculties role in this? How will the faculty feel about this? What can we do to reflect the proper involvement of faculty in the process?

SN: Another issue involving faculty and the trust between them and the administration has to do with collegial budget committees and the university-wide committee. There’s an enormous amount at stake there, and the faculty are watching very carefully—and those longer here than I tend to be more skeptical than I am, though that’s not to say I’m that skeptical. Whether, for example, there is a real role for faculty in reviewing deans, that’s going to be something of a litmus test for many faculty as they decide whether Temple has turned a corner in shared governance and trust between faculty and administration. Another one will be whether the members of these budget review committees are elected by the faculty. I mean, being dean must be a terribly hard job; I can’t imagine doing it myself. But if RCM is going to work the way you and Pres. Theobald envision it, the faculty on those committees should feel as if they are there because their colleagues have elected them as their representatives to advise the dean on these matters, though I know that the authority finally rests with the dean.

HLD: I think in the upcoming RCM model, you will see committees advising deans on budget in each of the colleges and schools. But still there will be some resources that will be allocated from the Provost’s office. And I anticipate I’ll have a faculty committee to advise me about the appropriateness of the university-wide initiatives.

SN: Anytime you have a new system come in, you’re going to have some people say, “Meet the new boss, same as the old boss,” but I really think that there is potential to change things here.

HLD: I do want to add one caution here that each college or school has its own by-laws, its own operating procedure. For instance, in the college where I was dean I had a faculty advisory committee. They would advise me on important issues. Here, we’re not going to say that there is just one rule to fit all the colleges; we’re going to let each college decide how they want to have that governing process.

SN: I think the FSSC sent you and the President our sense of what would be best in forming these committees. I don’t want to get lost in the weeds since we have so much else to talk about, but I think there’s some concern that the Deans will simply be selecting these committees. And if that happens in a particular college, in that college if that happens, then the faculty are going to think: Are we really having any input?

HLD: On that specific issue, I think the current Temple model actually works reasonably well. Every committee has a fraction coming from direct election and others by appointment. To be honest with you, we are all very busy, so it’s not necessarily true that a process by election will generate all the right expertise we need. Election balanced by appointment seems to be a fine compromise.

SN: You could see a model where there’s a mix.

HLD: We’re doing that already. Often, there are important committees whose members are a mixture from direct election and appointment. Sometimes you have to appoint because, for instance, in CST one department was very active in electing its own people. I couldn’t have a committee made up just from one department, so I had to appoint from other departments to balance this. As a Provost, I would leave this up to individual colleges. I think in principle this model is fine.

SN: There has to be a faculty voice.

HLD: Right.

Undergraduate Education and General Education

SN: I have other questions about governance, including the proposal to have chairs out of the bargaining unit, so I hope we can circle back to it. I have a couple questions about undergraduate education.

HLD: Sure.

SN: When I’ve heard you speak, my sense is that you think that the spine of undergraduate education has to do with the specifics of disciplinary knowledge. I started off as a double major in Chemistry and English. I went through Orgo which I loved, actually.

HLD: That’s a unique combination.

SN: I loved chemistry; I still do. I got through Orgo fine, but it became clear that the lab was not where I belonged. And I don’t think three-dimensionally the way chemists seem to be able to do. Undergraduate education does have to do with the disciplines, but then the question is what role there is for broader skills and competencies. So how would you respond to the claim made by the American Association of Colleges and Universities that says, “Look: If we are going to educate students as citizens and as people who can compete in a global economy, they will need these skills, knowledges, and habits of mind!” This has implications for Gen Ed, but before we get there, I’d be interested to hear your vision was how to balance disciplinary knowledge with broader skills and habits of mind that a college education needs to foster.

HLD: My answer is actually very straightforward. I think the principle of a liberal arts education is sound and should be sustained. The issue is in the details of implementation, not the principles. I didn’t get my undergraduate education in the United States; I was educated in Taiwan. It was very Confucian. But the goals are very, very similar. In a Confucian educational system, all governmental officials had to be learned intellectuals. In fact, China was not feudalistic. This is a misunderstanding. China had an imperial system. But all officials, starting with a local magistrate, had to pass a completely unbiased exam. We have these stories of someone coming from a poor family, who studied very hard for 10 years, and became a scholar, and then prime minister. You can’t become emperor though.

SN: That’s a matter of bloodlines.

HLD: Right. But you can become prime minister. And this was part of the entire Chinese traditional educational system. It emphasized service to society by serving people as officials. Now, we need to know the thoughts of the past and the most important issues that face us in the present. And then the other part of a Confucian education is actually the enjoyment of life. If you go to a museum in China, say the National Palace Museum in Taipei, almost all the famous paintings were done by famous scholars. This is very different from the West. We have few Michelangelos or Rembrandts. We have mostly scholar-painters. Every scholar needs to learn how to paint, how to write calligraphy, and how to play a musical instrument. This is why there are 80 million Chinese kids learning piano today.

SN: Then there are your own attainments as a musician.

HLD: Right. I’m a product of that tradition. All of these things - enjoyment of life, a learned intellectual, a lifelong learner, and to be a citizen; these are all noble goals of a liberal arts education as well. And Gen Ed is supposed to help us achieve these goals. I feel we have to talk about how to improve Gen Ed, which comes before training in specialized fields. But here lies the problem with our education, not just at Temple, but overall. When we think about education, we have to consider what we take in, and what do we want as the outcomes. In that sense I think American colleges are wonderful for Taiwanese high school graduates. Why? Because in Taiwan, the high school training is already specialized in terms of the disciplines. You follow the science track, the social science track, a health sciences track, or you follow a humanities or arts track. So when you come to the university you already have some disciplinary knowledge. For instance, a lot of the mathematics that I teach in graduate school I learned in high school. Seriously. But
DEPARTMENT CHAIRS’ RESPONSE TO TAUP’S “CHAIRS INTO MANAGERS”

open letter, “the dollars we are privileged to spend come, for the most part, from either a family or a taxpayer.” Any changes to the current system that enhance the value that we generate for our students, their families, and society, should be seriously considered and implemented. Coasting along on old, ‘unbroken’ models is a luxury we cannot afford.

2. “The administration’s motives for this seem to be (1) to plan for decentralized budgeting; and (2) to seriously reduce faculty power by putting the reach of management inside academic departments.”

This statement is puzzling and counterintuitive. One would expect TAUP to strongly endorse a movement away from centralized control over budget matters, and to favor decentralization that actually strengthens faculty power by putting decision making inside academic departments, rather than at the Dean’s, Provost’s, or President’s levels.

3. “If chairs were to become managers, there would be negative consequences for the faculty and for chairs.”

As noted, chairs play a vitally important dual role and act as the interface between administration and faculty. It can probably be empirically shown without too much difficulty that the most effective chairs in Temple University are those who take both of their roles seriously. Metrics for evaluating a chair’s effectiveness might include the academic department’s reputation and rankings, successful faculty hiring and student recruitment, high departmental research output, strong teaching evaluations and teaching innovations such as new, cutting-edge courses, programs, and partnerships that lead to healthy growth of enrollments and credit hours, fundraising, and so on.

In sum, we celebrate the significant progress that Temple University has made, along multiple dimensions, in recent years. We salute Temple’s students, alumni, faculty, librarians, administration, and staff, whose combined talents and energies made this progress possible. Working together, we can achieve even greater successes in coming years, and position Temple to be one of the finest public, urban institutions of higher education in the world.

Answering for Undergraduate Education

LaFollette continued from page 1

Sadly, over the past decade or so, I have watched Temple move in directions that I fear will interfere with our ability to give them our best. Some of this motion was, I believe, intentionally created with little faculty input. More of it may have been we ourselves simply wandering sheeplike, as we nibbled ourselves astray. But whatever the reasons, I am fearful that we are already giving our undergraduates less than we owe them, and that for two reasons – our increasing reliance upon non-tenure-track faculty, and our increasing and shameful desire to yield to others what should be our own responsibility – thoughtfully to choose our own courses of action. To misquote James Russell Lowell’s plain-spoken Yankee farmer Hosea Bigelow, “U.S News and World Report ain’t to answer for it. God’ll send the bill to you.”

There are several problems with our increasing reliance upon non-tenure-track and adjunct faculty, but I want to state loudly in advance that none of those problems has to do with their lack of excellence in teaching. Every time I make the suggestion that we rely too heavily on non-tenurable faculty I hear a chorus of “but they are some of our best teachers.” I agree. This has nothing to do with the relative teaching skills of tenure-track vs. non-tenure-track. Nor with the relative teaching skills of those who are highly funded researchers vs. those who prefer to balance their time between undergraduate and graduate education. It has to do, rather, with time, resources, and exploitation.

I believe myself to be a tolerably good instructor. I also have published in the American Journal of Physiology, Ultrasound in Medicine and Biology, Information Processing Letters, and other decent publications. Not often enough perhaps, but enough to demonstrate my competency. My colleagues, far more productive than I, are also generally good instructors. The difference between us is that I teach two or three sections a semester of 20 to 40 students and over the past 30 years at Temple have averaged about one paper or conference presentation per year. They publish far, far more extensively than that and may teach one or two courses per semester, perhaps fewer, and often not to undergraduates. There appears to be a healthy symmetry here that gives acknowledgement to the co-equal claims of our missions for scholarship and for undergraduate education. That symmetry, however, is not real. Because, increasingly, our undergraduates are not being educated by people like me. They are taught, rather, by non-tenure-track faculty who may teach 4 sections per semester. They often teach much larger sections, are given less support, and have salaries seriously inferior to their tenured/tenure-track colleagues. In spite of this, most of those whom I know give all that they have and more to their students.

But, because they are not tenured, they may feel less able to teach controversial topics within their field. Because they are not tenured, they are exploitable. They may do a surprisingly good job of teaching, but how much better could they be if relieved of these distractions?

So what can be done about this? Many of our non-tenure-track faculty have many years of demonstrated excellence in teaching. They have exhibited a love for Temple and concern for the well-being of their students. If we are prepared to hand over to these people the responsibility of educating those who pay the freight, those who call us alma mater, then we should be prepared to treat these faculty with the same care, concern, and respect that we extend to our tenure and tenure-track faculty that has been extended to me for the past 30 years. We need to find a way to tenure them.

How could we do this? The AAUP has been actively discussing the matter of decreasing dependence upon “contingent faculty” for at least a decade.

RESPONSE TO PROFESSORS PARKHE AND DRENNAN

bly so they could be rewarded for achieving the goals Parkhe and Drennan set out. But the TAUP contract is no obstacle to that. It specifies minimum compensation for chairs. Deans and chairs have the ability to exceed those minimums, with specific targets and incentives.

So, please tell us again, why do chairs need to be removed from the bargaining unit? ♦

Attention All Faculty Interested in Gaming and Education!

By Catherine Schifer, Associate Professor, Dept. of Psychological, Organizational, & Leadership Studies in Education

Games are not just for playing!! A group of your peers are interested in exploring how twenty-first century game environments can be used in higher education. We want to explore how people learn through these environments as well, perhaps, learn through creating these environments. In this group so far are Paul LaFollette (CIS), Karen M.Turner (Journalism/SMC), Jay Lockenour (CLA), Catherine Schifer (Educ), and Norm Roessler (CLA), along with several graduate students from Sociology and Communications, and Rick Moffat from Computer Services. We’ve been talking with several others as well, but these are the folks who have so far explicitly said they would be interested in exploring these ideas further. Last summer, Educause challenged schools and colleges to explore how games fit and influence higher education and to establish a 3-5 year plan to explore and study these issues. We propose an ad hoc committee of interested faculty to meet next academic year to explore these opportunities and draft a white paper about the future of games at Temple University. We know there are pockets of game-based activities around the University now, and we suggest these can be more productive if concerted, leading to better support, all around. If you would be interested in collaborating with your colleagues from across schools and colleges on this exciting evolving area of study, contact me, Catherine Schifer at ccs@temple.edu, or any of us named above. We look forward to working with you. ♦
What Faculty Should Know About International Students

International Students continued from page 1

material. They may simply need more time and different kinds of encouragement from professors and classmates to participate. There are many proven ways to elicit participation from international students without intimidating or embarrassing them. For example, paired-student or small-group discussions that are reported out to the class as a whole is one way of doing this. Calling on students unexpectedly is not. Nor is correcting grammar or pronunciation in a lecture setting.

It’s easy to create real or virtual ‘safe spaces’ for one-on-one or non-public participation. For example, professors could encourage international students to come to their offices in a special office hour for international students. Simply announcing this may be enough to create a more comfortable climate in which they can grow. Where participation is graded, it’s worthwhile explicitly stating that emailed comments and questions count as much as in-class efforts. Creating a dedicated discussion board for international students is another approach. Any of these efforts can quickly improve student confidence and result in broader participation as the semester progresses.

Friendliness, Motivation and Encouragement

International students want to make friends with professors and classmates, but they can be shy and feel like outsiders. Some are afraid that other students may think they’re weird. Professors should show more academic and non-academic concern — particularly to first-year international students. Remember that these young people are experiencing culture shock and that you could be among the first five or six people they’ve met in America. It’s a significant relationship that can be rewarding on both sides. And again, if a student feels that the teacher cares enough, they’re more willing to ask questions or go to office hours.

International students are often stressed and may need extra motivation. It’s worth remembering that overseas schools are often dramatically different (regardless of language). As a result, students often find to their horror that they’ve done badly in early assignments. They may even give up on difficult material and fall behind, simply because they’ve not been able to adjust to our expectations quickly enough. We should take into consideration these struggles and strains, and work with them to boost their understanding and confidence.

Culture

Professors should be more culturally-sensitive, and small efforts can pay large dividends. One approach is to find out where their students are from — perhaps in an anonymous online survey, for example. It might then be possible to incorporate relevant and uncontroversial items drawn from those places during lectures. For example, a civil engineering instructor might highlight a major public works project from another country rather than only drawing on American examples. Another approach is to ask how our subjects are taught in other countries, and discuss differences and commonalities. Done sensitively, these kinds of efforts can help international students feel more comfortable and have the added benefit of moderating local students’ parochialism.

There’s evidence that some faculty miss this opportunity because they assume foreign students are at Temple to learn “American style.” That may be true, but students cannot quickly or effortlessly leap from one academic culture to another. For example, students accustomed to highly ordered, deferential classrooms may resist asking even pressing questions about the material. Remember, too, that students may not know the locally-specific background material we often weave through lectures. We could help by giving a brief overview of particularly relevant culturally-bound material, and also assigning some introductory readings to international students to help them come in with a basic understanding of American culture. Recording and posting a powerpoint lecture on such basics can preserve classroom time for the more important material. And again, this can help our local students as much as our international students.

Answering for Undergraduate Education
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Their 2003 position paper, “Contingent Appointments and the Academic Profession” discusses the problem and proposes best practices and pathways to converting non-tenure-track lines to tenure-track. A follow up report from 2010, “Tenure and Teaching Intensive Appointments” enlarges on this theme, cites several case studies of successful attempts to reverse the current trend, and includes the following paragraph:

The best practice for institutions of all types is to convert the status of contingent appointments to appointments eligible for tenure with only minor changes in job description. This means that faculty hired contingently with teaching as the major component of their workload will become tenured or tenure eligible primarily on the basis of successful teaching. (Similarly, faculty serving on contingent appointments with research as the major component of their workload may become tenured or eligible for tenure primarily on the basis of successful research.) In the long run, however, a balance is desirable. Professional development and research activities support strong teaching, and a robust system of shared governance depends upon the participation of all faculty, so even teaching-intensive tenure-eligible positions should include service and appropriate forms of engagement in research or the sponsorship of teaching.

The sad fact, however, is that too many of Temple’s faculty remain unengaged with this problem. We are willing to accept unchallenged the claims of the Board and administration that our reputation will suffer if we “lower” our tenure standards. We are more concerned with the hope (however unfounded) of raising our prestige by being invited to join the Association of American Universities than we are with enjoying the pride we should feel in the amazing success stories of those we have graduated. So long as the tenured faculty are too comfortable and the non-tenure-track faculty are too vulnerable to object, we are all complicit in this shameful and, in my view, unethical state of affairs.
Interview with Provost Hai-Lung Dai, Part I

Interview with Dai continued from page 5

on the other hand, you look at American high school graduates, they have had a very general education.

SN: Unless they are in a magnet school.

HLD: Even in a magnet school, the curricula are general, broad, and soft. Here, you take the high school graduates and put them in our universities where many of our majors are only 60 credit hours. Some of them even include Gen Ed courses. Even 60 per se, excluding Gen Ed, is not too much. For example, the same chemistry major, the breadth and depth of our students learn compared to Chinese, Japanese, or European counterparts, are much weaker. I remember one of my best students ever, a Rochester graduate, summa cum laude, and Rochester is very strong in the sciences. She came to study with me at Penn for PhD. She told me that she spent the first 2 years in grad school trying to catch up with her counterparts from China, Japan, Korea, and Europe. This is part of the education we haven’t looked at in a long, long time. As a result, in science and engineering, we have a serious problem with too few American students in graduate school.

SN: It sounds then like what we need is to make the majors, particularly in the STEM fields, more rigorous and more demanding. And then that requires more credit hours and then what space is left?

HLD: Right.

SN: And then one of the questions is, one would like to think, though one would need to test it, so that the broad skills and habits that Gen Ed produces should also be wired into the majors themselves. Then you’d just need to be intentional about building those in and then testing for those outputs.

HLD: That’s right. This in the end relates back to Gen Ed. Gen Ed, when we design it, just using the goals we were talking about, are we really doing it right? I’m going to give you an example. Language, for example. I’m sticking my neck out here, since I really want to have some discussion about this. Let me say this in German - “Ich haben die Deutsch lernen fur zwei Jahren, aber ich kann NICHT die Deutsch verstehn.”

SN: “I don’t really understand it.”

HLD: That’s it. I formally took German for 2 years, but so what? Seriously. If you want to learn a foreign language, it’s not just 2, or 3, or even 4 years. My English is a result of starting from middle school, till college. That was 10 years of learning before I came to America for graduate school.

SN: And there you were immersed in it.

HLD: Yes, I was immersed in it. And even then I found the first semester in the US very hard even though my TOEFL score was very high. I would say that 500 years ago, if you wanted to be a learned scholar in Europe, you had to learn Latin, because Latin was the key to knowledge. I would argue that we are in an age where if you speak in German, I can take out my iPhone, or some device, and then out from it comes a translation in English. And furthermore, because of American dominance in the world, the entire world is speaking English, here we don’t say British English, we say American English. So we have to think about what is the purpose of “a second language.” Today, I would argue, shouldn’t we consider a computer language as an alternative?

SN: So if you learn HTML or C++,…

HLD: Or something like that. So that at least you know how a computer works, and how IT works. This, again I say, could be important if you want Temple students to be employable or to impress employers today. We all know that if you are a master of IT, in addition to your own expertise, you’re going to impress lots of people. There’s so much IT we use.

SN: I imagine the response would be, yes, let’s have a real discussion about this. But that when you learn German you not only learn morphology and other linguistic elements, you also learn something about German culture, you learn more broadly about a culture that is not yours. It could be German, it could be Taiwanese, it could be in Zimbabwe. One thing facility in a computer language would not give you is those kinds of benefits.

HLD: I fully understand that. As a scientist I travel all over the world, and I benefit from that. But I think today things are very different than, say, fifty years ago. Fifty years ago, if you had to go to Europe or Asia you had to go on a boat and it took a month or two. My cousin came to the US in the 60s, the first member of our larger family; she was on the boat for more than a month. Today, it’s so different. Today, I would argue that you don’t even have to travel to know the world. You can turn on your TV and see every kind of culture. We are living in a world so different from when the liberal arts teaching philosophy was developed. But how much has changed in the liberal arts teaching philosophy? Very little. Though the world has changed a lot.

SN: So the problem is that liberal arts education has not been sufficiently sensitive to these changes.

HLD: Or sufficiently effective. I’d rather one of our students have a good job, can earn a good living, and can therefore buy an airplane ticket to go abroad. Airplane tickets are so expensive today. If you really want to travel to experience another culture, you have to have the means. I want our students to go out and earn a good living. Then, the question is what are the skills that are most helpful. I would argue that today there are some fundamental skills every student should have. Some business skills, for example. If you want to open up a small business today—people keep saying that small businesses are 70% of the private economy—would you be able to look at a spreadsheet or understand accounting? Some kind of financial literacy is important. Then, let’s come to diversity. This part of Gen Ed has a very noble goal, it is essential to creating a harmonious society. But on the other hand, if you take only one course on one culture, you are only seeing one part. You can never embrace the entirety of the world culture. For example, if I learn Christianity, I may miss the Islamic philosophy. An alternative approach to diversity education, I would say is to learn the foundation for a harmonious society, the ethics and legal basis for tolerance and acceptance of difference in human society.

SN: That’s certainly an important part of it. There’s a specific to general or local to global movement, though. I think if you focused on learning the basics of Islam, you’d only be learning on one culture; and even though many of our courses are comparative in Gen Ed, but 2 is still not 5000.

HLD: Right. So I’m thinking that what I want to know is what constitutes the basis of ethics? What are the foundations of an ethical society?

SN: In that sense you would cover all the bases.

HLD: Yes, you would cover all the bases—diversity, tolerance, acceptance.

SN: I suppose one of the responses would be, “Well, yes, ethical questions, we would like to think that there are fundamental ethical questions, even if they are answered differently in different places and times, fundamental to a human life.”

HLD: Of course. Exactly.

SN: But those specific encounters with specific worldviews and the specific peoples who have occupied them cannot be substituted for by a general course in law or ethics. There is something irreducibly valuable about that kind of encounter.

HLD: In discussing ethics, we are not talking about metaphysical discussions. We should use real cases. Then you’d be in touch with those specific
Competencies and Their Discontents
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the faculty—Gen Ed has been ahead of the curve in articulating the competencies it aims to foster. 7 I believe the faculty as a whole would learn much more from thinking about how these competencies speak to the ones we are trying to teach in our majors and upper-level electives, a question I plan to keep in mind as I look toward my own courses and the curricular discussions in my department. Of course, The Teaching and Learning Center is another place for doing this kind of work. Its staff, including its Faculty Fellows, can help us think through what our students know coming in, what we wish them to learn, and how we can bridge that gap. We might also look to work done with specific student populations, such as international students (see the column in this issue and the thousands of transfers we enroll each year. Finally, we might look to our colleagues in the College of Education, for they have for decades had to tangle with competency-based instruction and its cognates—the latest of them being the Common Core State Standards Initiative, which is almost certain to alter the education of our future students. Recently, Prof. Stephen Gross and Joan Shapiro tried to bring me up to speed on the latest of them being the Common Core State Standards Initiative, which is almost certain to alter the education of our future students. Recently, Prof. Stephen Gross and Joan Shapiro tried to bring me up to speed on the current state of play in K-12 education; the organization they founded, the New DEEL (Democratic Ethical Educational Leadership), is asking hard questions about a version of education that stakes everything on tests of dubious value. It is also offering alternatives. To paraphrase Prof. Gross, we need to seek “competency” in a holistic way, not just “competencies” morselized into a set of boxes to be ticked off by a series of exams. Public-school teachers aren’t averse to “accountability” but rather to the impoverishing ideas smuggled in under its name. Similarly, we should show that we are willing to embrace “competencies” if it includes a serious discussion about the purposes of a university education and entertains the idea that faculty have a central role in it. Consider the Degree Qualifications Profile. It seems nuanced and rightly pluralist and liberal in its categories, including “broad, integrative knowledge, specialized knowledge,” and, an idea so often overlooked in competencies discourse, “civic learning and engagement.” But we are warned by one of the people who drafted these guidelines, the president of the liberal arts-defending American Association of Colleges and Universities, that this standard is nowhere near ready. 8 My fear is that while this model moves toward maturity, those who are pushing competencies of a less-substantive but more ‘efficient’ type will triumph. It is a disquieting fact that many of these matters are beyond our control. They are in the hands of state legislators, foundations, and other disruptive agents most of whom don’t care a rip about the views of faculty. And yet, as President Theobald recently averred, “Faculty are in charge of the curriculum.” If it is to remain so, we need to do a better job of articulating what our students learn in our courses individually and as part of a curriculum. We need to fight our reflex to dismiss such talk as the imposition of outsiders who don’t understand education. This isn’t to say that we don’t need to fight for our autonomy as instructors; I don’t want anyone dictating to me what I must teach, either—again, see the sobering experience of our colleagues in K-12 as they have been forced to teach to test at test test. But without taking seriously that some of the things that we teach can be specified and even measured, however subtle and dynamic those instruments must be, we will stand little chance of resisting the worst parts of the standard-izing tide. We will stand no chance of persuading the folks we need to persuade that there may actually be things that cannot be measured at the end of a term or even at the end of an undergraduate or graduate program. If we continue to put our fingers in our ears and shout “I can’t hear you” when someone says “competencies,” we abandon the field to Western Governors, Southern New Hampshire, and their ilk. And that would be a tragedy for us, for our students, and, to risk grandiosity, for our society. It would also be incompetent. ♦

7 See http://gened.temple.edu/faculty/assessment/program-of-general-education-self-study/
8 Carol Geary Schneider, “Is It Finally Time To Kill The Credit Hour?” http://www.aacu.org/liberatededucation/f-612/president.cfm
Faculty Senate Committee Reports, 2012-2013

Report of the Faculty Senate Budget Review Committee

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

The Governor’s budget for the next fiscal year has projected that the Commonwealth’s appropriation for the next academic year will remain at the same level as last year. That projection may change as the budget is finalized.

The Committee has also met with senior administrators to discuss the implementation of the University’s new budgeting system.

The Committee also met with the Faculty Senate Steering Committee in the spring semester to analyze, explain and discuss the University’s budget and the implementation of the University’s new budgeting system.

Respectfully submitted,
Rafael A. Porrata-Doria, Jr., (Beasley School of Law) Chair

The Invention and Patent Committee

The Invention and Patent committee (IPC) has met twice thus far this academic year. Our Invention and Patent policy is central in governing rules and transactions and act in capacity to protect the Inventor as well as the University, to build a research enterprise to foster more research and provide guidance, and rules to bring forth these inventions into commercializing. The IPC committee is continuing its ongoing discussions on preparing and revising the documents related to our policy to suit these needs and demands. There are 5 important sections in our policy document. It was decided in our last year meetings to debate and discuss sections during our regular meetings and assign the modifications/omissions/additions to be drafted by the office of technology development and commercialization (OTDC). Steve Nappi, the director of OTDC along with this associates and the university general council has done a wonderful job of making these changes and presenting these changes to the committees for further discussions and approvals. This is an ongoing process and we are meeting once again in end of May this year for securing final approvals on section 2 on ownership of a patent and continued deliberation of other sections. Submitted by Feroze Mohammeda, (School of Medicine), Chair

The Faculty Herald Editorial Board

The Faculty Herald Advisory Board met three times each semester with the editor and staff to discuss plans for articles and editorials for upcoming issues of the Herald and to review the past issue and reader responses. We worked closely with the staff to identify of major issues of community concern and to identify writers and interview subjects.

The advisory board’s conversations were ably led in the fall by Frank Friedman; I hope that I will be able to provide to the current board the strong leadership, courage, and vision that were hallmarks of Frank’s tenure. The editorial staff (Steve Newman and Kime Lawson) and the board members who began their tenure in the past several years are quite excited about the new members who came on board this winter: Andrea Monroe (Beasley School of Law), Will Jordan (College of Education), Terry Halfert (Fox School of Business) and Deborah Howe (School of Environmental Design). Providing a new breadth of perspectives that the Board was seeking last year, they joined Richard Orondenker (CLA), who has since resigned, David Watt (CLA), who will be rotating off the Board, Phil Yannella (CLA), Michael Sirover (TUSM), and Gregory Urwin (CLA). Deepest thanks to all of them.

This year we bid farewell to David Waldstreicher who provided us with excellent coverage of faculty issues at Temple and in higher education in general. Highlighting the fall issues were concerns raised over budgeting, the University’s fall advertising campaign, funding for Temple University Press, and a report on the status of Interdisciplinary Programs in the College of Liberal Arts. This spring Waldstreicher is being ably succeeded by Steve Newman whose goal is to open conversations between faculty and students, to focus on teaching and the future of higher education, and to continue to provide a forum for faculty to write about what matters to us in our careers as researchers and teachers.

Newman began his tenure with an interview with President Theobald, the first half of which was published in the Spring’s first issue (43:3), and a powerful editorial about state funding issues. Also included in the first issue were a column by Mark Rahdert, Vice President of the Faculty Senate, that detailed a proposal for a periodic review of deans that would substantively include the faculty, a warning from Dan O’Hara on the dangers posed by Massive Online Open Courses (MOOCs), and a note from Karen Turner on a task force investigating what can be done to protect faculty from disruptive and/or threatening students.

The second issue included the second half of the interview with the president; an editorial on how to address the lack of trust among Temple’s stakeholders; a report by Frank Friedman and Eleanor Myers on the steps recommended by the Institutional Integrity Task Force, a column by Kime Lawson on the potential effects of the Affordable Care Act on adjuncts and Temple, and a reflection by Michael Sirover, on the past, present, and future of Temple’s Health System. It also included an experiment that Newman hopes to repeat; he and the opinions editor of the student newspaper jointly published a pair of essays addressing what faculty and students need to know about each other, along with excerpts from an ensuing conversation between Newman and four student editors.

Among the pieces in the forthcoming issue, the last of the year: the first half of an interview with Provost Dai; a commentary by Paul LaFollette on the state of undergraduate education at Temple; an exchange between Art Hochner and Arvind Parke and Rob Drennan on the administration’s attempt to have chairs removed from TAUP; and a column by Alix Howard and Urszula Pruchniewska advising faculty on how to work most productively with international students. The final issue will also reprint Prof. Lewis Gordon’s letter explaining why he and his wife, Prof. Jane Gordon, have resigned from Temple.

After Volume 42 Issue 4, the number of Faculty Herald's unique readers fell slightly to an average of 356.6 per issue. Volume 43 Number 1 was our most successful issue of the year, with the peak of 440 unique readers. Overall, readership has been consistent with our established performance and seems in the most recent issue to be recovering from a downward tick since last October.

Rebecca Alpert (CLA), Faculty Herald Advisory Board chair

Unique Readers 2012-2013

Committee Reports continued on page 11
President's Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics

Because of the presidential transition, the President's Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics did not meet this year.

President Theobald decided to hold the committee in abeyance until he decides on the role he envisions for it. Faculty Representatives Erin McNama Horvat and Michael Jackson will continue as non-voting faculty representatives to the Board of Trustees Athletics Committee.

Prof. Eleanor W. Myers, (Beasley School of Law)

Library Committee

The purpose of the Library Committee is to establish a joint forum at which librarians and faculty meet. It is therefore important, on the faculty side, to have members represent as many schools and colleges as possible. For the past year, and continuing into 2013-14, we have achieved this goal: The committee now consists of 9 professors, representing 9 different schools or programs. Monthly meetings have also been attended by members of the library staff; usually four senior members and always including Carol Lang, the Interim Dean of University Libraries.

Meetings this past year have been held around such topics as the library budget, collection development, scholarly communication, the undergraduate library prizes, and others. Importantly, members of the library committee have participated in the on-site visits of the finalists for the position of the new Dean of Libraries.

For the coming year, two topics will dominate: to help the new Dean of Libraries settle into his role, and to help in the process of designing and building a new University Library.

Dieter Forster
Professor of Physics
Chair 2012/13

2013/14 members of the Senate Library Committee (Chair to be elected):
2013 Shenid Bhyaroor, SMC - Journalism
2015 Chih-Chien Chen, Tourism/Hospitality
2015 David Elesh, CLA - Sociology
2016 Dieter Forster, CST - Physics (Chair 2012/13)
2015 Robert Shuman Jr., Center for the Arts - Architecture
2016 Donna M. Snow, Center for the Arts - Theater
2015 Paul Swann, Center for the Arts - Film
2016 Elvis Wagner, College of Education - Teaching and Learning
2015 Jacqueline Volkman Wise, Fox School of Business - Risk

General Education Executive Committee
(GEEC)

General Education Executive Committee

Members: Istvan Varkonyi (Chair), Julie Phillips (Co-Chair), Cynthia Folio, Rickie Sanders, Deborah Stull, Vallorie Peridier, Mary Anne Gaffney, Peshe Kuriloff, Eli Goldblatt, Thomas Wright, Jill Swavelly (EPPC rep.), Michael Puppolo (grad. student), Matthew Schillizzi (Honors undergrad.), Patricia Boateng (TSG undergrad. rep.)

Early in the fall term we were notified by the Provost’s office that the GenEd Program would indeed go through program review during the academic year 2012-13 and a self-study would need to be written. The GenEd Executive Committee (GEEC) spent the fall term working in groups drafting parts of the self-study. The GenEd Director and the Associate Director then used the winter semester break to compile the materials into a formal draft. The external review committee is being organized by the Provost’s office for an on campus visit scheduled for mid-April.

GEEC has also engaged with the continuation of the GenEd course recertification process. For the current academic year roughly 35 courses are up for re-certification. With the assistance of the GenEd area coordinators, GEEC will begin in late spring to review submitted course portfolios.

Among some of the other points of discussion and areas of focus for the committee have been:

- RCM and its impact on university-wide programs, such as GenEd
- Communicating the central role of undergraduate education to university community
- Moving GenEd courses to the online learning environment

Committee on Status of Women Faculty

It was my great pleasure to become a member of the Committee on Status of Women Faculty in 2012 and serve as a Chair of the Committee on Status of Women Faculty since June 2012. On behalf of the Committee I would like to thank for a wonderful work previous Chair of the Committee, Dr. Nilgun Anadolu-Okur (African American Studies) and a previous member Dr. Armine Darbinian (Medicine) for their active participation in the Committee’s work, and their continuous support and helpful ideas. I am very proud to work with new great members whose terms on the Committee run from 2012 until 2014: Dr. Brianna S. Clark (Sport and Recreation Management), Dr. Mary Barbe (School of Medicine), Dr. Laura Katz Rizzo (Dance), and Dr. Dominique Kliger, (Distance Learning and Summer Programs).

Current goals of the Committee are:
1. To acknowledge wonderful women at Temple University who inspire students and faculties
2. To set nomination “Woman of the Month,” to nominate monthly who is doing remarkable work every day and who inspires so many female students to achieve their goals
3. To announce monthly Committee’s news and reports on the Committee’s website
4. To collaborate with The Faculty Herald to send brief reports from monthly Committee meetings
5. To collaborate with Committees on Status of Woman from different schools and colleges, including the School of Medicine
6. To encourage senior administrators and faculties from different Departments and Schools to participate in the Committee’s work
7. To consider areas such as salaries, retirement funds and promotion policies where women are thought to be treated inequitably and to recommend changes in policies to correct inequalities where they exist

In our previous report of the Committee on Status of Women Faculty at Temple University, on behalf of the Committee, we acknowledged three wonderful Great Teachers Award recipients who inspire so many female students to achieve their goals: 2011 Great Teachers Award winner- Dr. Joan Poliner Shapiro, and 2012 Great Teachers Award winners - Dr. Shohreh Amini and Dr. Sarah Bauerle Bass. Our congratulations for this wonderful award and to your great example and support! We asked all three recipients to answer to 10 questions, and we were happy to include a photo of the wall of the Founder's Garden inscribed with the names of Great Teachers Award recipients, followed by their thoughts and valuable suggestions, so important for our future work. Our Great Teachers report was published in The Faculty Herald Volume 43 Issue 2.

Personnel Committee

During this academic year, the Committee has considered, held hearings on and submitted a recommendation to the President, regarding an appeal by a faculty member from a denial of tenure.

Respectfully submitted,
Rafael A. Porrata-Doria, Jr., (Beasley School of Law) Chair

Committee Reports continued on page 12
Committee on the Status of Women Faculty, continued

The next nomination “Woman of the Month” will go to three women “Top Doctors”-2012: Amy Goldberg, MD, Surgery; Beth Moughan, MD, Pediatrics; Ellen M. Tedaldi, MD, Internal Medicine. Our congratulations to all thirty-two Temple University physicians who were included in Philadelphia magazine’s 2012 “Top Doctors” list, although there are only 3 women among those 32 doctors. We will be very proud and happy to introduce them in our next report.

We want also to develop a tradition to present gift watches with the Temple University Symbol and the Committee on Status on Women symbol to be given to all “Woman of the Month” recipients at the end of each year at a small annual conference where we will invite all our recipients. We plan to discuss possible mechanisms of setting this type of conference, and also about dates, topics, guests and speakers.

One of the goals of the Committee is to set a close collaboration between female faculties of Medical School and other schools within Temple, and to recruit more faculties from Medical School into Committee on Status of Women, and to organize joint meetings with the Committee on Status of Women in Medicine from Medical School, and to build bridges between Medical School and Main Campus. There are only 3 Committee Chairs from Medical School, only one female Chair (Committee on Status of Women) from Medical School. This Committee has so important goals for Temple community, as so many wonderful women work at Temple.

Sincerely,

Nune Darbinian, PhD
Chair of the Committee on Status of Women Faculty, Center for Neurovirology, Department of Neuroscience Temple University School of Medicine

Committee on the Status of Faculty of Color (FOC)

Our committee has always talked about reaching across the aisle and working with others on campus to contribute to the visibility and access to resources for our faculty. Our group meets once a month to discuss issues relative to faculty hiring, retention and professional development and continues to seek statistics on faculty of color (by school and college, at all ranks). The FOC committee coordinates the Chat-in-the-Stacks faculty speakers’ series in conjunction with the Temple Libraries to highlight current events and faculty achievements in research and creative work.

This year, in addition to our continuing commitment to faculty professional development initiatives, FOC sent letters to Governor Corbett in support of Temple University and welcomed our new president Dr. Theobald.

FOC and the Temple Libraries co-sponsored the following Chats in the Stacks:

September 27, 2012 Teaching Diversity with Tchet Dorman, Pamela Barnett and Donna Marie Peters

November 1, 2012 “Race in the Race” Dr. David Waldstreicher, (History), Dr. Wilbert Jenkins, (History), Sophia Sanders, (Art History) and Philadelphia attorney Michael Coard along with Micah Kleit of the Temple University Press

March 28, 2013 Black Women Journalist Commemorating the 150th birthday of Ida B Wells with Professor Karen Turner, Journalism and Meredith Broussard from the University of Pennsylvania.

April 4 2013 On the 45th anniversary of the assassination of MLK, our theme was social movements, Why they work and Why they don’t. 99 versus the 1 Percent Loree Jones Operation Understanding and David Organ Geography and Urban Studies, Micah Kleit, Temple University Press.

FOC welcomed two new members Dr. Elizabeth Sweet (Sociology) and Latanya Jenkins (Temple Library)

Student Award Selection Committee

On behalf of the Student Award Selection Committee, I am writing to report on our activities during the 2012-2013 academic year. We met twice, once to interview candidates for Commencement Speaker and once to determine finalists for the various university-level graduation awards within our purview.

The slate of candidates for Commencement Speaker was very strong this year, yet Joseph Stoney stood out to the committee as a clear front-runner. The interview process went very smoothly, the only suggestion being that next year each candidate should submit the most recent version of their speech at least 24hrs in advance so that Rosetta can copy and distribute it to the committee during the interview process in the event of any last-minute changes.

The Memorial Awards meeting encountered a few more bumps. This was the first time the committee had used Dropbox for all the files, and organizing them could definitely be streamlined for next year. Of particular concern was the fact that students that applied for multiple awards did not always have complete files in each award folder on Dropbox, and some that were on the spreadsheet for certain awards did not have application files for them. As a result, at least one candidate was selected but was later replaced due to ineligibility. Rosetta has suggested that this will work much more smoothly next year.

All members of the committee remarked on how much they enjoyed the process, and I am hopeful that many will choose to renew their terms.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Edward D. Latham
Assoc. Prof. of Music Studies
Boyer College of Music and Dance
Chair, Student Award Selection Committee

Committee on Administrative and Trustee Appointements (CATA)

This past academic year has been a relatively busy one for the Committee on Administrative and Trustee Appointements. The Committee proposed faculty candidates to the Faculty Senate for six University search committees: TU President, TU Provost and four college deans. We reviewed the credentials of well over sixty highly qualified faculty that indicated their willingness to serve, making for very difficult choice situations.

The Committee responded to the Faculty Senate's candidate requests in a timely manner, always within the deadlines set. I do not believe that that would have been possible without the great diligence and responsiveness of the Committee's members. This group performed its task more often than not within very confined time frames -- and on short notice. I was and am most impressed with their conscientiousness and fairness to all candidates.

Thanks,
Harold E. Klein, (FSBM) Chair
Honoring our Retirees

In recognition of their service and in appreciation of their many contributions to Temple University, we record here the names of those who have or will be retiring during the 2012–2013 academic year.

David R. Noyes, BFA, Center for the Arts/Tyler School of Art, Graphic Arts and Design, Associate Professor Emeritus
John Goldkamp, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, Criminal Justice, Professor Emeritus
Abu S. Aharry, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, African American Studies, Associate Professor Emeritus
Robert Aiken, PhD, College of Science & Technology, Computer and Information Sciences, Professor Emeritus
Klara S. Alperstein, DDS, Kornberg School of Dentistry, Restorative Dentistry, Associate Professor Emeritus
Bonnie R. Averbach, MA, Fox School of Business & Management, Risk, Insurance and Healthcare Management, Associate Professor Emeritus
Meredith C. Bogert, DMD, Kornberg School of Dentistry, Restorative Dentistry, Associate Professor Emeritus
David Boylen, MFA, Center for the Arts/Theater, Film and Media Arts, Theater, Professor Emeritus
Richard C. Brodhead, MA, Center for the Arts/Boyer College of Music and Dance, Music Studies, Associate Professor Emeritus
Corinne Caldwell, EdD, College of Education, Psychological, Organizational, & Leadership Studies, Professor Emeritus
Bruce P. Conrad, PhD, College of Science & Technology, Mathematics, Associate Professor Emeritus
Daniel Dallmann, MFA, Center for the Arts/Tyler School of Art, Graphic Arts and Design, Professor Emeritus
John Dowell, Jr., MFA, Center for the Arts/Tyler School of Art, Graphic Arts and Design, Professor Emeritus
Leroy Dubbeck, PhD, College of Science & Technology, Physics, Professor Emeritus
John V. Esposito, DDS, Kornberg School of Dentistry, Endodontology, Associate Professor Emeritus
Thomas Eveslage, PhD, School of Media and Communication, Journalism, Professor Emeritus
Ruth S. Farber, PhD, College of Health Professions and Social Work, Rehabilitation Sciences, Associate Professor Emeritus
Frank Friedman, PhD, College of Science & Technology, Computer and Information Sciences, Professor Emeritus
Janos Galambos, PhD, College of Science & Technology, Mathematics, Professor Emeritus
Katharine Garrinella, EDM, Center for the Arts/Theater, Film and Media Arts, Theater
Thomas Gordon, PhD, College of Health Professions and Social Work, Public Health, Professor Emeritus
Camilla N. Keach, PhD, College of Health Professions and Social Work, Communication Sciences, Associate Professor Emeritus
Novella Z. Keith, PhD, College of Education, Psychological, Organizational, & Leadership Studies, Associate Professor Emeritus
Seymour Lipschutz, PhD, College of Science & Technology, Mathematics, Professor Emeritus
Mahendra Logani, PhD, School of Medicine, Radiology, Associate Professor Emeritus
Walter K. Long, PhD, School of Medicine, Microbiology and Immunology, Associate Professor Emeritus
Robert J. Mahar, EdD, College of Education, Teaching and Learning, Associate Professor Emeritus
Linda Mauro, DSW, College of Health Professions and Social Work, Social Work, Professor Emeritus
Jo-Anna J. Moore, PhD, Center for the Arts/Tyler School of Art, Art and Education, Associate Professor Emeritus
Frederic H. Murphy, PhD, Fox School of Business & Management, Marketing and Supply Chain Management, Professor Emeritus
Priscilla Murphy, PhD, School of Media and Communication, Strategic Communication, Professor Emeritus
Mariquita G. Noris, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, French, German, Italian and Slavic Languages
Willis Overton, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, Psychology, Professor Emeritus
Milton Parnes, PhD, Fox School of Business & Management, Statistics, Professor Emeritus
Stephen Paul, PhD, School of Pharmacy, Pharmacy Practice, Professor Emeritus
Arthur Poe, PhD, College of Science & Technology, Computer and Information Sciences, Professor Emeritus
Lynda Price, PhD, College of Education, Curriculum, Instruction and Technology in Education
John Pron, MS, Center for the Arts/Tyler School of Art, Architecture, Professor Emeritus
K. Raghunandan, PhD, College of Science & Technology, Mathematics, Professor Emeritus
Anthony Ranere, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, Anthropology, Professor Emeritus
Daniel Reich, PhD, College of Science & Technology, Mathematics, Associate Professor Emeritus
Carson Schneck, MD, School of Medicine, Anatomy and Cell Biology, Professor Emeritus
Joseph Scorsone, MFA, Center for the Arts/Tyler School of Art, Graphic Arts and Design, Professor Emeritus
Marilyn Silberman, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, Geography and Urban Studies, Professor Emeritus
Ronald Tallarida, PhD, School of Medicine, Pharmacology, Professor Emeritus
H. Frank Thornton, MA, College of Science & Technology, Mathematics, Associate Professor Emeritus
George Tuszyński, PhD, School of Medicine, Neuroscience, Professor Emeritus
Thomas Walker, EdD, College of Education, Teaching and Learning, Professor Emeritus
Diana Woodruff-Pak, PhD, College of Liberal Arts, Psychology, Professor Emeritus
Marvin Ziskin, MD, School of Medicine, Radiology, Professor Emeritus
David E. Zitarelli, PhD, College of Science & Technology, Mathematics, Professor Emeritus
Philip Grosser, MA, Center for the Arts/Boyer College of Music and Dance, Dance, Professor Emeritus
Linda Knight, PhD, School of Medicine, Radiology, Professor Emeritus
David Lefkovitz, PhD, College of Science & Technology, Computer and Information Sciences, Professor Emeritus
Warren E. Masker, PhD, School of Medicine, Biochemistry, Professor Emeritus
Edward Newman, PhD, College of Health Professions and Social Work, Social Work, Professor Emeritus
Herbert E. Phillips, PhD, Fox School of Business & Management, Finance, Professor Emeritus

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

The events of this academic year, which is thankfully coming to a close, have led to my wife and me leaving Temple University. As the Herald is a publication for faculty issues, I here want to offer my account of what would compel us, after investing nearly a decade of our lives mentoring many students, organizing workshops and symposia, and contributing what we could to the international reputation of this institution, to leave, namely, what is, at the end of the day, wrong with Temple.

What’s wrong with Temple University is not the faculty. Temple has an excellent faculty with a high reputation for their research and teaching. There are award-winning scholars and artists, and there are faculty whose research is the subject of dissertations and academic profiles in professional journals and other publishing forums. Having served on the Great Teachers Award committee, I can attest to the teaching talent of faculty who also turn out to be some of the best scholars at Temple.

No, what’s wrong with Temple is an administrative environment of bullying, denial, and unaccountability.

Here is my story: I, an Afro-Jewish faculty member, filed on August 27th of last year a charge of racial and religious discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission against Teresa Soufas, the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, as well as a grievance through TAUP, the faculty union. The remote cause leading to my doing so was her response to an email I sent on July 30th to a member of her staff objecting to the disrespectful tone and closed-mindedness of her emails and expressing a wish not to have to communicate with her anymore. Our dispute was rooted in her cancelling my classes and rescheduling one of them for MWF afternoons, which would impinge on my religious practices since it would prevent me from observing the Sabbath with my family who reside in Providence, Rhode Island, a six-hour drive. (When I had last been assigned a MWF schedule, a TA had taught on Fridays.) In early August, I proposed arranging a MW class with an extra 25 minutes each day or paying a TA through my CarneU funds to teach on Fridays. Both of these suggestions were rejected by Dean Soufas. The union informed me by the end of the third week of August that I should contact Diane Maleson, Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, and I did so on that very day. Maleson expressed surprise on finding out I was Jewish, although as the director of the Center for Afro-Jewish Studies and the subject of profiles about Temple in The Philadelphia Inquirer and The New York Times I have been very open about my Jewish identity.

The response to my grievances was a series of retaliatory actions that brings out the absurdity of Temple’s rules and the pathologies of its administrators. On August 31st, the Dean issued a “warning” claiming that I supposed to have made up our minds to resign. The harassment I experienced made it clear to me that there was no future for my wife, an award-winning scholar and teacher in Political Science, and me at Temple. We were fortunate that several universities immediately offered opportunities across the globe to the both of us, and we happily selected The University of Connecticut. But even if these offers had not been forthcoming, we had already made up our minds to resign.

At the disciplinary meeting of October 31st, the Dean claimed that she had not forced us to resign from Temple. But I replied that she had done so by creating an intolerable work environment. If a Laura H. Carnell Professor could be treated this way, it left little hope for an untenured Jewish faculty member, especially one who was also my spouse. The level of corruption we saw at each stage of the grievance process, save for the work of TAUP, made it clear to us that the management of the institutional structure of Temple is thoroughly compromised. The response of my wife and me to this situation was thus the only sensible one, which is what most experts who study bad management counsel employees facing situations such as the one my wife and I faced at Temple: leave. It’s sad but clear that we had to exercise that option.

It’s difficult to see how a denial of anti-Semitism could be maintained when the accused sends someone to snoop on a Jewish faculty member on the holiest day of the year for Jews. And if the supposed instructor observed Kippur as well as the major holiday of Sukkot and the Friday immediately preceding my daughter’s Bat Mitzvah. Although I had arranged with the students to make up these classes, she charged me with violating her policy creating an intolerable work environment. If a Laura H. Carnell Professor could be treated this way, it left little hope for an untenured Jewish faculty member.

Yet this circumstance goes beyond my being black and Jewish. It raises questions about the legitimacy and even the constitutionality of Temple’s policy on religious holidays. On one hand the policy stresses the importance of respecting the religious beliefs of the members of the Temple community and on the other gives schools and colleges the authority to set the procedures. But what if a Dean insists on a procedure in conflict with the conscience of the faculty member? More broadly still, my case suggests that faculty lack recourse when they are being bullied by administrators; many
Letters to the Editor, April
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colleagues told me of encounters with the Dean where she berated them in a very unprofessional manner, and apparently her behavior is well known among faculty and staff most of whom are afraid to acknowledge this publicly because of a very real possibility of retaliation since her response to any assertion of dignity is “insubordination.” Moreover, from my discussions with faculty, alumni, and students, this seems to be part of a culture of bullying and micromanagement that goes beyond CLA, pathologies structurally endemic to Temple.

The Lord of the Flies imagery proposed as a campaign for Temple pride misses the mark for what is needed in a public university in North Philadelphia. School pride should be about having prized researchers, students who achieve academic and professional success, and community volunteers, staff who are recognized for their achievements and contributions to the community, and administrators who are models of academic and managerial excellence.

I have worked with administrations at several institutions of higher learning. In my experience, much is a matter of will. If there had been administrative good will, my situation would easily have been resolved with respect and professional decorum. Because there was ill will, every reasonable demand was treated as unreasonable and events unfolded as they did. That’s what’s wrong with Temple; and for the good of the colleagues and students I will miss at Temple, things must change. There is only one hope for Temple University to have a sane and viable future, and that will depend on the collective will of the faculty and the good will of the new president. I wish all of them—all of you—well in that effort.

Sincerely,

Lewis R. Gordon
Soon to be former Laura H. Carnell Professor of Philosophy, Religion, and Jewish Studies and Director, Center for Afro-Jewish Studies

Answering for Undergraduate Education

LaFollette continued from page 7

I remain proud of what we do for our undergraduates here at Temple, but I fear that I may be the last generation of tenured faculty here who can say that. As we wander further down the road to homogenized higher education, as we give up our special niche in a vain attempt to become a second-rate Penn, as we continue to expand upon the notion that if we “take care of the grants, the undergraduate programs will take care of themselves,” we will end up in a place where the tiny coterie of the tenured will have neither pride nor even interest in our undergraduates.

Let us not follow that path. Let us stop regarding ourselves as tenured, or tenure-track, or non-tenure-track, or research active, or even as faculty or as administrators, and look at ourselves as Temple, one Temple with a mission for scholarship and an equally powerful mission to serve an undergraduate population who are currently paying most of our salaries. And let us work together to provide that population with the best that we can. ♦
Representative Faculty Senate Minutes, February 19, 2013

Attendee:
Representative senators and officers: 28
Ex-officio: 1
Faculty, administrators and guests: 9
Total attendance: 38

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

2. Vice-President’s Report:
Mark Rahdert, Vice-President of Faculty Senate gave a brief report on committees. He reported that we have a need of candidates and appointments to several committees including three very important committees: Personnel Committee, UTPAC, and EPPC. He encouraged senators to ask colleagues to serve and reminded them that the nomination period for elected committees is over at the end of this month.

Steve Newman (CLA), Chair of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee Nominating Committee was asked to report on the Nominating Committee’s slate of candidates for Faculty Senate Offices for 2013-2014. The slate presented is:
- Mark Rahdert (Law), President
- Tricia Jones (COE), Vice-President
- Paul LaFollette (CST), Secretary

He indicated that after Feb 25th you can offer your own nominations, but we are no longer taking nominations from the floor. He encouraged interested faculty to go to the Faculty Senate website. For self-nominations you need to have 6 faculty senators writing in support of your nomination. If there are questions faculty are encouraged to contact Steve Newman or Cheryl Mack.

3. President’s Report:
Joan Shapiro, President of the Faculty Senate, introduced Steve Newman as the new editor of The Faculty Herald. She welcomed him and thanked him for his service in this role. She also mentioned that a new issue of the Faculty Herald had just been distributed. Joan also explained that there are two students doing filming at today’s session. They are focusing on pictures of Dai and are not recording any audio.

Jodi came to share exciting news about Banner Updates that will be in effect for summer and fall registration. These updates concern wait-listing and washing out.

Banner can now wait-list for courses. The Law School has been using wait-listing as a pilot so we now have a better understanding that wait-listing is a key tool for academic planning and scheduling. We will have wait-listing beginning in March for Summer Session and it will be available for every course. The capacity is 100 on waitlists. Students can see capacity and number waitlisted but not where they are specifically on the waitlist. If you are waitlisted and you are first on the list you are notified and have 72 hours to decide whether to take the opening or not (72 hours allow for students who need advisor signature to register, hence over the weekend).

This system doesn’t allow for section shopping – you can only be waitlisted for a course you don’t have. They can be on as many waitlists as they wish. This system eliminates the ability of an individual instructor to override enrollment limits and let a student in a course.

Washing Out: The Wednesday before start of semester, a student who has not paid for their courses are washed out. This was the #1 problem for financial aid offices and caused a great deal of stress and tension for students. We will no longer have washouts. Instead, students will be asked to sign an agreement that if they register for a course and cannot pay in full beginning of semester they will be put into a payment plan but will not be washed out of the course.

Jodi invited FSSC members to contact her if they have questions: jodih@temple.edu.

There were several questions on these developments (responses from Jodi are summarized in parentheses):
- Will instructors see waitlists? (Individual colleges are probably making this decision for their group. She wants to check on this).
- Will we be able to pick priority of waitlist? (Initially it was going to be first-come, first-serve. They have decided to do waitlist manipulation; working with associate deans and schedulers to see how they want to do this and who will be responsible at the school or college to control this).
- Is wait-listing by CRN rather than course level? (True, but wait-listing is for course access not section access. They can’t section shop.)

5. Guest: Provost Dai, Dialogue with Dai:
Joan Shapiro introduced Provost Dai who had recently been appointed as Provost for Temple University. She gave a general summary of Provost Dai’s credentials which attest to his excellence as a scholar and academic and his diverse interests and accomplishments outside the academy. Among the accomplishments she noted were:
- He is a scholar of Molecular and surface sciences.
- He has a great record of sponsored research.
- He plans to continue his research even as he serves as Provost.
- He has a truly impressive record of publications.
- He has received numerous awards and is a Fellow of several academic societies.
- He is also a Renaissance man – a former conductor of Philadelphia Chinese Musical Voices Choir.

Provost Dai welcomed the student representatives visiting to do videography of Provost Dai during the session.

He indicated that his intention was to discuss his goals as Provost. He summarized his goals as: (1) finding sufficient resources to accomplish the mission of access to excellence, (2) delivering the best education we can, and (3) supporting to the fullest extent the scholarly activity of our faculty.

He began by asking, “What are the strategies to accomplish these goals and what are the challenges we face?” He began by addressing the challenges. His comments indicated the following:
- student enrollment (we are seeing decreasing pressures due to demographic changes – 15-20% decreases; community colleges seeing 10-20% drop in enrollment)
- pressure on tuition and student debt increasing (we can no longer just raise tuition).
- pressure of stability of state funding (PA state appropriations are currently 12% of Temple’s operating budget).
Provost Dai then moved to a discussion of strategies that he believes we should implement to address these challenges. His comments included the following thoughts:

- improve our ranking (this is not just a matter of playing with numbers; we need to control the perception of the university in the larger public)
- Temple-made campaign only means something to Temple folks unless we increase our rankings.
- We have increased the investment in scholarships to attract the top students to come and move the SAT levels to the higher end.
- We still have ability to invest; we need to conduct a strategic investment in terms of hiring new, top-quality, research faculty.
- Investing in research and scholarly effort
- In terms of students – merit scholarships (applications 1300 or higher is up 6% and those indicating they will come are up 50%).
- Investing in student services; counseling, internships.
- We need international students. To maintain a USNWR ranking some schools don’t allow international students but this is changing.

There were questions and answers in this Dialogue with Dai (Provost’s Dai’s responses and comments to faculty comments and questions are presented in parentheses:

- Jeffrey Solow (Boyer) – How do we disentangle these things? President Theobald’s scorecard for costs of universities was in the press this week. Our scoreboard costs are $19,000 and Penn’s is $20,000. (We have been pursuing a wrong tuition policy; Penn charges $40,000 and then they move $15,000 to financial aid; they redistribute the funds. We haven’t done that.). (Highest student debt comes from specialty areas unless we increase our rankings.)

- Howard Spodek (CLA) – Observation – there is a huge difference in Temple’s population is physical presentation of the campus. Physical facilities are important. What about that? (Right now we are in the process of significantly upgrading the Temple campus and physical facilities that attract and retain students).

- Jim Korsh (CST) – Thank you for a serious discussion on some of these issues. But on the idea of rankings; rankings are the worst idea. We should consider an alternative plan. Value for dollar should be stressed. We should combine with other institutions.

- Chip Jungreis (TUSM) – The Temple Made campaign has merit. We don’t advertise it enough.

- Art Hochner (FSBM) – Congratulations on your appointment as Provost. Thanks for opening up the conversation. What is role of faculty and faculty senate and shared governance in achieving the goals you have set? (Faculty governance is important, faculty should be more involved).

- Tricia Jones (BOE) – There is concern that pursuing rankings may make it difficult to honor our Conwellian mission. How can we recon-

- Paul LaFollette (Law): Rankings have distorted the structure for Higher Education in Law. Rankings encourage institutions to look at numbers and how to manipulate numbers. (We improve ranking by improving our quality -- THAT IS THE CRITICAL POINT).

- Steve Newman (CLA): We have a situation of competing goods. There are tensions between 4 year graduation pass and bringing in international and/or urban students who take more support to finish well in 4 years.

6. Adjournment:
It was moved, seconded and unanimously approved to adjourn the meeting at 3:20pm.
University Faculty Senate Special Meeting, December 7, 2012

Minutes continued from page 17

Attendance:
Representative Senators and Officers – 40
Ex-officio – 1
Faculty, Administrators and Guests – 16
Total attendance – 57

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Joan Shapiro, President of the Faculty Senate, at 1:45pm.

2. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the May 2012 University Faculty Senate Meeting were moved, seconded and unanimously approved.

3. Vice-President, Mark Rahdert’s Report

Mark Rahdert made a report on the recently completed committee elections. There were several candidates for two of the three committees. Mark reported the winners of the elections for RPPC, UTPAC and EPPC. He extended thanks for those who were willing to stand as candidates. Unfortunately we did not receive any candidates for the open position on the University Subbatical Committee. We are still looking for candidates for that committee and FSSC may appoint someone to fill the open position for the rest of the year.

4. President’s Report

President Joan Shapiro gave her report and began by thanking the members of the FSSC, Cheryl Mack, and the previous two presidents of the Faculty Senate. Joan noted that the work of the FSSC takes time and effort and she is appreciative of the willingness of these faculty leaders and staff to give their efforts to support faculty governance. She also thanked Michael Jackson and Provost Dai for their support of the Outstanding Faculty Service Awards Branch. She also reviewed the range of guests that had visited with the FSSC during the fall semester. We have created some subcommittees (restructuring committee for arts and communications, chilly classroom climate subcommittee). And, in our last Representative Faculty Senate meeting, we discussed the characteristics that we desire in the Provost and those were shared with Therese Dolan, who is chairing that committee.

5. Dialogue with Provost Dai

Provost Dai addressed the Faculty Senate and reported on several important issues.
- It is a great pleasure to work with the Faculty Senate leadership to improve communication. Provost Dai invited Joan Shapiro and Mark Rahdert, as Faculty Senate leaders, to be honored at an upcoming Temple University game.
- He asked the faculty what he should be addressing during the next three months of his tenure.
- Jennifer Cromley (COE) noted concerns about general support for research. She suggested a poll of the faculty for perceived obstacles to submitting grant proposals and a restructuring of the OVPSR.
- Provost Dai responded that we do need better research support services. He mentioned that, as an active researcher, he knows firsthand the challenges being referred to. He understands that the difficulties vary from college to college and department to department. He gave a brief overview of recent history in terms of research support. President Hart elevated research office to senior Vice Presidential level and Larry Lemansky was hired to fill that position. He was charged with reaching out to foundations and government for pork barrel projects. However, that model of increasing funding depends on active industrial support for higher education research. Provost Dai noted that there is decreasing industrial support for research in the US and this has been a major loss of opportunity. He suggests that the key to increasing our external funding and our research rating is to hire faculty with research and funding potential and support current faculty doing research. His read of the current funding situation is that Temple should continue to hire research-oriented faculty and work to bolster infrastructures and resources to support their research activities. Provost Dai indicated that some colleges have done a good job of creating their own internal grant support services. Growing research faculty and supporting research faculty should be the primary task of the OVPSR. With the departure of Ken Blank, we have the opportunity to look at that office. He indicated he is not sure he can accomplish this in the next three months, but it should be on the list for the new Provost.

- An unidentified faculty member asked what is happening in terms of support for GenEd.
- Provost Dai answered that he wants to start a conversation with the faculty about the effectiveness of GenEd. This is the 5th year of implementation and the year of the program review. He feels we should conduct a review, not only on course generation and fiscal condition of GenEd, but also review the current design and model of GenEd. He thinks that the review should look at whether the current eight areas (e.g., Race and Diversity) are what is needed or whether the content can be learned in a different structure or format.
- Karen Turner (SMC) asked him to explain the new scholarships that are available.
- Provost Dai reported that in the last 3 months the Provost’s office has led new initiatives aimed at the class coming in fall of 2013. They created five scholarship categories. Any students with SATs of 1150 or higher will receive a scholarship of $3,000. For increasing increments of 50 there are additional scholarship packages. For students with SAT of 1250 they will receive 80% scholarship and one summer stipend. For students with higher than a 1400 SAT score Temple offers a full scholarship plus additional financial incentives in terms of three summer stipends to attract more merit scholars. A consultant firm ran a simulation that this scholarship package should have an increase of 50% for students in the 1400+ range. This will also impact financial aid necessary and tuition. Overall, this will cost us approximately $5 million, but this will increase our University rankings and gain the benefits of that in terms of donations.
- Art Hochner (FSBM) asked if he can give us indications of what might be coming out in the next Governor’s budget.
- The Provost commented that this is worrisome and it looks that the upcoming budget may be less positive than last year’s. The best estimate is we can best hope for a flat funding from state this year.
- Art asked whether he can give information about applications next year.
- The Provost said we are currently 7% behind the undergraduate applications from last year and noted this is similar to the experience of other institutions in the area. He did not have information for graduate enrollment.
- Art mentioned that he encourages the Provost to encourage Deans to have multiyear contracts for NTTs.
- The Provost mentioned that SMC has been moving in this direction and he is encouraging other deans to take a similar direction.
- Joan Shapiro thanked Provost Dai for his valuable comments.

6. Guests: Frank Friedman (CST) and Eleanor Myers (School of Law) on Institutional Integrity Task Force Report

Frank Friedman (CST), member of the Task Force on the Freeh Report.
Minutes continued from page 18

gave an overview of the committee process and recommendations and an
update of where the process stands. He also referred people to the attach-
ment that describes the process of convening and conducting the task force
and a list of things that the university has already done to enact recom-
mandations made. He emphasized that the members of the task force represented
a diverse group of administrators. He complimented the range and expertise
of the task force members. There are also references to the Freeh report in
the documents and he encouraged faculty to read the recommendations of
the task force. He hopes the Faculty Senate and the FSSC will work to help
make sure the recommendations are enacted. Eleanor Myers summarized the
recommendations that came out of the task force. The recommendations fall
into three categories: (1) the role of minors on campus – keep a general
inventory of activities that involve bringing minors on campus and Cleary
Act recommendations to insure the safety of minors and expand training to
consider sexual assault; (2) communication to and from the Board – met
with the Board to encourage more communication flow between the Board
and the university community; (3) the connection to athletics – that Temple
continue to monitor the work coming out of the NCAA and the Big Ten on
Integrity Guidelines. The task force urged the board to remain up to date on
those issues and to make sure Temple was acting in conformity with those
issues.

-Greg Urwin (CLA) said he sees the major issue to be the ability of a univer-
sity of this size to police itself. It’s easy to fall into a tribal mindset where
the norm becomes not mentioning things that might hurt our image. We
also have to break out of “shoot the messenger” syndrome that happens
in some colleges.

-Eleanor highlighted a recommendation that pertains to these comments.
One recommendation was that there should be an Office of University Integ-
rit y – a centralized place that reviews programs in the university that require
clearances and have background training – and an office that provides sup-
port to people who want to make complaints and support whistle-blowing.
Frank added it is not just the treatment of minors here, but the broader treat-
ment of everyone here at Temple – that everyone be treated more ethically
and with integrity – we need some function that helps faculty share informa-
tion that suggests actions and problems that need to be addressed. He is not
sure the need for this is shared by the top administration of the university
and feels strongly that we need to keep the pressure on.

7. Recognition

President Joan Shapiro began with acknowledgement of David Waldstreicher,
the out-going editor of the Faculty Herald. Joan mentioned that David
is a Professor of History and a prominent scholar and has brought his ecle-
ctic interests to inform the Faculty Herald in a wonderful way. She also ac-
nowledged Steve Newman, the incoming editor of the Faculty Herald.
Several people shared their recognition for David’s efforts and others who
have worked to support the Faculty Herald.

Joan Shapiro asked for retiring faculty to come to the front to be acknowl-
edged for their service to the university and to the Faculty Senate.

8. Adjournment

It was moved, seconded and unanimously supported to adjourn the meeting
at 3:04pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Tricia S. Jones
Faculty Senate Secretary