Bad News From Harrisburg and For FSSC

SEPTEMBER STRIKE IS AFFECTING TRAFFIC ON BROAD STREET.

Justice in the Reagan administration.

According to the Harrisburg Patriot-News, Ridge publicly declared that he believed most state aid for higher education should go to students directly—vouchers. This view agrees with his recommended increase in funding for PHIEAA. Like his newly appointed Secretary of Education, Governor Ridge was educated outside of Pennsylvania.

Not surprisingly, perhaps, the Governor also declined last month an opportunity to comment to the deterioration of the environment in which our teaching and scholarly activities take place. The delegation noted the deplorable condition of many classrooms and laboratories. Insisting that far too much attention was being devoted to the unrelated activities which our present facilities depend upon were falling apart, the delegation also wondered where the funds for the newly announced technological upgrade would come from. Much concern was expressed that the fund-raising for the Apollo was coming at the expense of these more central facilities.

In the light of the above expressed concern was an earlier report from Al Checcio, the Vice-President for Administration, which had been somewhat positive and encouraging. Checcio noted that plans for a "Campaign for Temple" were moving forward, but Apollo was coming at the expense of these more central facilities. In the delegation's view, this was something terribly wrong with a situation where full professors were making more money than the parents of their students, especially since faculty children received free tuition.

Lawless's attack on teaching loads, which he described, as at times, "a disgrace," and at others, "an outrage," was directed not at Temple alone but at all of the state's universities. Lawless also pointedly asked for the date of the expiration of the current TAUU contract. By the end of the session the only hope for an increase in funds that Chairman Joseph R. Pitts, Republican from Chester County, held out was linked to an increase in faculty productivity, which for the legislator seemed to mean simply teaching hours. "I think," he said, "we probably could at some point put requiring a certain number of hours on them.

If it is any consolation, the faculty-hostility at this meeting was extended to our colleagues at the University of Pennsylvania as well. Presently Pennsylvania shows little likelihood of improving its position in the ranking of states by their per capita support of higher education. Currently Pennsylvania lags near the bottom with Mississippi as a close neighbor.

In his recent inaugural address Governor Ridge spoke solemnly about the high priority and importance of education in the state and in his budget. He inherited a surplus in his Department of Education account but that and about his only increase is funding has been directed to PHIEAA for support of a voucher system that will primarily benefit the parochial school system of Philadelphia.

Certainly so far as public higher education is concerned the Governor's actions speak louder than his words. After a considerable delay Ridge finally found his Secretary of Education in Eugene Welch Hickok, Jr., Hickok, who holds an undergraduate degree from Hampden-Sydney College and advanced degrees from the University of Virginia, has been a member of the political science department at Dickinson College for a number of years.

Hickok's more interesting professional affiliations have been with the John C. Stennis Institute of Government at Mississippi State University, the Heritage Foundation, and the U.S. Department of Justice in the Reagan administration.

In recent weeks the Faculty Senate Steering Committee has been hearing very little good news. The Provost has been speaking pessimistically about a 250 million dollar budget gap that is not sufficiently appreciated by the faculty.

The reporter was happy with the spending core curriculum which he believes is unnecessarily complicated and hurts our student retention efforts. He has also been distressed by the declining quality of our students and is trying to reshape financial aid to attract better prospects.

The news from Temple Japan in Tokyo is not good either, according to Rich Jolly, vice Provost for Academic Planning and Administration. Endowments there have dropped sharply and the subsidy provided by Temple's Japanese partner is being cut back.

There is conjecture that the core curriculum, which had been somewhat positive and encouraging took on a different hue. Checcio noted that plans for a "Campaign for Temple" were moving forward, but Apollo comes first, he added that the Apollo should be no problem once it is back on track and that it is not marketed as an athletics building. The second meeting with Haller and Miller on April 4 did not produce the anticipated agreement on a proper course of action. Instead, extraneous suggestions that FSSC should first attend to improving the core curriculum, reinvent the University, and denounce delinquent colleagues effectively served as diverted the FSSC from attending to the issue at hand. Defocused and sputtering, the FSSC turned to its most frequently relied upon statistic when facing a crisis—it adjourned.

The Chronicle of Higher Education for March 17 told the story of the Apollo controversy here at Temple. The reporter noted that their athletic facilities are often considered a plus. "Few institutions, however, expect a sports facility to revitalize non-athletics program, but an entire university and its surrounding community, as well."

The reporter stopped short, but we will not, of suggesting that perhaps a name change would be in order—from Apollo to Sammets.
April Fool

For some years now public higher education institutions in Pennsylvania looked jealous­ously at their New York State equivalents who were being generously funded. Now that the new administration in Albany is roughly juggling the fiscal rug out from underneath those schools perhaps we should thank Harrisburg for weaing us the way they have been doing for the last decade or more.

Well, we're not really serious about that, but certainly the immediate plight of the New York State facing a huge cut in their public funding makes Temple's situation seem not quite so dreadful after all. Maybe it's just the old story of misery loving company, and there seems to be plenty of that going on in public higher education generally.

On the other hand, New York also provides us with a success story that should make us beam with pride. According to a story that appeared in the New York Times on March 20 New York University has come back from a near death condition a decade ago. N.Y.U., of course, is not a public institution, but otherwise its situation, as a big city school competing with many other schools, private and public, including Ivy League institutions, bearing the brand name with Temple's. N.Y.U. undertook a massive fund raising campaign ten years ago. They have raised close to one billion dollars. What is more remarkable is the use that they have made of it. Basically the money was used to enhance the academic quality of the school and to attract students from all over the country.

As a result, today N.Y.U. is one of the most attractive and selective schools in the country, ranking over 1200 on the SAT's. A decade ago over 80% of N.Y.U.'s students came from New York, its traditional source; now almost three-quarter of the student body come from outside the city.

Although once, many years ago, N.Y.U. had fairly successful athletic teams; in both football and basketball, athletics played no role, had no place in N.Y.U.'s master plan. Instead money was spent on a neural science center, an institute for mathematical sciences, a center for French civilization and culture, Near Eastern studies, and fine arts. The academic physical facilities also received a heavy infusion of money.

Continued on page 3
President's Report
by Roland Lipka

If it's broken, don't fix it...

I chose the above title because we have a debate going on within the Senate Subcommittee on Graduate Board Minutes. What is the policy for re-working the core curriculum? Is the core curriculum already sufficiently robust? Is is a form of the degree that is now broken, or a form of the degree that is current? We have no choice. We cannot compete without such a robust curriculum.

Then there is faculty governance. Is it broken? Specifically, who deals with faculty who are not meeting their set of responsibilities as implied by the faculty handbook? How many of the schools and colleges have a statement of professional responsibilities? And if those that do, do they follow the faculty's rules to execute its policy?

Workloads and tenure are under serious institutional pressures without and outside the University. Can we afford to look up? Can we afford to support research and faculty with 22 teaching loads? Worse, can we ignore programs that count cross-registered graduate and undergraduate classes as two courses for their students? The Law School and the School of Business and Management have codes of professional behavior. Such codes are an important first step toward effective governance.

What about our curricula? Last Spring there was asense that the Core was going to be simplified? It is not, and perhaps this is the right decision. Nonetheless, I have a simple proposal to make. I recommend that we bifurcate the core into what the Provost's Office has referred to as the "core core" (5 courses—our students may call it the hard core), and the rest of the core (7 courses). Let's assume for the present that the number is 12 is acceptable to everyone. In the core-core, we would have Comp, IB, a science and a math course. The other seven courses would be selected by the student to meet the intellectual interests and needs of the student. For example, the student who wants to know all about the different areas of the core would design a highly diverse selection of courses. But the student who is largely interested in the one or two areas of the core would design a narrower program.

What are the arguments against this? First, we can see that this solution is biased towards the core-core. Second, there is no guarantee that it will be sufficiently well-rounded. To the first, I agree, but I think it is worth the gains from simplification. To the second, a review of what is currently listed in the core suggests that to me our students are currently able to work through the core without being exposed to important knowledge. Again, we are faced with a tradeoff. I also believe that the benefits are compelling. First, beyond simplification, it will create greater flexibility. Second, our students are forced to take more responsibility for their education. They also will have the possibility of becoming more connected with the more different departments. Fourth, the design allows for transitions and change of major problems under the current system. Fifth, current problems that our students experience with the sequencing of math A/B and science A/B would be reduced.

Notice that the proposal is simple to implement and does not displace any of the areas of the core nor any of the courses that satisfy the core. Also, the design permits the construction of double majors more easily. Lots of things need fixing. Let me know what you think. My e-mail address is rlipka@vm.temple.edu.

Graduate Board Minutes
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POLICY SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT
The Policy Subcommittee unanimously recommends
"The policy requirement as currently constituted be eliminated."

Rationale: We now have rigorous, enforced time limits for the completion of doctoral studies, as well as for the time allowed between elevation to candidacy and the defense of the dissertation. It is sufficient to ensure the coherence and relevance of the doctoral experience.

This recommendation would, if passed, allow schools, colleges, or departments to establish their own residency requirements.

The question was called and carried unanimously.

NEXT MEETING THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1995, 2:00pm, CONWELL 3B

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00pm.

Sincerely submitted,
Sylvia Studemund

Special April FESSC Report
by Peter Tasch

The CAS Representative Faculty Senators, Special Annual Meeting, 1 April 1995
From CAS Representative to Faculty Senate Steering Committee (FSSC)

A recommendation from the University Patents and Inventions Committee is under discussion at the cabinet level. Because of the success of Temple's policy of dividing royalties 50%-50% with inventors, the practice will be extended to creative products: sculptures, paintings and the likes from Tyler, musical composition, fiction, poetry and other written expressions including software—any efforts which draw royalties or result in profit including outright sale. As long as the work has been accomplished with tenure or promotion, he said, "We shall not quash creativity with tenure or promotion," he said, "but I will review the teaching assignments and workload in relation to artistic productivity."

To stop the continued loss of revenue, the President Liacouras added the start of privatizing activities at Temple. "Every program, each college, all departments," he said, "must stand on their own box tight lines. From now on we are on a pay-as-you-go, free-market economy. And to do it, Tyler will hold a "stressed artists" sale at the Adam's Mark Hotel."

To underline our concern for students to achieve the best possible education, the President also announced, Temple is changing its motto from "To be the service past" to "Students R Us." The Board of Trustees approved construction plans for the creation of Athena, which will result from the complete rehabilitation of what was once the Kardon building. From now on we are on a pay-as-you-go, free-market economy. To do it, we shall review the teaching assignments and workload in relation to artistic productivity.

Road Not Taken
Continued from page 2

The money drive was spearheaded by the trustees who personally made some contributions and/or sought out other large-scale donors.

The philosophy behind the saving and elevating of N.Y.U. was not the quick, easy fix but a solid build-up of resources, financial and scholarly. No smoke and mirrors, just a focus on what was important for any real university.

So, here's to N.Y. U., the school that got it right and did it right.
Representative Faculty Senate Minutes - March 16, 1995

The Provost reported on several items from the recent Board of Trustees meeting. The SCAT reorganization which had been approved the previous year was formally approved by the Board. The Board also approved an extension of the severance plan through 1995. This is the day before the next Board meeting. The Provost described the evolution of the severance plan as it was initiated and as events developed. He stated that he did not want the plan to serve to increase the student/faculty ratio. He felt that he had a good working relationship with the Board. He stated that he hoped he could work out an arrangement with TA's, Dean's offices, and the Senate Office.

The discussion proceeded to the President's Plan to restructure Temple. The Provost stated that we had a serious financial situation which had been indicated 2 years ago. The $14,000,000 deficit incurred last year was the largest ever incurred by Temple. The Provost noted that a $6,700,000 deficit was anticipated for this year. However, this may underestimate the number of items which we did not plan to do but will do this year. These include the replacement of student employees on University buildings as well as the investment in technology to help increase our recruitment and retention of students. The Provost stated and believed about the quality of our student body. He stated that 40% of incoming freshman this year needed remediation.

A number of questions were then posed to the Provost. He was asked about what degree of accountability is expected by our input. This was unclear although it did not seem likely that he would agree to our suggestion not to build the Apollo or not to play football. However, he may be receptive to other suggestions.

In the absence of the Provost there was a quantitative relationship for measuring the quality of the students we are admitting. The Provost was unclear as to specific distribution group. However, Nancy Hoffman responded that the Admissions Office keeps records of SAT scores. In that material, Temple dropped dramatically. We are seeing more problems in writing and in mathematics. This could reflect the change from the AP and the general drop in student SAT scores. Our levels have not diminished to a greater level than the overall reduction in SAT scores.

At the last Senate meeting, President Liacouras stated that $40,000,000 would be spent on technology. Of that sum, $12,500,000 would be derived from student fees and $27,500,000 derived from reallocations. With regard to proposals for a new computer center, the Provost stated that he would have to provide a share of that figure. With respect to increasing the student/faculty ratio, the Board had acknowledged that the reduction of 40 faculty (in all schools) would have an effect on that ratio. With respect to both spending, the Provost noted that these figures were not casually arrived at. Indeed, there was a large amount of analysis. The President has indicated where funds will be found over a 2 yr. period with regard to spending on a continuing basis. The Provost confirmed that there is a fairly well defined. Concern was raised with respect to our commitment to affirmative action in restructuring. The Provost responded that the Board cannot allow the restructuring to occur if there will be no change in our commitment to affirmative action. Further, the President has spoken at some length to make certain that the financial circumstances of the university would not be used as a way to diminish affirmative action policy. Questions were asked with respect to concerns on the relationship between physical erosion of university buildings and its effect on teaching and recruitment. This would reflect the university's expenses for buildings. Policies which emanate from the physical plant drain money for teaching. In this regard, the Provost responded that he has a plan for the future. Policies in some way to participate in making policy for the physical plant and in administration of those policies so that we are not victimized by unforeseen conditions.

The Provost responded that he has put a plan on the President's desk to rehabilitate existing buildings.

The Provost was asked whether the Administration would pledge that the severance plan be used as an excuse to diminish our affirmative action. The Provost was asked whether there are fig­ures which would show that severance plans have impacted the severance plan. He responded that there were no hard figures but it appears that approximately 35 individuals have accepted the plan.

A representative of The Commission of the Arts have been and read a statement for the record, "There has been some discussion that the new convocation center, the Apollo, might serve as a center for arts activities. Temple Arts, thus addressing the severe lack of performance and exhibition space on campus. As the Commission designated the center as a place that, instead of teaching, it will be an event of the University."

The Provost, David Glasser, for Administration and Academic Programs. He was stated that it was important that any affirmative action is not valid. Scholarship is the important thing. He stated that the Provost described the role of the Board of Trustees last week. He will report to the Board and to the President who will receive their report which will be disseminated to the University. This process will take place through May and the early summer. They will then make their recommendation.

He described some immediate cost reallocations with respect to Administration efficiency and inefficiency. They will also consider mechanisms to improve service to students. They will also work with the $15,000,000 deficit to find a way to devise a program to reinvest resources to eliminate the deficit. However, elimination of those policies so that we are not here for a while. Costs have risen faster than revenue. This is a chronic condition. We need to control costs and increase revenue.

The Provost stated that there is no place in the existing offices. It is based on previous experiences. Currently, they started with 500 alternatives which have now been reduced to 70. Each alternative could save $100,000 or more on a continuing basis. They are reviewing the financial analysis of all 70 items. They will also compare Temple University to other comparable universities. They are not those institutions to those other institutions. Their hierarchy for implementation focus first on administration followed sequentially by Campus Operations, Revenue Enhancement and, lastly, Academic Programs. He noted that they will not evaluate the University as an ordinary mobile institution. Their report will provide strategies to achieve both cost-cutting and revenue enhancement.
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