From Senate President Karen Turner

By Karen Turner
Faculty Senate President

When I first contacted the Herald editor about writing for this last issue of the 2008 - 2009 academic year, I planned discussing in some detail several senate accomplishments. For example, how we now videoconferencing our monthly senate meetings to the Ambler and Health Sciences campuses, and using TU capture to audio record those meetings when we convene in Kiva Auditorium. Special thanks go to Senate Coordinator Cheryl Mack and Associate Vice President Sheri Stuhler and her staff for making this happen. I also intended to talk about the thoughtful preparation that goes into Faculty Senate Steering Committee (FSSC) and monthly senate meetings, and the generous guests who presented over the year. And finally, I wanted to talk about the activities for next year, especially our efforts to reach out to our students and NTT colleagues, and to make yet another pitch for faculty governance and the need for faculty participation.

But the events of past few weeks have caused me to refocus.

I remain deeply disappointed in the tactics employed by members of the faculty senate to successfully shut down the debate and vote on the motion: Status of Contract Negotiations and Involvement of the Presidency. Debate is always healthy. To thwart the fundamental right to vote on an issue is unconscionable. What happened is that senate members resorted to the never before used (certainly in recent senate history) quorum rule to prevent a faculty vote on an important concern. Using such a strategy to undermine faculty voices is indefensible. There were countless opinions on the appropriateness of the motion. This is even more reason to let the faculty speak through the vote. After two failed attempts to bring the motion to a vote, I believed it would serve no purpose to continue to raise the issue.

The FSSC thoughtfully and deliberately spent several meetings discussing what if anything we could or should do to jumpstart what appeared to those who presented over the year. And finally, I wanted to talk about the activities for next year, especially our efforts to reach out to our students and NTT colleagues, and to make yet another pitch for faculty governance and the need for faculty participation.

But the events of past few weeks have caused me to refocus.

Karen M. Turner
Senate President
www.temple.edu/senate

On Being NTT Faculty at Temple

By Noah Shusterman
Assistant Professor, Intellectual Heritage

There’s an old joke that says, “there’s a support group for people who don’t like their jobs. It’s called everybody; they meet at the bar.” But with all of the various debates about the contract negotiations, about the status of NTT faculty here at Temple, I wanted to start by saying something that you don’t hear NTTs say nearly often enough:

I like my job.

Oddly enough, at times I feel like I’m not supposed to say that out loud. But I like being at Temple, and teaching the students here. The interactions with the rest of the faculty have meant a great deal to me. And it means quite a bit to be able to teach here in Philadelphia, a city where we’ve put down our roots.

Do I have my complaints? Of course. And if you catch me on the wrong day, I tend to go on a bit about them. But most people have their collection of grievances. For now, I enjoy the classroom interactions, I like being able to touch so many students’ lives. And while the teaching load cuts down my productivity in publishing, it doesn’t eliminate it. No one will mistake me for Steven King, but I am able to set aside writing time every week.

Noah Shusterman, Assistant Professor, Intellectual Heritage

You’ve Got [G]mail!

By Aaron Sullivan
Assistant Editor

Notice anything different about your TUMail account lately? If you haven’t personally seen changes yet, you will soon. This issue of Faculty Herald takes a brief look at the what-who-where-why-and-how questions of the ongoing email transition from Mirapoint to Gmail and highlights a few of the more useful features offered by the new system.

What’s going on?

Computer Services has worked hard to keep everyone up-to-date, but in case you’re among those who haven’t heard, the old Mirapoint email system is going away. It’ll be replaced by a new TUMail system powered by Google’s Gmail. Student accounts have already been moved over to the new system; faculty and employee accounts are in the process of transition even now.

Who will this affect?

Just about everyone. A few select accounts will transition from Mirapoint to Microsoft Exchange, but most of us are headed toward Gmail. Student accounts were moved to Gmail last Fall and Alumni accounts made the
Committees, We’ve Got Committees! Reports 2008-2009

This spring the Faculty Senate Steering Committee decided to publish the reports of the Faculty Senate Committees in the Herald, to increase awareness of the important work that these committees are doing. We would like to take this opportunity to thank the committee members and chairs for their exemplary service.

For supporting documents mentioned in these reports, and reports submitted after our publication date, please see the Senate Committees webpage: http://www.temple.edu/Senate/committees.htm

1. The University Study Leave Committee

The University Study Leave Committee evaluated 81 study leave proposals, 27 summer research award proposals, and 48 grant-in-aid proposals. These numbers were all up compared to the 73 study leave proposals, 24 summer research award proposals, and 38 grant-in-aid proposals last year.

Of the 156 proposals, 153 were recommended and subsequently awarded or will be shortly. This was the second year in a row that the Provost extended the deadline for study leave proposals which contributed significantly to the larger number received this year.

For last year and this, all grant-in-aid funds were used up for round I grant-in-aid awards which were funded at recommended levels. For both years, the Provost provided additional funds for round II grant-in-aid awards. Last year all were funded at recommended levels. This year, although all were recommended and funded, due to more round II proposals and fewer funds, it will not be possible to fund them all at the recommended levels. The committee would like to see just one round of grant-in-aid instituted from now on.

The committee hopes this trend toward more faculty applying and receiving each of these awards will continue. The committee would like to thank Chris Wolfgang, who was Associate Director, and Nelia Viveiros, Assistant Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, for their help and support. Finally, the committee welcomes Marsha Zibalese-Crawford as next year’s newly elected chair for 09-10.

Jim Korsh, Chair

2. Committee for Community Based Learning and Collaboration

The Senate committee for Community Based Learning and Collaboration accomplished three primary objectives during academic year 2008-2009.

First, the committee finalized a set of institutional criteria for Community Based Learning at Temple. These criteria were approved by both the EPPC and Provost Staiano-Coico. Section numbers are currently being assigned and the new criteria will begin identifying courses as CBL beginning in Spring, 2010. The criteria are attached.

Second, the committee has established a ‘community planning group’ to work with the committee to institutionalize community based learning and campus-community partnerships in the spirit of reciprocal collaboration. Both the faculty committee and the planning group have identified a set of guiding principles for a campus-wide Community Based Learning Initiative. This group is composed of a diverse group of community based organization staff from a broad range of service providers throughout the city. The roster of planning group members is attached.

Third, the committee developed a budget proposal to support a set of outcomes to continue institutionalizing Community Based Learning at Temple. The budget and outcomes were developed as the result of research into similar initiatives at comparable universities across the country. The budget and the outcomes were presented to Provost Staiano-Coico in March. The committee’s proposed budget was included in the University’s budget, which was recently approved by the Board and is expected to be finalized in July. The budget and outcomes are attached.

Eli Goldblatt (committee chair for 2007-2008) and Novella Keith (committee chair for 2008-2009) were also awarded a seed grant of $50,000 to support the committee’s activities in the coming year.

3. Honors Oversight Committee

During the Spring semester, we spent most of our time discussing ways in which the Honors Program could be enhanced. We will make the following proposals to the Provost:

1. Honors students should be allowed to priority register one day before their cohorts. Thus, for example, sophomore Honors students would be allowed to register on the same day as non-Honors juniors, etc. This is not only a perk offered by many other schools (and, as such, it is important if we want to compete for the best students - in fact some schools offer Honors students priority registration independent of class), but it is necessary for our Honors students, because they often have little or no choice of Honors sections for certain courses and they have to complete these courses in a timely manner in order to graduate on time.

2. Honors students in good standing should be allowed to register for up to 19 credits, with approval of the Honors Program directors, without having to pay for an overload. Again, this is a perk that is needed in order to make us competitive. In particular, many Honors science majors must take four 4-credit courses in addition to English during their first semester in order to stay on track, and it is unfair to ask them to pay for an overload. Further, such an arrangement would enable capable Honors students to broaden their education with a wider range of Gen Ed and other courses.

Reports continued on page 3

Provost Launches Academic Strategic Compass Website

On April 30, the Office of the Provost launched the Academic Strategic Compass as a website: http://www.temple.edu/provost/academicaidcompass

This might seem to be a minor publicity moment—but it is actually part of the development process, I learned after meeting with Provost Lisa Staiano-Coico and with Senior Faculty Advisor Betsy Leeborn-Tuttleman. In keeping with the change from “strategic plan” to “strategic compass,” the website is designed to gather information, including suggestions from faculty, and to track the progress of initiatives.

Provost Lisa emphasized that the use of the (anonymous) suggestions drop box on the web has already “helped us take a critical look at current programs in terms of efficiency.” The website will be updated periodically and already includes outcome measures for the past two years. –The Editor
You’ve Got [G]mail!

You’ll find a special email from it after you log in for the first time.

transition earlier this Spring.

When is my email going to change?

If it hasn’t happened already, it will soon. The transition team is in the process of moving as many as 1,000 accounts per day to the new system. But don’t worry about being out of touch; you’ll always have the ability to send and receive new email, even in the middle of the transition, though your old email messages may become unavailable for a few hours as they’re moved from the old system to the new one.

Why change email systems?

The old Mirapoint system is, well, old. By today’s standards it’s slow, restrictive, and more than a little cumberson. It’s also small, as anyone who has run out of space and been forced to go through the painful process of clearing out old emails can attest. The new Gmail system gives us each more than 7 Gigabytes of email storage; that’s about 35 times what the old system offered.

TU Gmail also comes with an extensive set of handy tools and features, such as Google’s powerful searching capabilities, and will be much less expensive to maintain.

Where will all my old emails go?

Your old emails will follow you to the new system and show up under the “All Mail” section of your TU Gmail account. There are, however, a couple of exceptions related to attachments. Attachments larger than 20 Megabytes and executable attachments (i.e. programs) will not be moved; those files will remain in the old Mirapoint system where you’ll be able to access them for 30 days after the transition. Any folders you created in the Mirapoint system will be transferred to the new system and turned into “labels”, the Gmail equivalent of folders; more on that below.

If you’ve been using the TMail calendar and address book, that data will also be transferred to the new system, though you’ll have to import it after you log in for the first time. You’ll find a special email from computer services explaining how do that waiting for you after the transition. Finally, if you’ve set up any aliases (i.e. alternative email addresses) those will still work in Gmail.

There are, however, a few things that won’t make the transition. While all your contacts will be moved over, contact groups will have to be recreated in Gmail. Signatures, rules, and forwarding information will also have to be set up again in the new system.

How will this affect the way my email works?

If you’re used to checking your email online with TMail, then you won’t have to do anything different; the new system can be accessed using the same URL (tumail.temple.edu) or through TUPortal, and your username and password won’t change.

If you’ve been using an email client like Outlook, Thunderbird or Eudora, you’ll need to reconfigure it to work with the new system. You’ll find a handy email from Computer Services explaining how to do that waiting for you after your account transitions.

Should you need to access your old Mirapoint account, it will remain available for 30 days after the transition. Look for a link on the TMail login page.

Paradigm Shifts

Gmail is, in general, a pretty user-friendly system and its fairly easy to get the hang of it. However, there are a few things that Gmail does differently from most email systems that are worth pointing out.

The first of these is Archiving. Let’s say your old Mirapoint account was filled to over-flowing; you were using all 100% (200 megabytes) of memory allotted to you. When all that mail gets transferred to your new TU Gmail account it will only take up about 3% of the space you have available there. The up-shot is that with so much memory available to you, you don't really have to delete anything anymore. Instead you can "archive" it, which takes it out of your Inbox but keeps it in your "All Mail" repository so that you can...

Committee Reports 2008-2009

3. There should be an Honors Faculty Fellows (HFF) program, under which five faculty members per semester, preferably from different areas of the university (Sciences, Social Sciences, Humanities, Business and Arts) should be assigned to spend one-fourth of their work-load in the Honors Program, mentoring, advising, programming and helping to identify and prepare Honors students to compete for national and international fellowships. HFF’s should normally serve for a minimum of 2 and a maximum of 3 semesters in any 3-year period. HFF’s should also normally teach an Honors course during each semester of their fellowship. In exchange for accepting this responsibility, HFF’s will receive either a one course reduction from their normal teaching load or a stipend (as yet to be determined) during each semester of their fellowship. Whether to receive the teaching load reduction or the stipend would be the choice of each fellow.

In addition to these three proposals, the committee has begun work on two proposal to go into effect in the future

a. The Honors Program should be granted control of all of 1300 Cecil B. Moore Avenue, so that they can offer housing to Honors students throughout their undergraduate career,

b. An office of fellowships and scholarships should be established within the Honors Program to help identify and prepare students to compete for national and international fellowships.

These two proposals require further work, and will be put forth in the future.

Finally, in addition to the proposals above, the committee has approved an new Honors Program for the College of Engineering.

Orin Chein, Chair

4. Educational Programs and Policies Committee

The Educational Programs and Policies Committee (EPPC) met approximately every two weeks during the 2008-2009 year. Among the topics we focused on were:

• Faculty Development for instructors of Writing Courses
• New procedures for identifying and promoting Community-Based Learning Courses
• Review of the work of the new Student Feedback Form Committee
• Recommendation to the Provost’s office of a policy on multiple repeats by a student of the same course. The final recommendation reads: “Any student who fails a course twice has a hold put on their registration and must see an advisor. A student who has failed a course three times cannot register for that course the fourth time without the permission of his/her dean”.

• Review of current policies on the acceptance of AP, CLEP, International Diploma, and Military course credits

EPPC still has one more meeting scheduled for this year. We will be discussing the granting of credit for Life Experience.

5. The International Programs Committee

This academic year the committee again sponsored a “Global Temple” Conference in November.

The one day conference included paper presentations, panel discussions, poster exhibitions, film presentations and a performance hour. The International Programs staff report that approximately 400 people were present for the various sessions.
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While I’ve not taken any polls, my sense is that most NTTs value their jobs here. Hence the eagerness to keep those jobs, and the willingness to put in the time and effort to improve the situation. Its limitations are obvious, but in today's climate, this job is better than many, many others – and that includes a lot of tenure-track jobs.

I'd like to be able to keep my job, and this is where things get complicated.

Notification of rehiring is always notoriously late, at least in my department – sometimes in April, sometimes in June. It makes planning a future a bit nerve-wracking. But the uncertain status of NTTs does not only affect NTTs. Others I've talked to have confirmed something I'd already suspected – that the current situation is making Temple a more contentious and fragmented place than it would otherwise be. And I don't think that it has to be that way, even with the presence of a large portion of NTT faculty. But the answer doesn't simply lie in making things "better" for NTTs. It involves making NTTs a full part of the Temple community. And in this process, there are steps that everyone can take.

It's tempting, of course, to lay out the whole blame for everything bad that's ever happened on the administration - especially tempting in today's context of eternal negotiations and posturing. But that's neither accurate nor fair.

Similarly, it would be easy to say that the administration doesn't support NTT's research; the job description doesn't include it and the Merit guidelines don't recognize it (at least in CLA). But things are not that simple. While some people would say that the sheer amount of work precludes an active research agenda, the teaching load is comparable to what many tenured professors have at non-research universities. And although they don't publicize it much, the administration does give us money – real live, cash-money, bigger piles of money than the ones in the Geico commercials – for summer research.

Yes, higher salaries and a lighter teaching load would be nice. But even with the conditions as they are, Temple could get a lot more out of NTT faculty than they currently do. Many lecturers are eager to serve on committees for which they are fully qualified, yet ineligible. Many are capable of teaching classes in specialties unrepresented among the presidential faculty, but are limited to teaching in the core curriculum. To not recognize the "merit" of a publication, simply because of the job status of the author, does far more harm than good. But above all, the administration needs to rethink this idea of flexibility. The true cost of flexibility is the morale of the university. Nor is it good business sense; a well-run company knows

You’ve Got [G]mail!

TU Gmail continued from page 3

search for and find it again should you ever need to. Of course if you're absolutely, positively sure you won't want a particular email ever again, you can still delete it, but be warned: since the new email accounts aren't stored on Temple servers, 30 days after you press the "Delete" button that email will be well and truly gone forever, and no amount of fancy data recovery work by Computer Services will ever be able to bring it back.

Another facet of the new system to get use to is "Labels". In most email systems, you organize your mail into folders. For example, you might have a folder for news from home, a folder for emails containing recipes, and a folder for your investigations in ancient Chinese culture. But what happens when someone from back home sends you an email about an authentic Chinese recipe they just discovered? Which folder does that email go in?

Labels are meant to solve this problem. In Gmail you can create labels for "home," "recipes," and "China" and then, if need be, apply all three labels to the same email. Once you've labeled an email you can archive it (to get it out of your Inbox) and then easily find it again later either by clicking on the appropriate label name or searching for it. If you're used to using "rules" to automatically file certain emails into specific folders, you can do the same in Gmail with "filters" and labels. Of course labels also have their downside; they can't be nested inside other labels the way folders can which makes having more than a couple dozen different labels cumbersome. If you use an email client like Outlook or Eudora to access your email, your folders will still appear as folders rather than labels.

Finally, Gmail introduces "conversations." In the old system, if someone sent you a message, you replied to them, and then they replied to you, you'd have 2 entries in your Inbox: one for the original message and one for their reply. If you kept replying to each other, or if several people were all responding to the same message, you might have ended up with a dozen or more separate entries that were all part of the same email discussion. In Gmail, all of these would be collapsed into a single entry in your Inbox called a conversation which would contain all the different messages and responses in order. A number in parenthesis tells you how many separate emails are contained in a given conversation, and any new messages that you haven't read yet are marked in bold.

Those are some of the major changes to get used to going from Miraint to Gmail. The new email system also comes with a number of useful features, a few of which are worth highlighting.

Handy Features:

Every Gmail account also comes with Google Calendar, a user-friendly, online calendar application. Calendars created in Google Calendar are easy to share with other users, which is especially handy now that the entire student body has TU Gmail accounts. So, if you're teaching, it's easy to make a calendar with all the meeting times, due dates, and deadlines for your class and then share it with all the students. Once they accept it, all the items from your class calendar will show up in their Google Calendars, color-coded for your class. If something comes up and you need to change a due date or reschedule a class, just make the change on your calendar and all of theirs will be updated automatically.

TU Gmail also comes with Google Docs, a suite of powerful online programs including a word processor, spreadsheet application, and Power Point-like presentation editor/viewer. Google Docs files are available to you from any computer with internet access and you can share them with other users, making it easy to collaborate on a project. And of course, if you want, you can download the files to edit them off-line or upload existing files to the internet to edit or share them via Google Docs.

The new email system also comes with Google Sites, a website editor, and Google Chat, an instant messaging application that includes the ability to video chat.

Computer Services has been holding a series of training seminars this month for those new to Gmail. The next two are on May 26. For more information, see some of the sites listed below:

To register for a training seminar:
http://www.temple.edu/cs/training/

The TU Gmail Resource Center:
http://www.temple.edu/cs/email/gmail/

Google's "Getting Started Guide":
http://mail.google.com/support/bin/answer.py?hl=en&answer=90877

Shusterman continued on page 5
On Being NTT Faculty at Temple

Shusterman from page 4

that it is easier to retain talented, dedicated employees than it is to hire or recruit them.

As for what the presidential faculty could do, the first thing is simply to recognize NTTs as colleagues. NTTs are not here to teach any more than the presidential faculty are; they are not here to do research any less. We’re all here to be part of the profession. Yes, there are plenty of NTTs who do not have active research agendas. But that is true of the tenured faculty as well. So when there are opportunities to highlight faculty research, leave behind the titles and focus on the work. When there are forums on pedagogy, don’t assume that these are for NTTs. And everyone needs to recognize academia for what it is – an all-too-often arbitrary profession, where titles and status cannot be counted on to accurately reflect the activity of a scholar.

And finally, my advice to other NTTs is simple: Be part of Temple. Be part of your field. If there are scholars in your field, or in related fields, contact them, get to know them. Volunteer for committees (even committees that are currently limited to presidential faculty). Take part in the many study groups and forums that Temple has. Right now, the job is simple: teach. Sometimes that winds up feeling like, “teach and shut up,” or “teach and then go home,” and too many people listen to that voice. That, in my opinion, is the worst thing that lecturers could do.

There is a guiding principle to all of this: let the institutional divisions be what they are, but don’t let them rule every aspect of every interaction. If something is about institutional distinctions, so be it. But if it is an intellectual matter, leave the institutional distinctions behind. Fill committees with people who want to serve on those committees. Recognize good teaching and good research wherever it is, regardless of titles. Base merit pay on merit, not on the decisions of the search committees of years gone by.

I didn’t decide to become an academic because I thought it would be easy. But publish or perish isn’t the rule of the industry anymore, and the number of people doing both grows every year. Temple can’t change that, but it’s up to everyone here to investigate what advantages there are to be found in an evolving profession.

committee reports 2008-2009

The committee also met to advance the goals of the new Office of International Affairs and met with the Provost and her staff about concerns over the need to search for a new director of that office. Currently the committee is involved in planning for a ‘Global Temple’ Conference for November of this year and in making recommendations for Temple’s involvement in The Center for International Initiatives at the American Council on Education (ACE). The committee also voted to elect Rita Krueger and J. Brooke Harrington as co-chairs of the committee starting in January of 2009.

Brooke Harrington, Chair

6. Personnel Committee

The Faculty Senate Personnel Committee, during the Academic Year 2008-2009, considered four cases.

In two of those cases, the faculty member involved declined to file a written petition for relief from the Committee.

The remaining two cases, in which the Committee prepared a written opinion, involved an appeal from a promotion denial and a faculty disciplinary matter.

Rafael A. Porrata-Doria, Jr., Chair

letters to the editor

May 11, 2009

Dear colleagues

We are writing about the labor fee that the union wants to collect from all faculty (or more recently from new faculty). The union has labeled this involuntary fee as fair share, suggesting that non-union faculty are “free riders” who are taking advantage of the union’s negotiations without sharing the costs.

We would like to provide a voice to individuals who CHOOSE NOT to join the union and have a different perspective. We believe in free choice, the right to work, and the power of the individual. Our perspective is that being forced to be part of the collective bargaining agreement is costly and unfair.

The notion of having an involuntary tax imposed on us or our future colleagues seems even more unjust. We are against being coerced by the union into paying them a percentage of our salaries.

We have chosen not to join the union and would prefer they did not represent us in setting our pay raises. The current model is of free choice in which each individual gets to choose whether they want to join the union and pay dues. We have been solicited numerous times in our offices and have received phone calls at home to join the union. There seem to be union solicitors constantly roaming the hallways to get people to join the union. Given that union membership has hovered around 60% for a very long time, clearly, many of us don’t want to join the union.

Please understand that we have nothing against the union leaders and members – it is absolutely your right to join and participate. The union leadership and university administrators involved in this process deserve our respect and thanks for their dedication and efforts. However, we ask that you please respect our right to choose as well and also the right of our future colleagues.

Respectfully,

Dan Fesenmaier
Professor & Director, National Laboratory for Tourism & eCommerce, School of Tourism & Hospitality Management

Munir Mandviwalla
Associate Professor and Chairman of Management Information Systems Executive Director Institute for Business and Information Technology

Ram Mudambi
Professor and Perelman Senior Research Fellow Chairman of General & Strategic Management

Terence A. Oliva
Professor of Marketing

Eric Press
Associate Professor and Chairman of Accounting

David Reeb
Professor and Fuller Senior Research Fellow Department of Finance

April 29, 2009

Dear Editor,

I would like to address the issue of agency fee/fair share, which seems to be a major obstacle in the faculty, librarians and professional staff obtaining a contract. I am about to take a position unpopular to many, but one that truly expresses my deeply held sentiments. I hope that you will respect the
Letters to the Editor
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person in any replies you might make, even if you don’t agree with the position.

From a variety of sources, I have been told that both sides, TAUP and the Temple University Negotiators, seem to be at an impasse regarding the topic of agency fee/fair share. Both sides have stated with certainty that they will simply not change their minds, and that in fact, no contract will be agreed upon until the “other side,” gives in. So, we could wait another few years, and still not have a contract. Meanwhile, we have been without a contract for a full school year, we have had no raises this year, and the merit folders of meritorious faculty are languishing on chairs’ desks. This is really untenable.

I am a member of TAUP. I joined because I felt that if my voice was to be heard by TAUP, I should be a member. So, here is my voice on the matter:

The university has clearly stated that when the TAUP membership reaches 70% of those eligible to join, the university will impose an agency fee/fair share. As much as TAUP has tried to garner the sufficient number of members to make this happen, they have failed to obtain this percentage of members. Clearly, not enough faculty, professional staff, and librarians have joined TAUP despite a concerted effort to increase membership numbers.

Even though I chose to be a member, I do not feel that it is fair to insist that my colleagues should be forced to pay a fee. I realize that TAUP represents the entire faculty, but this does not necessarily mean that the entire faculty wishes to be represented by TAUP – there is no choice since we are a unionized faculty. I look at the salaries of some of the Non-Tenure Track faculty in my department, some of whom have experienced great salary compression, and I do not feel that they, and others in similar situations, should be forced to pay an agency fee.

So, I say to TAUP – give up your position on this issue, and let’s move forward. It is not fair to try to force approximately 40% of eligible faculty, professional staff and librarians to pay a fee when they simply do not wish to join TAUP, and in fact, if given a choice, might opt out of having a unionized campus.

Many of us are very tired of waiting for this to be over. Obviously, the Fair Share/Agency Fee is a major “sticking point.” My request to TAUP is “just give it up and let’s move forward.” No one should be forced to have a deduction taken from their salary when they do not wish to join the union.

Remember, this is an opinion respectfully submitted by a dues-paying TAUP member, who like so many others, is tired of waiting for a contract to be agreed upon and signed.

Sincerely,

Roberta Sloan, Ph.D.
Chair-Department of Theater
Executive Producer – Temple Theaters
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7. Lectures & Forums Committee

The Lectures & Forums Committee awarded $4,900 of its $5,000 budget to lectures and forums sponsored by colleges and departments from across the university. Funding for honoraria were received by Geography/Urban Studies, Film & Media Arts, History & American Studies, Journalism, Department of Public Health, College of Health Professions, Fox School of Business, Art History, Social Administration, Music Theory Department (EBCM), College of Education, and the Center for Humanities. Lectures were presented on everything from last fall’s election, the current economy, Afghanistan, “vertical farms,” aspects of arts and culture, film, to global business challenges, illegal gun trade, and film, among others. $100 of the budget was unspent because one lecture was postponed.

8. Committee on the Status of Faculty of Color

The Committee on the Status of Faculty of Color worked to foster a community of inclusive excellence through intercultural dialogue and education programs.

Two weeks before the historic election of Barack Obama to the U.S. presidency, we presented a forum on race and the race for the White House which attracted hundreds of students, was broadcast live on the Internet, and received front-page coverage in the local news section of the Philadelphia Inquirer. In the spring, we hosted a faculty reception to celebrate the diversity of our distinguished faculty that featured greetings from Provost Lisa Staiano-Coico and an address from former Mayor John Street.

In addition, we engaged in a couple of successful collaborative ventures. Working with Paley Library and the Temple University Press, we are organized four “Chat in the Stacks” events that offered faculty from diverse disciplines, including History, English, Theater, Biology, and Kinesiology, to share research that excited dynamic exchanges over issues of diversity in American culture. We also helped the Temple University Black Alumni Alliance and the Development Office to put together a spring recognition ceremony on honor of Dr. Molefi Asante.

A recent AAUP national faculty survey found three-quarters of the respondents believed that gaining an appreciation for diversity is a vital part of higher education and a comparable number called for hiring more faculty of color to promote intercultural competency. Accordingly, we have maintained a dialogue with the provost seeking to establish best practices for recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty.

Our plans for next year include the following programs: 1) graduate symposium, 2) undergraduate Forum, 3) faculty dialogue, and 4) recognition ceremony. In addition, we will organize four more “Chat in the Stacks” events.

Roland L. Williams, Jr., Chair

9. The Budget Committee

The Faculty Senate Budget Committee met with Bob Lux, CFO of TUHS, CFO Anthony Wagner and Provost Lisa Stiano-Coico as well as Deputy Provost Richard Englert. We also did trend analysis of Temple's expenses over the past decade which we shared with the administration.

Frankly, in my opinion, the protracted contract negotiations between TAUP and the administration hindered in depth ongoing discussions about these expenditure trends. Once a contract is completed the Budget Committee can renew these discussions.

Leroy Dubock, Chair
Task. The subcommittees accomplished the following:

1) Awards Subcommittee: The GEEC awards subcommittee evaluated 19 applications to select 3 winners of the Provost’s Award for Innovative Teaching in General Education; it evaluated 27 applications to select 18 pairs for the Peer Teaching Program; two interdisciplinary teams were selected to team teach existing GenEd courses in Spring 09. After this first award cycle, changes were made to the language in the applications based on this group’s recommendations. In early June further award decisions will be made regarding Peer Teaching and summer stipends for interdisciplinary and PEX course development.

2) Assessment Subcommittee: This group participated in the AAC&U meta-rubric project, providing feedback on six draft rubrics and using them as models for ongoing work. The group drafted a rubric for critical thinking and a time-line for testing the rubric against Temple student work.

3) Per Observation Subcommittee: Focusing on the vital GenEd learning goal of communication, this group decided to concentrate within that on identifying teaching practices that would enhance good classroom discussion. Their first step involved viewing videotapes of faculty leading discussion, and reaching consensus on a number of issues and traits. Each subcommittee member then contacted a faculty member still in the piloting phase of GenEd teaching with the offer to provide observation in three phases: a meeting before viewing the class to get oriented and hear from the faculty member as to goals and challenges; a classroom observation; a follow-up meeting for developmental (as opposed to evaluative) feedback. At the conclusion of this process the subcommittee then discussed moving forward with the TLC’s guidance, building a peer observation into a learning community of faculty interested in supporting one another in better understanding best teaching practices.

In addition, the plenary GEEC approved two waivers in Human Behavior, for Nursing and for Secondary Education, and reviewed and approved 12 new courses, four in the area of Human Behavior—the area in which GenEd most needs new courses.

11. President’s Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics

The President’s Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics successfully completed its work as the core of the Steering Committee for the second cycle NCAA Re-certification of Temple’s Intercollegiate Athletics program. The Committee hosted the NCAA peer review team which visited campus for several days during the fall. In April 2009, the NCAA announced that Temple’s athletics program had been fully certified without conditions, based on its self-study and the results of the peer review team’s report. The Committee meets three times a year and will be pursuing initiatives it developed this year, including increasing non athlete student enjoyment of the intercollegiate athletics program, creating a faculty mentoring program for student athletes, and coordinating with the Provost’s office to explore the possibility of more flexible class scheduling, if feasible. In addition, the Committee created subcommittees on gender and racial equity, admission and graduation rates, APR and academic performance, and compliance and student athlete well being. Faculty representatives serve on each subcommittee.
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University Faculty Senate Meeting
April 16, 2009

1. Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 1:56 PM.

2. Approval of Minutes:
The minutes were accepted as amended.

3. President’s Report: Karen M. Turner

Turner stated that if you want to listen to the proceedings of our last meeting or earlier meetings, go to the Senate website where there is a link to the meetings via Apreso. This meeting is being video conferenced to Health Sciences and Ambler.

4. Guest: Provost Lisa

Provost Lisa provided the following updates.

- With respect to Graduate Education, CST Dean Hai-Lung Dai has been asked to form a task force on research administration and graduate education. The Faculty Senate Steering Committee (FSSC) made recommendations for the faculty appointment to this committee. The Provost has received oral reports from the consultants relative to the funding sources of the Graduate School.

- Relative to the Academic Strategic Compass, the Provost is giving presentations to all of the collegial assemblies. She is asking for input relative to the plan. There is a website linked from her website, www.temple.edu/provost and a drop box for faculty to make suggestions.

- Social Administration will now be the School of Social Work in the College of Health Professions. In the near future the name of this college will be changed to the College of Health Professions and Social Work.

- The Provost is working with a transition team for Ambler. The School of Environmental Design will be nested in the College of Liberal Arts.

- With respect to the Federal Stimulus Grants, it is expected that Temple faculty and departments will be submitting about 40M dollars of grant applications.

President’s Report, Continued

- Since our last meeting the Steering Committee met with President Hart, the CARE Team, Michelle O’Connor, Assistant Vice Provost for first year and transfer programs, Debbie Hartnett, Vice President, Human Resources, Bernie Newman (SSA) Student Feedback Forms Committee, and Larry Alford, Dean of University Libraries.

- Note that the minutes of all of the FSSC meetings are posted on the Senate website.

5. Vice President’s Report: Paul LaFollette

- The results of the Senate election are in. The only competitive race was for RPPC. Marina Angel and Jennifer Crowley were elected. Only 202 people voted. There are still vacancies on some of the committees. These vacancies will have to be filled in the fall.

4/16/09 minutes continued on page 8
6. Old Business:
None

7. New Business:
Dieter Forster (CST) requested that the minutes be posted on the web earlier so that faculty can know about issues before the meeting. Turner replied that the Secretary will take care of this issue.

Turner explained that the Bargaining Units Liaison Committee submitted this motion for the FSSC’s review and approval. The FSSC made some changes and then approved the following motion at its April 7th meeting: 

The FSSC, over a period of many weeks has talked about what their role should be with respect to the contract negotiations. The committee walked a fine line because of the senate’s unique role. The Committee opted to not be public with their discussions and waited to see what would happen with respect to a contract being reached. Many faculty members have contacted the FSSC on this issue.

Turner presented the following background information relating to a motion that the FSSC is presenting: The FSSC, over a period of many weeks has talked about what their role should be with respect to the contract negotiations. The committee walked a fine line because of the senate’s unique role. The Committee opted to not be public with their discussions and waited to see what would happen with respect to a contract being reached. Many faculty members have contacted the FSSC on this issue. Turner explained because the motion is coming from the FSSC to the university senate assembly, the approval by the FSSC is considered a first reading. There are precedents for this interpretation of Article 5, Section 4 of the senate bylaws. Therefore, this is a second reading if the motion goes forward with discussion.

- Marge Devinney, CLA, moved the motion which was then seconded.
- Roberta Sloan, SCT, asked for a paper ballot.
- Richard Englert, Deputy Provost said he is opposed to the motion. He sits on the negotiating team and finds the motion troubling since he feels that it is based on the false premise that the President is not involved with the negotiations. He said that the President has been involved from the beginning and that she has been responsible for the progress that has been made. He said that the premise could have been resolved if she had been asked about this issue.

He feels that the motion is one-sided and that any neutral person would say ‘Let’s get the parties together.’ Englert feels that the motion is about process and that the problems are not about process, but about substantive issues: The University is against unconditional mandatory agency fee and it wants a prudent salary increase.

He feels that the FSSC should be neutral on this issue and speak for the whole faculty. He said some members of the faculty have said to him that the faculty senate seems to be a stepchild of the union by taking what seems to be a one-sided view of the negotiations by approving this motion. We are all frustrated, but “ultimately there will be a contract that all will like.”

- Paul LaFollette, CST is for the motion. He feels that the resolution deals with process. It is the Senate’s job to advise the administration, not to negotiate. There is a relation between TAUP and the Faculty Senate. This is one faculty, one Temple, and one in our commitment to excellence, to shared government, and academic freedom.

The two bodies are deeply intertwined. The TAUP contract establishes the groundwork on which shared government is built and processes and procedures on which tenure and promotion are based. These processes have an impact on other Schools and Colleges that are not part of the bargaining unit. He feels that the perception is that President Hart is not engaged in the negotiation or not interested in the faculty.

- Diane Maleson, Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Faculty Affairs and Professor of Law at the Temple University Beasley School of Law. Maleson stated that every one is frustrated. There are three members of the academic team in the negotiations: Dick Englert, Diane Maleson and Concetta Stewart. They have been advocates of all things related to academics. They have spoken up on matters of tenure and promotion, study leaves, and other academic issues. In early autumn they met with (Joyce) Lindorff and (Art) Hochner of the TAUP negotiating team. She mentioned that President Hart is fully engaged in the in the negotiations.

- Lois Millner, School of Social Work, Member of FSSC, for the motion. She mentioned that there was a lot of discussion before FSSC made the motion. One outcome is making the issue clear and transparent.

- Concetta Stewart, Dean of SCT. The President was very clear that academics be part of the team. She has been very involved.

- Bob Aiken, CST and immediate past President of FSSC. Aiken wants to address one underlying theme of respect for faculty in the context of shared governance. The Union deals with economic issues, and the Faculty Senate deals with academic issues. But there are overlaps.

During his tenure as President of FSSC he said it was easy to be president because he had the respect of the President and the Provost. It was easy to communicate with them. This was shared governance and it is important to take shared governance seriously. The administration has also taken shared governance seriously. It is important to keep the lines of communication open between faculty and administration and exchange views. He added that the motion is not a sign of disrespect for the administration.

- Deborah Howe, Ambler is against the motion. It creates problems in the negotiations. It is one-sided and directed to the President and the University and not to the Union. It is inappropriate for the Faculty Senate to vote on it.

- Jim Korsch, CST is for the motion. He read article II, paragraph 3 at the top of the motion which stated...
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that the Faculty Senate has the responsibility and right to advise the administration and the Board on all matters of University policy. The Senate has the responsibility to make this motion. This is a request for the President to take charge. It is disrespectful to faculty for the administration to decide the salaries for the faculty. It shows disrespect for the faculty.

- Karen Bond, BCMD, announced that at their assembly, the faculty voted to endorse the motion.

- Elaine Mackowiak, Pharmacy, mentioned her experience on the Handbook Revision Committee composed of representatives of the Schools and Colleges. The academic members of the negotiating team were members of this committee. After all of the work of the Committee the administration only agreed on the status of emeritus. The group was told not to work on any other changes until the new contract was drawn. The administration did not want feedback from the committee.

- Greg Urwin, CLA said that we, the faculty are also an important part of the University. We are part of the team. We want to get past this and use our potential to succeed.

- Bill Cutler, CLA said there is a lot of passion involved. Ann Hart is his friend. If a problem arises, the buck stops with her. She also represents the faculty. She must take on the charge.

- Phil Vannella, CLA was involved with John Langel three times in the 1980’s In Union negotiations. Langel is very good at long deadly negotiations. He is a top anti-union lawyer.

- Turner said she is disturbed by Dick Englert’s comment that some faculty feel the faculty senate is the stepchild of the union. She explained the FSSC is an independent group that works with both the administration and the union. She reiterated that the FSSC struggled with whether it should get involved for many weeks. Turner said at least conversations are now out in the open. She said many of us are members of the Union, but the senate is not acting for the administration or for the union.

- Linda Mauro, SSA called for a quorum.

- Scott Gratson, SCT Parliamentarian of the Faculty Senate, read the Section on Robert’s Rules. It was determined there was no quorum. The meeting was over.

- Turner said that the vote would be made electronically.

8. Adjournment:
The meeting was adjourned at 2:44 PM.
Bonnie Averbach, Secretary

---
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University Faculty Senate Meeting
April 29, 2009

1. Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 2:05 PM.

2. President’s Report: Karen M. Turner

Turner mentioned that the purpose of this special meeting is to vote by paper ballot on the motion made at the April 16, 2009 University Senate meeting. Since a quorum was called at that meeting and there was not a quorum present, the vote did not take place and that meeting was adjourned.

This meeting was called within a two-week period in accordance with the Faculty Senate bylaws, Article 5, Meetings, section 6. Turner then asked if there was further discussion on the motion.

James Ryan, Professor of Physiology, Temple School of Medicine, replied, stating a point of order. He then called for a quorum since the session was not video conferenced to the Medical School. As a result, eligible members of six schools and colleges could not be present.

The secretary counted the number of faculty who had signed in. The count was 122 present, not a quorum.

Roberta Sloan, Theater, asked to make an amendment to the motion. However this was not possible since the meeting was over.

Turner adjourned the meeting and then asked that there be a general discussion of the issues for those interested in staying.

3. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 2:32 PM.
Bonnie Averbach, Secretary

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

---
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