The Governance Issue

For more than a year we put questions of governance on hold while we waited for a new contract. Still, why would we want to consider the form and substance of faculty governance at a time of economic crisis? As a student of political history, I can say that it is precisely in times of economic crisis that the rules of the political game are often reconsidered, with creative and positive consequences. There is something about change that makes us look at our institutions, sometimes with more perspective and wisdom than we can muster at times when things seem more stable.

This issue of the Herald offers ample perspective and, I think, wisdom. We hope it will open up further discussion of how to move into the future while preserving the Temple faculty’s best traditions. We welcome letters in response, which we will post to the Senate listserv as well as publish in our final issue of the academic year.

Competing University Models

...and the Role of the Faculty Senate

By Paul LaFollette, CST, Mark Rahnert, Beasley School of Law, and William Woodward, Beasley School of Law

Universities are a battleground for competing models of management. On its administrative side, today’s university is a very large and complex business with a fairly rigid hierarchical management structure. Since universities are typically nonprofit organizations, the monetary profit motive that drives most businesses toward “efficiency” is absent, but it has been replaced by a variety of other measures of success: endowment and budget growth, rankings, median SAT scores, and the like. The aim of the administrators on this side of the university is to manage the university with businesslike efficiency in a way that maximizes its “return” on these various measures of success. This is the university’s business model. Over the past 30 years it has evolved in the direction of increasing centralized control not unlike the corporate command model of many non-academic American corporations.

Reminiscences and Parting Remarks

...Some Thoughts on Retirement

By Orin Chein
Professor of Mathematics, CST

From time to time, I have noticed that a faculty colleague whom I used to see has seemed to disappear, and I have wondered whether he or she has left Temple or has simply ceased to be visibly active. It has long been the custom (at least in CAS and now in CST) that new faculty members are introduced at a collegial assembly, and I thought it would be nice if we also bid farewell to faculty who are leaving. I suggested this to both Dean Dai and to Senate President Turner. They both liked the idea and said they would implement it this year. But my “reward” for making this suggestion is that I have been asked to write this article for the Faculty Herald.

I have decided to use this opportunity to reminisce about my experience at Temple and offer some thoughts on what I would like to see for Temple’s future.

I came here in July of 1968, fresh from receiving my doctorate at NYU. Although I had several other offers at the time, I “chose” Temple, and I have never regretted the decision. At the discussion of Quality of Life issues during the January meeting of the Representative Faculty Senate, several people voiced the concern that Temple can be unwelcoming to new faculty members. This was not my experience. Long before my official arrival, one of my then future (now current) colleagues invited my wife and...
Teaching, Scholarship and Service at Temple University

Actions Speak Louder Than Words
By Michael Sirover, Professor of Pharmacology, School of Medicine

President Obama raised a question which this author has seen debated throughout his 32 years as a member of the Temple University faculty. What is the true value of service as part of our work here at Temple? Does it really matter? Is it a worthwhile contribution? Should we simply forget about it and have the Board of Trustees eliminate that term from the Faculty Handbook?

Temple University justifiably emphasizes with pride its “125 years of Service to the Community” as a priority mission along with teaching and with scholarship. So, how should we interpret Temple University’s slogan of “125 years of Community Service” as it relates to our service mission as its faculty?

For that discussion, it may be useful not to consider actions at the Main Campus but rather events that have occurred here at the School of Medicine. The rationale for this relates of course to the TAUP contract which defines specifically faculty time, effort and merit. As such, it places limits on university action. In contrast, the Medical School is not TAUP affiliated. The University can set its own policy and thus reveal its “true feelings” with respect to teaching, scholarship and service.

So, how are faculty evaluated in the School of Medicine? The current Dean (I think my 14th but I’m a Senior Citizen), John Daly, M.D., along with his associates Richard Kozena, M.D. and Jo-Anne Orth, Ph.D. developed a matrix to evaluate faculty performance. The matrix is a spread sheet program in which diverse activities are allotted different numbers of points, i.e. x number of points for each extramural grant which is submitted (whether it’s funded or not), y points for extramural grant support (including the percentage of your salary generated and the amount of indirect costs provided to the University), z points for numbers of hours of teaching, b points for being a course director and so on. The more points one has, the higher the merit raise. There is a threshold below which one is considered as having no merit, i.e. worthless, and does not receive any raise whatsoever (there is no “floor” for even a 1% cost of living increase). As such, those individuals actually see their net salaries decrease as there is always an annual increase in insurance co-pays.

Why raise the issue of this matrix as it relates to the question of service? As recently explained by Dr. Orth at a Department of Pharmacology staff meeting, the current Dean and his associates decided to cap points for service at 20. To paraphrase Dr. Orth, everyone does so much service anyway. The total number of points is approximately 400. This means that no matter how much service you do, it can only comprise 5% of the total points available.

This begs the question, “Why is service capped at 20 points?” If the Faculty Handbook describes our responsibilities as Teaching, Scholarship and Service, should not a faculty member be awarded m points for serving as a Faculty Senate officer, n points for serving on the Senate Executive Board, o points for membership on the Steering Committee, p points for serving on CATa, etc. There may be similar omissions in merit for extramural service. For example, how many points should an individual receive if he/she was the President or Officer of a regional, national or international organization, the Chair of an NIH study section, a member of a study section, or an external advisor for a faculty member’s promotion at another institution?

Why does this matter? As an example, consider that, although the President of the University Faculty Senate is usually a Main Campus individual, some presidents have been from the Medical School or other schools at the Health Sciences Center. In addition, other Health Sciences Center personnel (including the author) have served as Senate officers. As anyone who has served as a Senate officer or as a member of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee knows, this involves a major commitment of time and effort.

Given that as a basis, what would be the worth of a Medical School Faculty member who, in a given year, is either the President of the All University Faculty Senate or is elected to another office? As defined by the Medical School matrix, it would appear that that person could receive a total of 20 out of 400 odd points for all of the time, effort and commitment inherent in that service position. As such, it is not unreasonable to hypothesize that said individual could fall below the merit threshold and therefore be deemed lacking in merit, i.e., worthless, without even a minimal 1% cost of living increase.

That being said, the hidden agenda of the matrix may be that it is a means to reward those individuals who bring in money through research or through teaching, i.e., it is the Practice Plan of Temple Hospital adapted to the Medical School, an educational institution. With teaching, such dollars are provided through tuition while in research, such dollars are provided to pay not only for faculty salaries but also to provide indirect costs for use by both the University and by the current Dean. Service, by definition, may generate favorable publicity as well as intramural and extramural good will but it does not bring in dollars directly. As they say, “Money talks, nobody walks.” Or “In G-d we trust, all others pay cash.”

This brings us back to the dueling concepts of “Actions speak louder than words” and “Words have meaning”. As such, it may be of educational interest for the faculty as a whole if the University administration could provide a rationale to reconcile the stated commitment of the University to faculty service (intramural or extramural) in relation to the apparent lack of such recognition at one of its subsidiary colleges.

The author is a Professor of Pharmacology at the School of Medicine, a Past President of the Medical Faculty Senate, a member of the Editorial Advisory Board of the Faculty Herald, and has the privilege of serving as the Chair of a National Cancer Institute Special Advisory Committee on Cancer Prevention.

Senate Discusses Faculty Governance
At its March 17 meeting, the Representative Senate held an open discussion of issues relating to shared governance. Concerns raised by faculty members included:

- Revising Collegial Assembly bylaws that were imposed on some schools during the previous administration – especially those that empower deans to run collegial assemblies, or approve bylaw changes.
- Budgetary decisions that include declining percentages of funds devoted to instruction.
- More open discussions in collegial assemblies for the purpose of setting agendas.
- The need for faculty to get more involved in governance in order to have more input.
- Perceptions of decline in faculty governance in recent years, and its possible causes.
- The difference between faculty ideas being adopted or embraced, and real shared governance.
- The increasing power exercised by deans.

A more complete accounting of the discussion will appear in the meeting minutes in our next issue, after the minutes are approved at the next meeting.

Nominations Sought for Director of General Education
The Provost invites nominations (including self-nominations) for a new director of the General Education program through April 13.

For more information please see the following web site: http://www.temple.edu/provost/GENEDSearch.htm
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five years since schools were empowered to form Collegial Assemblies, and asked that schools who hadn’t done so to now establish them, and recommended procedures for expeditiously doing this.

An important footnote referred to the Faculty Senate Constitution, Article III, No. 2b, adopted by the Faculty Senate in February of 1969 and approved by the Board of Trustees that May. The article stated: Each school of the University shall have its own Collegial Assembly with its own presiding officer, executive and standing committees, with regular meetings and such rules and procedures as it may deem necessary. Each Collegial Assembly shall determine its own membership provided that all University Senators shall be members thereof.

In my view, the CASBA served as a true democratically functioning institution for many years. Since my department, which started in SBA, was subsequently moved to three other colleges at Temple, I can also attest to other Collegial Assemblies having operated quite differently than they do today.

Why has this change happened? The primary reason is that the “rules and procedures” of Collegial Assemblies were originally determined exclusively and entirely by the faculty. This changed when the previous administration insisted that new Collegial Assembly By-Laws be written and that they conform to specific constraints - which effectively limited the voice of faculty and the role of faculty governance.

Soon, Collegial Assembly By-Laws should be undergoing review in all colleges, and the Provost’s office is working on the baseline By-Laws should meet. It is hoped and expected that these will be considerably more faculty governance friendly than the current version.

However, in my view, real faculty governance means it is the faculty who determine the By-Laws - as we did during the 1970s. In fact, unless this is the case, I suggest faculty do not actually have real faculty governance.

Of course, faculty governance has two components – a means by which faculty can find their voice and a willingness for the administration to seriously listen to that voice.

As stated in Article II, No. 3 of the Faculty Senate Constitution: The Faculty Senate shall have the responsibility and right, by the exercise of one or more of its powers, to advise the administration and the Board of Trustees on all matters of University policy, on all matters affecting the relations of the faculty of the University, and on all other matters of policy and administrative decision-making in which the faculty claims a reasonable advisement either through consultation or review and either at the initiation of the administration or at its own recognition. The Senate, through the process of recommendation, may initiate advice to the administration and Board of Trustees on any matter of policy, decision and program.

Just as the Faculty Senate has the responsibility for considering issues involving the entire University, it should be undergoing review in all colleges.

For quite some time, the faculty has been remiss in fulfilling its responsibility either by not adequately attending Senate or Assembly meetings or by not considering important issues. The February Faculty Herald alludes to these failings in the comments of the Herald’s editor on Senate attendance and in the two letters to the editor that concern the administration’s recent emphasis on research, the kinds of faculty the administration chooses to hire, the degree to which undergraduate education is being properly supported, and budgetary concerns. As examples, the shift to enhance the University’s research profile and the upward trend in NTT and adjunct hiring have never been seriously brought to the Senate by the administration for consideration. Nor has the Senate exercised its responsibility to consider such matters. This must change if faculty governance is to be a reality here.

It is very significant that our current administration does appear to want to be the needed partner in achieving real faculty governance. It is incumbent on the President and Provost to actively encourage the development of real faculty governance in our colleges by insuring that Deans pursue such a partnership as well. Once the faculty sees that they really have a voice in decision making they will be motivated to participate.

The faculty must also do its part. This means supporting the Senate and Collegial Assemblies, and creating Collegial Assembly By-Laws that foster faculty governance. It is now almost four years since the current administration has been at Temple’s helm – and it is time for it to unshackle the Collegial Assemblies!

Academic Compass Update

The Academic Compass, the academic strategy plan launched by the Provost’s Office last April, has been updated to reflect progress and initiatives for year two. Members of the University community can view the year two executive summary and updates at www.temple.edu/provost/academiccompass and provide comments and feedback via the Compass suggestion box.

Competing University Models
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For a variety of reasons, some rooted in history and tradition or dictated by law, others the product of this particular business model itself, the business model of the modern university functions in a very top-down style. The board of trustees dictates to the president (in business parlance, the CEO), who dictates to the senior management, who dictate to the junior management, and so forth on down the pyramid of authority to the workers (including faculty) at the base. It’s the same basic management model that one finds in American corporations like General Motors hum, and that more recently has arguably contributed to bringing them down. Like its counterpart in the for-profit world, this management approach is heavily oriented towards short-term goals, usually defined in terms of quickly achievable quantitative bumps in the various measures that have been identified as the higher education version of profit and loss. Senior managers stake their reputations (and their prospects for promotion or recruitment to higher positions elsewhere) on their ability to achieve these short term goals. They endeavor to do so by promoting efficiency, standardization of product and process, a market- and consumer-oriented mentality, flexibility in resource allocation, centralized planning, and objectively measured quality control.

There is nothing inherently wrong about this model, and indeed a university like Temple would surely fail without very careful attention to the bottom line by those with a well-developed business sense. Temple University has a budget that runs into the hundreds of millions. It is one of the region’s largest employers. It provides critical educational and health care services. It also provides extensive residential, food, recreational and security services to thousands of student “customers.” It has a sprawling and complex physical plant. It operates in multiple locations throughout the world. If it were operated for a profit, it would be deemed a multinational corporation. Any business that big and complicated needs a highly organized and efficient system of management.

But the business model is not the only model that operates here, or at other universities. There is another, older model – we’ll call it the academic model – that exists beside by side with the business model, and that also permeates higher education. In its purest form, the academic model differs sharply from its business counterpart. Where the business model is organized vertically into a steep pyramid of authority, the academic model is horizontal, with a very wide base and a very short ascent. Instead of organizational hierarchy, it emphasizes individual autonomy and collegiality. Instead of objectively determined and quantifiable short-term goals, it emphasizes a longer term perspective and diffuse goals (such as quality of instruction, growth of knowledge and understanding, and development of creativity and innovation) that seldom translate into easily tracked or quantified external measures. Instead of standardization, it emphasizes intellectual diversity, experimentation, nonconformity, and methodological variety, both across and within particular intellectual disciplines. Peer review and collective decision making, rather than top-down command and control measures, predominate on questions of policy.

“In its purest form, the academic model differs sharply from its business counterpart.”

University Models continued on page 4
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Even a cursory description of these two university models suggests their potential to operate at cross purposes and pull in different directions. Often, one model craves what the other eschews. The potential for conflict between them is ubiquitous. When it arises over major questions that strike at the core of either model’s essential values, the effect can be highly destructive. The annals of higher education are sadly full of cases where presidents, faculties, and even entire institutions have been brought low as a result of interminable warfare between business and academic model champions. But these two competing university models need not be constantly at war with one another.

“But these two competing university models need not be constantly at war with one another.”

With capable and sensitive senior leaders, who understand and value both models, who are capable of mediating between them, and who are adept at keeping each in balance, it is possible to create and maintain an institutional environment in which the two models support and reinforce one another. Typically this involves defining a primary sphere of operation for each model, structuring a cooperative relationship between them in areas where they overlap, and ensuring that neither one overwhelms the other in the formation and implementation of college or university policies and procedures. This task is never easy, but it is considerably easier in good times than in bad ones. In periods of economic growth and institutional advancement, the models tend to coalesce (or at least leave plenty of room for each other), and it is possible to achieve their divergent definitions of success simultaneously. When times are hard, however, the fault lines between these two models tend to become more visible and place greater stress on the university’s systems. Tensions between competing perspectives rise to the surface, and the potential for conflict increases. The task of mediating between competing university perspectives becomes progressively more demanding.

Unfortunately for all of us, there are plenty of signs that hard times may lie ahead, for higher education generally and Temple in particular. After a multi-year demographic spike in college-age student populations, years of steady decline in those age groups lie ahead. Public financial support for state-related universities is declining. The tough economy has produced significant cuts in private giving and external research funding. Students are less willing to incur substantial debt in order to finance higher education that affords diminished prospects for gainful postgraduate employment. If there are bright spots in higher education’s financial picture, they are getting harder and harder to find. If past is prologue, these changes are likely to elevate the prominence of the business model in university decision making, placing pressure on the values of the academic model in the process. Moreover, the academic changes that result from the business model’s top-down decision making model and the values it embraces are likely to be permanent.

What does all this have to do with university shared governance and the role of the Faculty Senate? We believe that the Senate is (at least potentially) a pivotal institution in the struggle to maintain a balance between business and academic university models in the lean years that probably lie ahead. As economic challenges mount, the University’s central administration is likely to focus with ever-greater intensity on the demands of the business model, and to press for changes and sacrifices in the academic model’s core values. The values most at risk will be those least susceptible to translation into the quantifiable measures of economic success that lie at the heart of the business model’s approach. Unfortunately, those are also typically the values that lie closest to the heart of the university’s academic enterprise. At the extreme, we face the prospect of sustaining our existence only at the cost of sacrificing part of our identity – the University’s Faustian bargain with itself in times of shrinking resources.

To avoid this danger, we need constant and effective champions of core academic values at all levels of university decision making. This is the essential role that shared governance plays in our system. Where faculty are actively and meaningfully involved as true participants in making the major decisions that chart the university’s course, there is good reason to believe that the core values of the academic model will be advanced, and that the final decisions will take those values into account. At the level of schools and colleges, that task falls to the collegial assembly. At the university level, it falls to the Faculty Senate. The Senate must be an actively engaged, well-informed and articulate champion of academic values if the critical balance between the business and academic models of the university is to be preserved.

Sadly, at Temple the Faculty Senate has often been relegated to a minor and ineffectual role. Past university administrations have either treated the Senate as an irrelevance or, worse, regarded it with outright suspicion. The result has been a prolonged vacuum of university-wide faculty leadership accompanied by widespread faculty apathy regarding university affairs, developments that have been further aggravated by devaluation of university service as a professional obligation. To their credit, both President Hart and Provost Lisa have signaled a desire to reverse these trends and give the Faculty Senate a more audible voice in university decisions. But that won’t happen unless faculty members themselves step up to the plate, serve on the university committees that do the bulk of the Senate’s consultative work, attend the Senate meetings that provide our main opportunities to communicate with central administration and deliberate over matters of importance to all faculty, and take the time to become both informed and involved in central university matters. Time may well be running short. In times of financial stress, decisions must be made about the direction of the institution and the content of its academic programs. It is, of course, in the institution’s interest that those choices are academically sound. But unless we reverse the long-term negative trend toward faculty apathy regarding university governance, we may find ourselves in an institution whose academic integrity is a great deal less than faculty, our students – or even our administrators – would wish. •
**Letters to the Editor**

**March 1, 2010**

Temple was the school of my childhood. Every member of my family and extended family went to Temple. My grandparents were all immigrants to America and they sent their children, my parents, aunts and uncles off to a better future at Temple. Better may not be an accurate descriptor because it was not just a better future, it was the possibility of a future. They all worked for tuition, studied, married, educated themselves and became accountants, doctors, dentists, podiatrists, social workers and productive members of the community. That is the Temple I remember: a combination of affordability, possibility, and public transportation. You could get there with a token.

Temple today is a disappointment. We have prostituted Conwell's vision and no longer believe that our acres of diamonds might lay in Philadelphia. Temple was once the university that gave young people a chance. Temple was available to everyone including those that had not yet demonstrated achievement, but were poised to work harder than they had ever worked before. If you graduated from high school, Temple would admit you and give you the opportunity to prove that you were prepared and worthy of higher education. But no longer, today we only look for the best students, and are proud that incoming SAT scores continue to rise. I still labor under the belief that any student able to persevere and graduate from an inner-city school deserves that chance.

The plight of these students and abandoning Conwell's mission changes the perspective of everyone employed at Temple. Those of us who remember what Temple was constantly compare what we do today with what we might be doing. I don't know if this is true for the younger faculty, and I don't know what they think Temple stands for today. Maybe they think we are an exclusive institution dedicated to research and turning out PhDs. Maybe we are no longer the place for immigrants, veterans, and young people that want a better future.

I also believe that the administration's desire to become known as a research institution is compromising the mission of undergraduate instruction. We may gain prestige and may see increased revenue from the research grants, but this should not continue to be accomplished at the expense of undergraduate education. It appears that we have strayed far from Conwell's mission in our desire to reconstruct Temple's image. But I guess at this late juncture it is not an area that I can influence. This new direction minimizes any real accomplishments in teaching and university and community service; it causes us to not continually increase and improve our offerings, and fosters an attitude of complacency.

I am frequently reminded of the merit system in conversations about my feelings regarding Temple's direction, individual recognition, and appreciation at Temple. While I am not aware of all merit awards, it would seem on the surface that the merit system is actually a rebate system to reward researchers who are entitled to additional compensation because they have generated grant dollars. A few non-researchers receive single units of merit, but that seems to be correlated to service, and it does not look like anyone receives merit because they have demonstrated that they are capable teachers. But maybe NTTs shouldn't expect more.

We also pretend that NTTs are faring better these days because of the possibility of multi-year contracts. It is admirable and desirable to offer employment security, but not the way we administer the process. By waiting to the last possible minute to offer contracts and renewals, NTTs must sometimes feel appreciated by most of my colleagues, both within and outside of their department. This was never the situation in Mathematics.

I have seen many changes during my life at Temple. Overall, students were reasonably good when I first came here, not outstanding, for the most part, but teachable. Then, (I don't recall exactly when it started, or ended for that matter, but I believe it was related to an effort to increase, or at least maintain enrollments), the quality of students deteriorated significantly. Some were barely capable of learning anything. Fortunately, the trend was reversed and, currently, our average student (whatever that means) is on a par with and maybe slightly better than the students I first taught.

Over the years, there have been many changes in the curriculum: Basic Studies, distribution requirements, the Core and now General Education. I am a strong believer in a broad undergraduate education, and, if it were up to me, we would return to the days of “distribution requirements.” By the time they graduate, students should be introduced to a wide variety of subjects. Unfortunately, although there may be much to be said for GenEd, I feel that the spectrum is not broad enough and that many of the courses are too focused on marketability rather than on the basics of their disciplines.

For the most part, I feel that the university has treated me well throughout my career. Of course, I would not have complained if we were paid more, but I have generally been pleased with the benefits we received. (However, see my closing remarks below.) In addition to receiving early tenure (which relieved many of the anxieties I might otherwise have had), I have received many units of merit during the course of my career. And I have usually felt appreciated by most of my colleagues, both within and outside of their department.
Reminiscences and Parting Remarks

Chein continued from page 5

of the Mathematics Department. In addition, whenever I applied for one, I received a Research and Study Leave or a Summer Research Award, and I have had many opportunities to travel.

I have also been given the opportunity to take a leadership role – at the department, the college and, to a lesser extent, even at the university levels. Although I agree that research and teaching are the most important functions of a faculty member, I also believe that faculty should lead the University academically, so that service is important as well. During my 42 years at Temple, I have served on almost every committee that exists in the department and the college, and I have served on many different Senate committees as well. I like to be involved in things, and the many committees on which I willingly served have provided me with a varied and exciting opportunity to do so. I have chaired the Mathematics Department, been President of the CAS Collegial Assembly and served on the Faculty Senate Steering Committee. I have also directed the CAS Teaching Improvement Center and the Faculty Teaching Fellows Program. I mention these service opportunities for two reasons – first, because I want to emphasize how I found this a rewarding part of my employment at Temple and to urge others to take a more active role, and, second, because it relates to a question that I will address below.

But teaching has always been my real vocational passion in life. When I was in high school, I used to tutor other students. During my career, I created several courses which have remained part of our curriculum. In 1995, I was fortunate enough to be selected as one of the recipients of the Temple University Great Teacher Awards. After I retire, I plan to continue tutoring, as the opportunity presents itself. I have been asked by many of my colleagues, why I want to retire now, when I am only 66. The answer is fairly complicated, but, in one short sentence, I would say, “I’m tired.” Physically tired, tired of the self-imposed pressure to continue to develop my teaching and to be productive in my research, and tired of fighting against autocratic adminstrators. (Note that I made the decision to retire a number of years ago, before the current administration.) When our 2004 contract instituted a “Transition to Retirement” policy, I decided to take advantage of the opportunity. I would have preferred a five year transition, but I was not given a choice. Once I signed the papers in December 2007, I was committed. Had I known then of the changes that would take place in the administration at the University, the College and the Department level, I might have waited a bit longer, but I am not unhappy with my decision.

The other question I am often asked is “What will I do when I retire?” My pat answer is “Sleep”, but even though I am not teaching any courses this semester, I seem to be just as busy as I have always been. I am still working on my research; I have joined a gym, which I attend about four days a week; and I have all kinds of projects around the house, and I have spent an inordinate amount of time this winter shoveling snow and cutting up fallen tree limbs. I am also doing some volunteer work, and my wife and I plan to travel, something we have always done, but now we can travel in the off season, when the prices are not as high and the weather is not as extreme. In any case, I don’t think that you have seen the last of me around Temple. Next year, I plan to spend a few hours a week at the MSRC, tutoring students in advanced Mathematics Courses. (Such tutoring is not currently available.) I have also inquired whether a Professor Emeritus is allowed to serve on a Senate Committee. I have not yet received an answer, but, if the answer is “Yes”, I might even agree to serve on some committee that does not meet too often.

I would like to end this letter with some suggestions to the Administration. I won’t suggest that they should increase faculty salaries, lower workloads and increase the number of tenure track lines, although it would be wonderful if they could do that, but I do have some comments with respect to some current policies and fringe benefits.

1. I think it is unconscionable that the University stopped providing post-retirement health benefits for recently hired faculty. I understand that this is a very expensive benefit, but, until this country has universal health coverage, employers have a responsibility to care for the needs of their loyal employees. I don’t know how this should be funded, but there must be a way to do so. Possibly increase the number of and you are out. The only issue is how Temple would deal with tenured faculty that do not meet some level of university standards.

As a consequence of these and other issues of concern, I’ve made a decision to leave Temple at the end of the current semester. My choice presumes that I will actually be offered a contract and induced to stay with a multi-year commitment. Actually, I would make the commitment while Temple only agrees to employ me as long as I am needed. Depending upon who is counting, I have been an NTT at Temple for 10 years, and leaving Temple is not uncomplicated.

So why leave Temple? Every minute in the classroom reminds me how it good it feels to potentially make a difference in someone’s life. I learn from my students every day and hopefully there is some reciprocity. My collection of letters from students record wonderful successes. I’ve been invited to graduations and weddings and I have spoken with parents that are confident that their children benefited from their Temple education. All teachers know there are no better emotions than the ones derived from young people telling you how you have changed their lives.

But there is another dimension that I have been unable to reconcile. I sought to be recognized as a good teacher. I brought over 20 years of teaching experience to Temple and added another 10 here. Every day of those 30 years is valuable to me because I know I made a difference. Now I look back at the initiatives and programs I introduced at Temple in an effort to make an even bigger difference: the creation on an advisory board, three new courses, fund raising, committee time, mentoring, assisting entrepreneurs and investing in student projects, awarding scholarships to Temple bound students, creating relationships with the business community, inviting speakers, assisting local non-profits, etc. I believe I did these things because they were the right things to do (and admittedly enjoyed doing them), and hoped that all these activities would be enriching and offer my students experiences beyond the classroom.

Recently I have been reminded that these are not the criteria that Temple prizes when evaluating an instructor. Temple only wants degrees, the more the better, and while Connell alerted us to where we may find qualified students he failed to point out that maybe there are people that can effectively educate, even though they haven’t the coveted PhD golden ticket of admittance. Even more sadly, Temple no longer makes me feel like I am contributing to the community that needs what Temple stood for for so many good years.

Sanford M. Sorkin
Faculty Chair Computer and Information Science Dept. Advisory Board

February 17, 2010

After Herald Editorial meetings and the most recent Faculty Senate meeting, it seems that future Temple discussions will all be about the “Budget Crisis.” Temple administration has always claimed a budget crisis – even while the university was expanding and enjoying steady appropriations and increased tuition and enrollments. Now that business really is bad and likely bad for a long time to come, we have to find out whether Temple can afford to be a University, or whether we will have to settle for being a fund-raising and external fund-gathering machine.

To hear that Dean searches are on hold pending Commonwealth decisions to approve casino gambling is stunning – almost as much as the news that the Tyler faculty and programs are now stuck with re-paying the mortgage on their new building because they failed to raise sufficient money to pay for it. The reports of increases in the numbers of large lecture classes, of increased course loads for tenure and tenure track faculty, and of the increase of adjuncts and decrease of Letters continued on page 7
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NTT faculty -- all this tells us where we are and what is coming. But there’s more. We have heard that applications are up at prestige institutions in the area but down significantly at Temple. This is surprising. After all, Temple offers a cost-effective package for families that may, in better times, have been enrolling their youngsters out of state or in expensive institutions locally. Perhaps something else is happening. Could it be that families concerned about future prospects of graduates lack confidence in a Temple degree? If this occurs, along with the increasing trend among typical Temple students to do the first two years at a Community College before transferring, we are in a very tight corner. Is this the time to be thinning faculty ranks and increasing class size? Shouldn’t we be building prestige undergrad programs and supplying resources to support honors programs worth talking about? Or is building buildings the only building that will save the day for us?

This concern about the value of what universities offer is becoming a national discussion. Yesterday’s New York Times (02/15/10) reported eroding confidence among the general population in what universities do. Increasing numbers believe universities are in business and care little for the prospects of their students. An even more sobering discussion (Don Peck, “How a New Jobless Era Will Transform America”) appeared in the March Atlantic Monthly (http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/201003/jobless-america-future). The article maintains that graduates these days are not well prepared for the hardships they will face. This is especially the case in the less prestigious universities, where degrees are likely to be tickets to nowhere special or even nowhere at all. Much as we hate the Newsweek rankings; poor to middling rankings compromise our students and their futures. I hate to think that our talented students, and we have quite a few, will suffer because Temple does not appear to be all that it often is.

Along with this, there is the faculty governance debacle -- also an old story. Almost 20 years ago, Herb Simons proposed we look at the U. Maryland model, where faculty sit at the table where the real things happen, and where the faculty voice is effectively focused instead of distributed out into myriad “participations” on endless committees of little consequence.

For those who remain in the fight for an informed community -- all good wishes to and appreciation for David, our hard-working and thoughtful editor -- there are real stories still to be told.

Steve Zelnick
Department of English

The Faculty Herald remains dedicated to promoting a dialogue with and among the faculty of Temple University and invites readers to write the editor in response to anything in this or a previous issue, or on other topics of interest and import to Temple Faculty. New letters sent to the editor will be published to a prominent place on the Herald’s website (www.temple.edu/herald) within one or two weeks of the editor receiving them and will be included in the next issue of the Herald.

Letters to the editor should be emailed to David Waldstreicher at facultyherald@temple.edu.

Reminiscences and Parting Remarks: Some Thoughts on Retirement

Chen from page 6

years that an employee must be at Temple before the benefit kicks in. Maybe the amount that employees must pay into the system while they are working should increase. But the option of receiving this benefit must be provided. (The benefit should include not only medical, but dental, prescription, and vision coverage as well.)

2. Tuition remission benefits at a reasonable level (that increases with inflation) should be available for faculty children to attend not only Temple but other schools as well.

3. More money must be available for faculty to attend professional conferences. Not only should it be easier for faculty to be approved to attend such conferences, but the amount of money that they receive for doing so should not be restricted by caps that are ridiculously low. If there must be caps, they should be set at levels that cover the bulk of reasonable costs of attendance, and they too should increase with inflation.

4. Extend “Transition to Retirement” to up to five years.

5. Curricular decisions should be left in the hands of the faculty. Administrators may provide guidance and/or suggestions, but the curriculum must ultimately be the faculty’s domain.

6. When engaged in contract negotiations, Temple must be careful to be scrupulously honest in their public announcements.

7. A way must be found for the administration to encourage and recognize significant faculty service. Although this may be difficult to administer, one suggestion is that a “brownie point” system might be devised to award faculty a number of points commensurate with the amount of effort they expend in serving on a committee. When a faculty member accrues a certain number of points, he or she should receive a teaching load reduction. Points might be accrued for other activities, such as attending teaching improvement seminars, as well.

8. CATES and other Teaching evaluations should only be used as formative, not as summative instruments. I served on the Faculty Senate Steering Committee when the institution of CATES was approved, but we did so only with the explicit promise from the President and the Provost that they would not be used summatively. Yet, the reality has become that not only are they being used in contravention of this promise, but, in some cases, the entire form is boiled down to a single number. This is ludicrous.

9. The University and its arms should make every effort to become cognizant of the major religious holidays and of the ways in which they are observed, and they should be careful to avoid scheduling significant events that conflict with these observances. Care should be taken to avoid scheduling events on days in which work or travel is restricted. For example, although I have been eligible for the past 17 years to attend the 25-year Club dinner, I have never been able to attend because the dinner is always held on a Saturday night after the clock changes in the Spring, and it always begins long before the Jewish Sabbath ends at that time of year.

10. The Administration should consider reinstituting such programs as Freshman Interdisciplinary Studies and the Teaching Fellows Program. The former was a wonderful experience for students and faculty alike, and the latter provided an opportunity for relatively new faculty members to spend time developing a course they would like to offer and to improve their teaching skills.

Be well.
2009/2010 Faculty Retirements

The following faculty members plan to retire during the 2009-2010 academic year. We thank them for their hard work on behalf of their students and colleagues, and wish them the best!

~Herald Staff

David Appleby, School Dentistry, Restorative Dentistry
Frank Bramblett, Tyler School of Art, Painting Drawing and Sculpture
Orin N. Chein, College of Science & Technology, Mathematics
Abraham Davidson, Tyler School of Art, Art History
Eugene Ericksen, College of Liberal Arts, Sociology
Laurita Hack, College of Health Professions & Social Work, Physical Therapy
Mark Haller, College of Liberal Arts, History
John Harding, School of Medicine, Psychiatry & Behavioral Science
Alan Harler, Boyer School of Music and Dance, Music - Choral Activities
Karen S. Kozriara, Fox School of Business and Management, Human Resource Management
Albert Lamperti, School of Medicine, Anatomy and Cell Biology
Ted W. Mihalisin, College of Science & Technology, Physics
Jugoslav S. Milutinovich, Fox School of Business and Management, Marketing and Supply Chain Management
Agnes Moncy, College of Liberal Arts, Spanish and Portuguese
Louis Raymon, College of Science & Technology, Mathematics

George Rengert, College of Liberal Arts, Criminal Justice
Shepherd Roberts, College of Science & Technology, Biology
Joseph G. Rosenfeld, College of Education, Psychological Studies in Education
Ira Shapiro, School of Tourism and Hospitality Management, Sports and Recreation
Woollcott K. Smith, Fox School of Business and Management, Statistics
Raymond Tedrick, School of Tourism and Hospitality Management, Sports and Recreation
Daniel Tompkins, College of Liberal Arts, Greek and Roman Classics
John Wade, Tyler School of Art, Art/Art Education
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Representative Senate Meeting
February 16, 2010
Minutes

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

2. Guests:
President Ann Weaver Hart; Provost Lisa Staiano-Coico; and CFO Tony Wagner

Before introducing today’s guests, President Karen M. Turner asked for a minute of silence in memory of those faculty members who died at University of Alabama in Huntsville.

The first speaker was Provost Lisa Staiano-Coico who began by making a few announcements: She said that the Middle States visitors will be on campus from February 28 – March 3, 2010. She also said that the visit to Temple University Japan, that had already taken place, went well;

She invited the faculty to meet with the Middle States team on March 1st, from 4:00 – 5:00 p.m. The faculty are invited to Kiva Auditorium; the staff will meet in Walk Auditorium; and the students will meet with a team member in the Student Activities Center, Room 217;

She thanked Dr. Corrinne Caldwell (Educ.), Dr. Michael R. Sitler (Kinesiology) and Dean Robert Stroker (BCMD) for co-chairing the Middle States Report;

Provost Lisa said that faculty could look at the report by going to www.temple.edu/middlestates/ or by contacting Deputy Provost Richard M. Englert’s office at 1-8873.

President Ann Weaver Hart spoke next providing, what she called, a seamless overview of the 20/20 Framework that focuses on Destination Temple. She said that a number of those individuals who were very much involved with the framework saw this as seamless because the Academic Strategic Compass was so much a part of the framework. She mentioned that this is a flexible plan for the physical plant in a very bad economy. It is a ten year framework.

President Hart then asked CFO Tony Wagner to discuss important threads related to the 20/20 Framework. He spoke of the following:

Declining state appropriations;
Reliance on tuition, endowment, fundraising and research;
Importance of pricing to be competitive in the market place;
Shrinking student cohorts.

CFO Wagner showed us how trends had shifted with Commonwealth appropriations. He discussed the difference between 1972 when state appropriations made up 60% of our budget compared with the 22.5% of our current budget. He provided us with a sense of what the Commonwealth emphasizes today including Medicaid, corrections and basic education that take up much of their budget. Higher education only makes up 6.5% of the current appropriations and Temple itself receives even less. CFO Wagner pointed out that 50% of our tuition dollars are made up of student debt. Additionally, he spoke of the next decade’s demographics in which the cohort of students will be down 8-10%. Currently we are at capacity, but we have to maintain a high level of tuition dollars, and we need to increase our
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market share. We also have to take into account our residential needs. Increased enrollment without an increase in facilities for our students has been a problem for us.

President Hart provided a more in-depth overview of our physical plant situation. She offered some background:

Before the Academic Strategic Compass was completed, she sat with Trustees and discussed the need for help with the physical plants. A competition was held and Olin Partners became our consultants;

It was decided that Barton Hall had to be replaced. It is a poor physical plant and not reusable;

Paley Library was from the 1960’s, and it proved to be cost prohibitive to upgrade this library for the 21st Century; however it has “good bones” and can be reused, perhaps as a research building;

A Steering Committee was brought together of deans, administrators, faculty and students as well as Temple Trustee, Mitchell L. Morgan, who became Chair of the Facilities Committee.

President Hart then spoke of the planning principles. They included:

The importance of facilities aligning and supporting the Academic Strategic Compass, focusing on the academic and research mission of the university;

The need to increase Temple’s competitive profile;

The emphasis on campus-wide participation and community participation. In this case, this was accomplished by holding two open Town Hall meetings and targeting faculty for focus groups;

The stress had to be on fiscal responsibility;

There must be a commitment to sustainability

There had to be a respect for the surrounding community who would prefer to have fewer of our students living in the neighborhood and asked that we not expand the footprint of the campus.

Hence, she pointed out that the 20/20 Framework, with Destination Temple at the center, should not be carved in stone, needed financial supports, and should take into consideration strategic serendipity. President Hart then focused on design goals. They were:

A need for the best resources to attract and serve students, faculty and staff;

The importance of increased activity on Broad Street moving it into the academic core;

Enhanced safety and engagement with surrounding neighborhoods;

Venues for activities to attract outside groups, such as the use of the Baptist Temple for interfaith services next year on Martin Luther King Day.

She showed us a map of future sports and recreation areas on Temple’s main campus. She spoke of Pearson and McGonigle Halls and discussed that the decision was to leave them and see if they could be remodeled to add dedicated practice facilities for basketball, exercise space and retail stores. The plans include upgraded dance studios and parking that would not be on Broad Street. As an aside, she mentioned that every part of the USB building will be recycled.

President Hart spoke of the new science research and education building, and the 21st Century library that would be across Broad Street so that the community could also use the facility. There may be a new residential tower and the development of green space, creating a campus quad where Barton Hall now stands. In addition, she talked of the need for separate spaces for architecture and engineering.

When new designs will be discussed, President Hart is hoping that faculty in these affected areas will volunteer to take part in the planning process. She believes that the plans must be razor sharp so there will be no change orders requiring more monies than originally anticipated. She will be doing her best to seek philanthropy and capital appropriations to pay for the new buildings. Since the past campaign raised more monies than expected, she has high hopes. Hence, as she says, the story is not full of doom and gloom for Temple’s future. After the presentations, there was some time for questions:

Dieter Forster (CST) asked about the reconsideration of closing 13th Street to traffic and President Hart said that conversations were going on at the present time.

Karen Turner inquired if CFO Tony Wagner’s presentation could be made available. President Hart said it could be but she wanted to make certain that the presentation would be kept current and she suggested that a date needed to be put on the slide show. Provost Lisa said that the slideshow could be provided not only by Tony Wagner’s office but through her link as well.

Roberta Sloan (SCT) said that missing from the plan was the theatre and some of the arts. There was a need for black boxes, and dance performance and opera appropriate spaces. President Hart indicated she had a couple of donors in mind, and Dr. Sloan said she would be very willing to work with them.

Art Hochner (Bus.) said he was glad that we had this presentation, and he mentioned the troubling article in The Philadelphia Inquirer. President Hart said she was surprised by the piece as well. Art Hochner then spoke about his concern that money might be taken from the teaching and research budget for buildings. President Hart said this was not the case and when questioned about the plant fund she said that was strictly for maintenance operations and not for new construction.

Luke Kahlich (BCMD) encouraged President Hart to use the expertise of the faculty for fund raising. He said that it might be worth finding out if faculty wanted to put their energies into helping to raise funds for small creative projects. President Hart said that David Unruh, Senior Vice President for Institutional Advancement, was planning to use this approach.

Frank Friedman (CST) found the plans to be very impressive. However, he said that while it was good to focus on the future, we needed to also think about new researchers to Temple who were frustrated by a lack of support. Provost Lisa believes that the new Senior Vice Provost for Research Administration and for Graduate Education could play an important role in helping these researchers. She urged faculty to attend the up-coming open interviews.

Tracey Weiss (CST) spoke of how other universities recruit new students and asked if we were as competitive as we should be. Provost Lisa said that her office was working with enrollment management to craft positive messages to attract students.

Jane Evans (Tyler) was concerned about The Pennsylvania State University moving into Philadelphia. President Hart responded that this was a misunderstanding; it is the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education that is coming to Philadelphia and not Penn State. She had even spoken with Penn State President Graham Spanier about this, and he was not even aware of the misreporting.

Michael Jackson (STHM) spoke about the student facilities labs and the
2. Approval of the Minutes:
The meeting was called to order at 1:45 p.m.

Minutes
January 25, 2010
Representative Senate Meeting

Representative Faculty Senate Minutes, Jan. 25, 2010

3. Approval of the Minutes:
The Representative Senate Meeting Minutes from January 25, 2010, were approved unanimously.

4. President’s Report: Karen M. Turner
President Turner announced that there now was a Subcommittee for the Constitution and the Bylaws that included Paul LaFollette (Vice Pres.), Tricia Jones (Educ.), Mark Rahdert (Law) and herself.

Nora Alter (SCT) mentioned the transfer students and was pleased that their concerns of where they would live were being considered.

3. Approval of the Minutes:
The Special Representative Faculty Meeting Minutes of December 10, 2009, were approved with two abstentions.

4. President’s Report: Karen M. Turner
President Turner announced that now was a Subcommittee for the Constitution and the Bylaws that included Paul LaFollette (Vice Pres.), Tricia Jones (Educ.), Mark Rahdert (Law) and herself.

Nora Alter (SCT) mentioned the transfer students and was pleased that their concerns of where they would live were being considered.

5. Unfinished Business:
There was none.

6. New Business:
There was none.

7. Adjournment:
The meeting ended at 3:20 p.m.

Joan P. Shapiro
Secretary
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Joan P. Shapiro
Secretary

• The University Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee was discussed. The Provost needs three nominees and the Faculty Senate needs three as well. The Provost would like the Faculty Senate to put forth their names first. There cannot be more than two representatives per college/school.
• The Provost asked Diane Maleson, Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Faculty Affairs, to explain the new process with this committee. In the new contract, the uncontroversial cases would go directly to the Council of Deans; split votes would go to the Tenure and Promotion Committee; difficult cases from the Council of Deans would go to the Tenure and Promotion Committee. All materials are online although there would probably be a need for discussions with difficult cases.
• Provost Lisa then answered questions:
  • The first question focused on who was eligible to serve on the University Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee. The answer was only full tenure track professors;
  • A professor wanted to know if and how the 20/20 plan connected to the Academic Strategic Compass. The Provost was looking into this and also awaited President Hart’s visit to the Representative Faculty Senate;
  • A faculty member was concerned about an article in The Philadelphia Inquirer which said that Penn State was going to open a campus in Philadelphia. It was stated that Temple was too expensive and there needed to be competition. The Provost agreed that this was worrying and already had Kenneth Lawrence Jr, Senior Vice President for Government, Community and Public Affairs, looking into this;
  • Another faculty member hoped that non-tenure track faculty would be receiving merit in this next round (2008-2009). The Provost said this would occur. She also mentioned that the new online Annual Report would hopefully help to make merit more equitable;
  • A faculty member from the Fox Business School wanted to know if Honor’s Students would be helped with financial aid. The Provost mentioned a new web site focused on students that would provide cur-
Mark Rahdert first provided a brief background for the need for this committee and its charge. The topic came up from the Senate floor, but due to contract negotiations, it had been put on hold until now. Then the questions and discussions were opened to the Faculty Senate Representatives in attendance.

- A faculty member from the Health Sciences brought up the issue of tuition remission for children of faculty who are going to universities other than Temple. He did not feel that we were as competitive as other universities in the area because of the lack of tuition remission.

- In response, Art Hochner, President of TAUP, provided the institutional memory that Temple did have such a policy until 1996. But the remission was very low ($870.00 taxable benefit). The state legislature did not look kindly as a state related institution using its monies to fund other institutions and the benefit was just too small.

- A NTT faculty member felt that it was hard for younger faculty to juggle their working lives with children. He also thanked TAUP and Provost Lisa for really taking into consideration the role of an NTT faculty member.

- A faculty member from CST was concerned about his younger colleagues who did not have post-retirement medical benefits. He said this may not be an issue if the health care bill comes through; however, he was concerned and felt something should be done for his junior colleagues;

- A faculty member in Anderson Hall felt that there were very real problems with this building. They included: climate control; elevator troubles; and poor classroom facilities. He wondered if anything could be done, even to the point of demolishing the building.

- A new faculty chair in Communications thought that a chair mentorship was needed. Senior faculty, especially those who were brought in to lead units, need advice as it is hard to find one’s way at Temple. They also needed to find out about what resources were available for their young children.

- A faculty member in Anthropology wanted to know if the Dysfunctional Rules inbox had been taken down. He felt that it was important to have this charge given to a standing committee.

- Provost Lisa explained that The Faculty Herald would hopefully take on this task and provide an anonymous outlet for compiling these rules and sending them on to her.

- The Provost also spoke of the joint topics that the Council of Deans and the FSSC would be discussing at the dean’s retreat. Dysfunctional rules and policies might be one of those areas.

- President Turner expressed concern that this was meant to be a conversation and not just a point by point presentation. She then asked a new chair who had previously mentioned her need for an orientation to elaborate a bit more.

- The chair stressed the need for more orientation specific to this kind of position that should be provided right away and not in November when it was too late. She also felt there was no support for a personal life.

- Another chair in the same school, who was relatively new, agreed with the new chair’s comments. She said that the acronyms alone were terrible confusing. Outside chairs needed help.

- An experienced faculty member, here for a long time, indicated that he felt that the new health center was very helpful as well as the CARE Team. But he believed that treatment of the staff was not as good. New chairs needed to learn how to treat staff.

- Another faculty member felt that orientations should not be once a year but should be often and ongoing.
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- A faculty member in the health sciences found the orientation to be very good. But she discovered childcare to be a real problem on the Health Sciences’ campus.
- Another faculty member felt strongly that Temple University should be a safe place for dissent.
- An alumna of Temple’s undergraduate program, who had a successful career in business and became a faculty member here, encouraged her child to apply to Temple. She discovered that Temple took too much time to accept her daughter, and other schools did not. She also wondered why there seemed to be a lack of community here. Big receptions are not enough. Pride and community are needed.
- A faculty member said that the helping of newcomers varies from department to department. Orientations for all chairs and deans are needed. Newcomers need to be encouraged to participate in faculty governance.
- The Chair of the Faculty Senate’s Committee on the Status of Women thought President Hart’s words at The Balancing Act Conference were wise. President Hart spoke about the glass ceiling that exists in certain disciplines for women. The Chair also felt that on-site childcare deserved attention.
- A faculty member from the Health Sciences said that while the new medical school is superb; the physical therapy space is the same one that she was educated in some years ago. There is a learning space issue and a taskforce is needed.
- TAUP representatives wanted the faculty to know that they were doing a little bit toward making the university more family friendly by providing parental benefits for new children in a household. Most recently, a male faculty member used this option. Art Hochner said to contact the TAUP Office for more information and he also said the contract would be out soon and faculty could read about this for themselves. Provost Lisa was very supportive of this option.
- An NTT faculty member thanked the administration for their support of multi-year contracts which are good for the faculty and for the university.

Paul LaFollette asked faculty to join the Ad Hoc Faculty Life at Temple Committee. Either write to him directly at: Paul_LaFollette@temple.edu or write to senate2@temple.edu with a brief statement of interest and, if possible, provide a link to your curriculum vitae.

7. Unfinished Business:
There was none.

8. Adjournment:
The meeting ended at 3:01 P.M.

Joan P. Shapiro
Secretary