The administration has launched an ambitious pilot program testing online Student Feedback Forms, and recent weeks have seen an outpouring of discussion about the pros and cons (including time set aside for the subject at this Thursday’s University Senate meeting). Senior Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies Peter Jones has emphasized that the online SFFs are an expansion of the voluntary experiment launched last year, and that assistant professors and NTTs should not participate. He acknowledges that student response rates have been in the 26-44% range and pale compared to the 71-79% response rates for the SFFs administered in class.

TAUP stepped into the communication gap in November, appropriately enough since SFFs are used to evaluate members of the bargaining unit for promotion, merit (theoretically, where teaching is deemed meritorious), and tenure. In its memo, TAUP noted that “we have heard contradictory things regarding the status of this online program from several sources. On the one hand, we’re told the pilot program is still in the testing stage and that no...”

The CARE Team and the Faculty

By Stephanie Ives, Associate Vice President and Dean of Students

Looking out for student well-being is an important and often difficult undertaking at a university of 37,000 students. Temple University’s Crisis Assessment, Response and Education (CARE) Team is a central group to which faculty and other members of the Temple community can bring their concerns about students they consider at risk of endangering themselves or others in the university community. The CARE Team was formalized following the Virginia Tech shootings as a consistent, primary resource for those troubled by students’ problematic behaviors. Typical CARE Team referrals include matters of self injury, suicide attempts, depression, aggression, intimidation, harassment, erratic behavior, relationship or other physical violence, substance abuse, serious academic difficulty and a wide range of other issues.

The CARE Team is comprised of representatives from Campus Safety Services; the Division of Student Affairs, including University Housing and Residential Life, Disability Resource and Services and Tuttleman Counseling; the Office of Senior Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies; the Office of Student Conduct; Student Health Services, and University Counsel.

A 20/20 Update from President Hart

President Hart Outlines Building Plans at Faculty Town Hall Meeting

On November 16, before about forty faculty members, President Hart fleshed out the ambitious picture of a new “destination” campus not too far on the horizon.

She began by noting that when she arrived at Temple, she was told that there was no master plan for the campus and shouldn’t be; if there was, she was told, “everyone” would just tell her what to do. Nevertheless, she thought it necessary to have a “flexible” plan, a “living document” with a ten to twelve year vision that would answer the question of what needed to be done to Temple’s physical setting in order to accomplish the goals of the Academic Strategic Plan.

The six major aspects of the plan are:

• Temple will build but remain within its current “footprint,” partly in response to the concerns of area residents
• to improve and replace aging facilities
• to add 2000 beds, in response to students who wish to be on campus
• to increase indoor and outdoor recreation space, including green space...
Advancing Research Excellence

By Aaron Sullivan
Assistant Editor

The first in a series of five forums highlighting the components of the Academic Compass, the Advancing Research Excellence Forum was held November 4 in the Medical Education and Research Building, one of the health science campus’s newest and most stunning structures. Organized by the combined efforts of Temple faculty, the Office of the Provost, the Senior Vice Provost for Strategic Initiatives and Communications, and the Senior Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Education, the forum brought together the faculty from thirteen different schools and colleges, allowed them to share their research goals and strategies and, hopefully, fostered new interdisciplinary connections. Reflecting on the results of Temple’s most recent Periodic Program Review, Provost Dick Englert’s opening remarks noted that the external review teams who had come to evaluate Temple had consistently commented on the difficulty faculty had communicating and interacting across collegial and departmental boundaries. The Advancing Research Excellence Forum was meant to help bridge these divides.

The bulk of the forum was given to the faculty’s presentations of their research. The breadth and variety of the participants’ intellectual pursuits was truly impressive. As the session moved from presentation to presentation, one was struck by the diversity, not only in what is being researched, but in understandings of what research means and how it should be conducted. Thankfully, the structure of the forum succeeded in making this diversity enlightening rather than competitive. At times, however, the rapid change from one topic and approach to another could be overwhelming. A study on the science of informatics gave way to a theoretical exploration of the “gray space” between absolutes; a series of graphs with error bars reflecting the impact of cannabinoids on the immune system was followed by a quote from Thomas Jefferson on the nature of westward expansion. Dr. Steven Zohn, who rose to follow a presentation on the development of effective drug treatments with comments on the secular cantatas of an eighteenth-century composer.

“A...the structure of the forum succeeded in making this diversity enlightening rather than competitive.”

Achieving Equity

By Aaron Sullivan
Assistant Editor

Society’s progress toward the sometimes elusive goal of gendered equality in the workplace was under review on October 20. “Achieving Equity: Women, the Workplace, and the Law,” the second annual conference hosted by the Faculty Senate Committee on the Status of Women, met at the Gittis Student Center to explore the advances and challenges of gendered equity here at Temple and in the academic workplace generally. Key themes included the often invisible nature of discrimination today, the particular challenges women face as care-givers and mothers, the academic mission and standards of Temple University, and choices the faculty and administration face when deciding how to continue the pursuit of equity.

Law Professor Marina Angel’s keynote, “The Glass Ceiling – Now a Glass House?” explored the trials women continue to face when attempting to “have it all”: both a serious career and a growing family. Though such a path is possible for women today, it remains difficult and Angel worried about the future of the upcoming generation of young women, who she felt were largely unaware of the gender discrimination that still exists in America today and all too likely to blame themselves for the effects of societal and professional discrimination.

Angel’s address paid particular attention to the situation at Temple University. She noted the rising percentage of NTTs among the faculty, the growing emphasis on funded research, the potential threats to the tenure system, and the vulnerability of NTT and contract faculty. The final point was particularly salient, she noted, since women faculty at Temple are overwhelmingly in contract positions. In the final analysis, Angel’s perspective was, by her own admission, pessimistic. Concerned about the unrealistic expectations of her female students and the general trend of university politics and economics, her address called for greater transparency and a greater sensitivity to the iniquities that still exist and the challenges that loom in the future.

Panelist Sandra Sperino, also from the Beasley School of Law, and Natasha Abel, of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, each addressed issues of continuing discrimination in the American workplace. Abel focused on instances of sexual harassment, and her presentation pro-

A 20/20 Update from President Hart
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• to replace surface parking with “structured parking” (parking buildings)
• to “focus urban energy on Broad Street”

The first major project, the renovation of Pearson-McGonigle, is on schedule for completion during the fall of 2011. New features will include more open space and energy producing windmills on the top of the building.

A new architecture building will also be completed during the fall of 2011. With lots of glass and windows, its design has been described as relatively edgy for Temple. But as one of the trustees voting on the plan put it, “it is, after all, an Architecture building.” Ground has been broken on a residential, dining, and retail complex, on the corner of Broad and Cecil B. Moore, with 1500 suite-style beds and some family housing.

Barton Hall has been deemed “irretrievable” and will be replaced by a 250,000 square foot science and education research building. The Barton space will become green-space and make possible the first “quad” at Temple.

And eventually a new library will sit to the north of Pearson-McGonigle on what to most of the faculty is “the other side” of a transformed, better lit Broad Street, which will have marked pedestrian pathways. The Avenue of the Arts corporation has secured funding for “a demonstration lighting project with a new kind of street lamp that would be hidden by trees.

“We’ll get a much more exciting building for not much more than it would cost to try to fix Paley.” Because Paley has “good bones” – weight-bearing library floors – it will be developed for other, yet-to-be-determined uses possibly a research center, a home for Student Life, or another tech center.

The faculty present who spoke up received the plans with considerable enthusiasm. Unsurprisingly, some asked questions about how the new buildings would be paid for. President Hart noted that some funds would come from special Commonwealth appropriations; some, hopefully, from donors; and the rest from bond issues and borrowing at this propitious moment of low interest rates. In response to questions about maintenance and sustainability, she noted that she expected new buildings to meet current standards, and that efforts are underway to reduce the costs of maintenance and operations gradually so as to cushion the impact of new buildings on the budget.

One faculty member asked whether a new child care facility had been considered. The President said in response that there does not seem to be sufficient interest in a full time, five-day-a-week child care program. Faculty members and staff want “drop-in” child care, whereas private providers are only interested in full time, monthly fee services.

“The Editor
Advancing Research Excellence

Research Forum from page 2

century composer, aptly captured the experience with an opening quote from Monty Python: “And now for something completely different.”

And yet, perhaps not completely different. For those who could overcome the mentally sedative effect of the constantly shifting terminology and frames of reference, some important threads of continuity emerged (aside from the ubiquitous use of PowerPoint). Time and again presenters spoke of how other disciplines had shaped their own research; time and again they offered their services, insights and collaboration to any of their fellows who desired it. The later presenters remarked on the work of those who had come before them, making small connections which, perhaps, will form the seeds of larger partnerships in the future. Appropriately enough, the forum ended with a “Research and Scholarship Networking Event.”

In sum, the Advancing Research Excellence Forum was an intriguing and enlightening event. It addressed itself to a felt shortcoming of the university and took a firm, if small, step toward rectifying it. In the end, the future of interdisciplinary understanding and collaboration at Temple will depend on the willingness of the faculty to bridge collegial and departmental divides, and on the support of the administration in encouraging such endeavors, outside of the occasional forum. •

Also Known As…
The Baptist Temple is now also known as The Temple Performing Arts Center. At the Faculty Town Hall Meeting, President Hart explained that this is not a name change as much as a marketing necessity for drawing acts and crowds to the venue.

Achieving Equity: Women, the Workplace, and the Law

Achieving Equity from page 2

did not fare well by comparison.

Bass focused more directly on the issues of pregnancy and motherhood, highlighting “the rights women have and the rights they need.” She paid particular attention to the legal requirement that employers offer pregnant women “equal accommodation” with other employees experiencing similar physical challenges. Bass also described the newly passed Affordable Care Act which, among other things, requires that employers accommodate women who wish to express breast milk with an opportunity to do so in a sanitary and private environment. Bass depicted the act as one recent step toward securing the rights women need in the workplace, but certainly not the final step.

The final two sessions of the conference brought a more precise look at the status of women in academia today and a focus on how the university, and society generally, can move forward. John Curtis, Director of Research and Public Policy for AAUP, presented a wealth of data which demonstrated both the current gendered balance of the academic workplace and how that balance has shifted over time. Curtis’s analysis of his many charts and graphs indicated that significant strides have been made over the past few decades. For example, more than half of university degrees at all levels, including doctorates, are now awarded to women, and the gender gap in faculty employment has largely closed. However, inequities still exist with regard to questions of seniority, tenure and pay, among others. Furthermore, the long-term trends suggest that the climb toward gendered equity may be approaching a plateau well short of the summit.

Melissa Gilbert, CLA, explored how such surviving inequalities could be addressed in her aptly titled talk “Paths Toward Equity.” In short, Gilbert advocated a “gender integrated approach” that not only sought to apply standards of performance equally for both men and women but also consciously evaluated the gendered nature of those standards. Furthermore, she called for Temple to evaluate how the standards with which it evaluates its faculty relate to its mission(s) as a university. In this, Gilbert echoed some of Angel’s earlier concerns over the apparent conflict between Temple’s quest for funding, dedication to research, and pursuit of the “Convivialian Tradition.” Gilbert, somewhat less pessimistic than Angel in her analysis, believed that these many missions might yet be viewed as synergistic rather than antagonistic.

Though most attendees came and went as their schedules allowed, a respectfully sized audience remained throughout and the sessions were generally well received. Joyce Lindorff, chair of the Faculty Senate Committee on the Status of Women, assures us that another conference is being planned for next year.

The conference presenters have graciously offered to make their PowerPoint presentations and outlines available electronically for those who were unable to attend or wish to review their findings with more leisure. Please see this article on the Faculty Herald website (www.temple.edu/herald) in order to access these rich resources. •
**The Great SFF Debate**

Editors note page 1

decision to move wholesale to it has been made. On the other hand, faculty are telling us that their Deans’ offices are presenting the push toward online as inevitable...”

We should not be surprised to see Deans’ offices once again appear as enforcers of policies that appear to the faculty to come from nowhere in particular – and certainly not from Senate or joint faculty-administration committees. Proper procedures for a matter of great consequence to faculty are at stake.

The arguments in favor of moving to online forms, or at least trying to see if they will work, are serious and substantial. A thoughtful email from an assistant dean in my college mentioned the 40 trees worth of paper used every semester. Class time would be saved at the busy end of term. “Early adopters will be asked to provide additional feedback after the process is over which will be considered as the process is refined for future semesters” – get on board, in other words, before the ship sails.

Critics have also mounted impressive arguments. Forms filled out on line may be more likely to emphasize quickly clicked numerical ratings – the administration’s main interest, some say – than the thoughtful written feedback most valued by instructors. Low response rates could make already questionable measures of teaching prowess even more dubious. Would online forms cater to students who don’t even show up to class as opposed to those who do? As one faculty member observed in the TAUP forum, “we already have an online rating system – the notorious RateMyProfessor.com. Why not just use that in lieu of CATE/SFF scores. If we go to online student evals aren't we simply creating a Temple based RateMyProfessor.com?”

The idea broached at a Senate meeting to raise low online response rates by making participation mandatory, or necessary for receiving grades, has been rejected as “coercive” to the students. Other schools are trying incentives. If they will work, are serious and substantial. A thoughtful email from an assistant dean in my college mentioned the 40 trees worth of paper used every semester. Class time would be saved at the busy end of term. “Early adopters will be asked to provide additional feedback after the process is over which will be considered as the process is refined for future semesters” – get on board, in other words, before the ship sails.

“The low response rates could make already questionable measures of teaching prowess even more dubious.”

Fall 2010 University Senate Agenda

The Faculty Senate Steering Committee would like to hear from you about two issues.

We plan to spend the bulk of the meeting soliciting your response to the following questions:

1. How can we make the best use of the Student Feedback Forms (the instrument previously known as CATE).
   - How should they be administered?
   - What functions should they serve?
   - What functions should they not serve?

2. How well is the current matrix serving your students?
   - What has your experience been in accommodating to the matrix?
   - Does it provide sufficient flexibility in scheduling?
   - Does the process for getting permission to schedule off the matrix work effectively to benefit students?

Please join us, and help us understand how these issues are affecting you and your students.

The formal agenda will be:

Call to order at 1:45

Approval of the minutes from the May 2010 University Senate meeting

Dialog with Dick - Provost Englert responds to your questions and comments

Old Business

New Business

Discussion of the issues listed above

Adjournment *
Representative Faculty Senate Minutes, Oct. 12, 2010

Representative Senate Meeting
October 12, 2010
Minutes

Call to Order:

Paul LaFollette called the meeting to order at 1:50 PM in Kiva Auditorium.

He announced a change in the agenda: Interim Vice President and Provost Richard Englert will present his report and answer questions now, since he must leave early to attend another meeting.

Guest: Interim Vice President and Provost, Richard Englert

He shared the following items with the Senators and visitors:

- President Hart is establishing the position Faculty Fellow in her office and has opened the application process. Englert provided a copy of the position description. [Attached.] The Faculty Fellow will advise the president on a range of academic and faculty matters and planning, and will represent the president in many discussions and on key search committees.

- Faculty at the tenured professor rank are encouraged to apply. The ideal term of service is three years. Dr. Vicki McGarvey can provide additional information.

- Englert cited the very positive recent article in The Philadelphia Inquirer lauding the drug discovery initiatives led by Associate Dean Magid Abou-Gharbia at the Moulder Center at the School of Pharmacy.

- There are currently four hiring searches for deans. Three of these committees requested volunteer members, and Englert thanked FSSC and TAUP for their help in identifying faculty to serve.
  - The chairs are:
    - Dean Joanne Epps (Law) - Tyler
    - Dean Keya Sadeghipour (Engineering) - Health Professions and Social Work
    - Dean Teresa Soufas (Liberal Arts) - Communications and Theater.

Each college has elected five faculty for its committee in addition to those put forward by Faculty Senate. Each committee of 12 includes six faculty (one of whom is a dean) plus other students, alumni, and board of visitors’ representatives for individual schools. All three committees are ready to meet; and faculty will be kept informed.

The fourth search is to replace Dean Kent McGuire, who will take over his position as President of the Southern Education Foundation in Atlanta, Georgia on 8 November. Englert expressed appreciation of McGuire and wished him well. Englert will meet with faculty and staff of Health Professions and Social Work on 13 October to discuss how to move forward in filling the position.

Englert then answered questions on any current issue.

Gregory Urwin (CLA) asked about the freeze on faculty travel funds that require specific approval from the Provost’s office. In particular, he wished to know if this policy is internal or external. Englert explained that TU is cooperating with the Pennsylvania legislature; deans confer with Englert, who reviews the request. He noted that in this process he is aiming to expedite but remain prudent, and that this has generally worked out quite well.

Art Hochner (FSBM) was concerned about the success rate of the Annual Report of Faculty Activity. Englert deferred to Diane Maleson for particulars. Of more than 1200 eligible faculty, only 18 failed to submit the report. Hochner reported that TAUP was evaluating the process and encouraged faculty comments. He then questioned whether Student Feedback Forms are to be submitted on line, and noted that pilot studies show much lower student response rates when this occurs. Hochner asked Englert to provide information about how this might affect faculty, esp. in the areas of work-load, merit, promotion, etc. Englert replied that discussions about online evaluations over the past two years considered sustainability (savings of paper), among other issues. Working with faculty groups and pilots, Peter Jones reported a return rate of 70-80% with paper, and 35-45% with the online initial pilot. Other institutions show 45-50%. Our return might decline when the novelty wears off. Until now, our pilot is entirely voluntary, and no final decisions have been made. Since so many decisions rely on this data, much more data is necessary.

Scott Gratson (SCT) asked how students serving on deans’ search committees are selected. Englert replied that both the undergraduate and graduate students are selected by students. The basic default is that they are elected by students within the college, according to the college’s governance document; without a structure, a formal request is sent to Student Government, who has presented undergraduates for all three search committees. For the graduate student representation, Tyler had a governance group; and the representative for the two other committees was named by the Graduate School.

Bob Aiken (CST), speaking in reference to on-line SFFs, noted the importance of including adjunct and NTT faculty in discussions and decision-making. He requested specifically that all faculty already working on issues concerning evaluation and large class sections be included in all discussions.

Approval of Minutes of 13 September 2010:

The minutes from 13 September 2010, with one correction that appears on the document distributed at this meeting, were accepted unanimously.

LaFollette postponed his report until later in the meeting in order to allow maximum time for discussion.

Vice President’s Report: Joan Shapiro:

Joan Shapiro (Educ) reported a message from Steve Napi of the Office of Technology Transfer, thanking FSSC for its diligence in staffing its committee, which had not met recently. These are: Jan Fernback (SCT), Steven Jefferyes (Dental School), Gregory Mandel (Law), John R. Williams (CST), and Feroze Mohamed (Medicine), who will serve as chair. Ken Blank, Senior Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Education has expressed his appreciation for the Senate’s timely composition of this important committee.

Shapiro noted that several faculty had volunteered to serve on the three dean’s search committees; and there are now enough to complete the staffing. However, the fourth search, in the College of Education, will require additional volunteers; and it should be noted that some of the current volunteers requested very specific assignments. FSSC members working on this
will consult Tony Ranere, Chair of CATA. She urged volunteering for other committees as well, and encouraged faculty to consult the list of opportunities attached to the 13 September 2010 minutes, and submit names by Friday, 15 October.

She emphasized the pressing need for tenured professors to complete the Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee, which, she explained, now has a significantly streamlined process. She cited the needs of additional committees (Educational Programs and Policies Committee, University Honors Program Oversight Committee, and the Personnel Committee), suggesting that faculty consult the Faculty Senate website for comprehensive information, and emphasizing that faculty participation in committee work is essential for shared governance.

Shapiro then announced two conferences on gender equity presented by the Senate Committee on the Status of Women: “Achieving Equity: Women, the Workplace, and the Law,” 20 October, with Marina Angel (Law) as the keynote speaker; and “Mirages of Equality: The Changing Status of Women in Science,” 21 October, with MIT Professor Nancy Hopkins, delivering the keynote address.

**Old Business**

Julie Phillips (GenEd), who had been away at the time of the 13 September meeting when a report on GenEd was requested, announced that she had brought the information, and then presented statistics for the current term (Fall 2010):

- 1021 sections – 8.1% do not have a faculty member identified with the course
- 35.75% are being taught by adjunct faculty
- 40.75%, by NTT faculty
- 14.3%, by tenure-track faculty (comparable to last year).

**New Business**

Gregory Urwin (CLA) presented the following motion:

> **Resolved,**
> Temple University administrators wishing to appear on the agenda of the Faculty Senate must provide the senate secretary (or some other senate officer or functionary) with the text of a summary of their remarks and any accompanying PowerPoint presentations) two weeks before the meeting at which they wish to appear.

These materials will be posted on a Blackboard page (or some other Internet location) to which all Temple faculty will be granted access.

The names and e-mail addresses of all faculty senators will be listed on the aforementioned Internet location and grouped by college, permitting faculty from their respective colleges to easily send them feedback concerning the items the administration wishes to discuss with the senate.

When administrators appear before the Faculty Senate, they will keep their introductory remarks brief to provide more time for questions and discussion with the faculty’s representatives.

Exceptions to this policy may be granted by the Faculty Senate’s president or Steering Committee as occasions demand."

Urwin explained that the aim of this motion is to increase the representative character of the Senate by allowing colleagues to enhance the work being done, and to reduce the “infomercial character” of some Senate meetings. Frank Friedman (CST) seconded. LaFollette noted that since the motion was presented by an individual rather than a committee, it requires a second reading before the vote. Parliamentarian Scott Gratson declared that because the motion had been made and seconded, the floor should be open for discussion. No one answered LaFollette’s call for discussion. The motion will be discussed at next Senate meeting on 10 November.

**President’s Report: Paul LaFollette**

For Representative Senators: If you cannot attend a Representative Senate meeting, send an alternate, and forward email to the Senate address so there will be accurate statistics at end of year.

FSSC has been working on ways to make Senate meetings more interesting and relevant to all faculty. To this end, LaFollette will invite committees to report and will decrease the number of visits by administrators. The President is always welcome.

LaFollette will meet with Senate committees. He has begun doing so with committees such as EPPC and the Committee for International Programs, and has scheduled dates for others. This is intended to be an ongoing activity which, along with presentations by committees at Senate meetings, is expected to lead to discussions of issues that are interesting, helpful, and positive.

LaFollette encouraged colleagues to suggest topics for Senate meetings that reflect concerns and interest across a broad spectrum of faculty. He noted that today’s issue is result of comments made to FSSC members about shared governance.

To begin this discussion, he presented some recent observations of the implementation of the Temple Compass. He sees it as an open process, from initially dealing with the concept of the compass, and then involving volunteers in an open, fact-finding process. Reports were presented first in confidence, then publically, and there was ample opportunity to edit, comment, etc. However, with the 20-20 Plan, there was not much discussion: e.g., the location of library has not been addressed.

Other possible issues for discussion include the increasing reliance on the scheduling matrix and its inflexibility; and the proposition to administer placement testing, as well as the piloting of SFFs online.

Peter Jones (Senior Vice Provost) characterized the process as inclusive and gave examples. LaFollette pointed out that the information is not readily available to faculty. LaFollette opened up the floor to general discussion.

Scott Shall (Tyler) reported he has always been able to talk with his dean and associate dean, and that President Hart met with him about GLBTQ. He recognizes that others’ experience might not be the same, but his experience has been good.

Bob Aiken (CST) expressed the hope that the ongoing work to make college bylaws workable is progressing, and asked about the current status. LaFollette understands that Diane Maleson’s office has approved and they are working with legal counsel. LaFollette mentions it at every meeting with President Hart and Vice President Maleson.

LaFollette asked the group in Ambler for comments. Sue Dickey (CHPSW) wants to keep a dialogue open while evaluating faculty productivity issues for those who teach in clinical areas. LaFollette will make time at FSSC meetings for their representative to report.

Billie Goldstein (CST) noted that, as NTT, she is never consulted; and cannot get to talk to administrators in her college. She presented an example of the difficulty getting an appointment with administration.

Hochner: Faculty do not have time to participate because of increases in workloads, class size, and required record keeping. Faculty participation is very necessary. Faculty consultation is not effective participation; for ex-
ample, a brief report to a faculty committee is not the same as a discussion. Therefore, not many are aware of what is going on; and this situation could be improved. He has restarted a practice of meeting with the President and Provost periodically, which has been successful; and he would be glad to carry messages. Many faculty feel intimidated about speaking up; NTTs in particular may fear consequences (e.g., non-approval of appointment or change in workload), but this is usually not so. When more participate, we have a better idea of the issues and more coverage.

Maurice Wright (Boyer) commented on the University’s use of private companies as consultants (e.g., personnel searches, planning), and pointed out that this is problematic when there is a veto at the end of the process after faculty might have been consulted. In each case he cited, the faculty input or decision was ignored.

Jim Korsh (CST): If faculty want shared governance, they must participate, especially representative senators, who have the responsibility to attend Representative Senate meetings. He also spoke for the value of faculty evaluations of administrators, especially deans.

Marina Angel (Law) noted that FSSC had set up a recommended official slate for senate elections. This is against old procedure. LaFollette countered that we are operating under current bylaws. Angel noted that this not how it used to be and offered to write a motion to return to the old by-laws.

Deborah Howe (SED-Ambler) This person had been on the 2020 Plan committee, but has no access to the implementation plans. And she explained that we need full engagement, i.e., we need an expert to helping most processes, and there are many faculty who have expertise in fields that could be used in university planning.

Mark Rahdert (Law): We need opportunities for presentation, explanation, dialog, and regular communication from people who have knowledge. We do get presentations, but with only brief question-and-answer periods, which is falsely considered consultation.

Gregory Urwin: Departments operate differently internally, depending on personalities and practices; but on a higher level there must be more comprehensive engagement and genuine interest in the Temple community. And if none have been, which are going to be consulted; i.e.: What kind of metrics are involved, what will it take to look at this and, if it turns out so, to be abandoned. We need a deliberate consultative process.

LaFollette clarified that a faculty committee is working on this and their reports would come to EPPC, FSSC, or both.

John Nosek (CST): On CATEs and the practice of doing peer evaluation of one coming up for tenure. Where should the faculty be in this process?

Shapiro noted that the original concept of CATES was that it is a tool for improving teaching. However, it has moved into the area of high-stakes testing. It is important for faculty to bring today’s ideas back to their collegial assemblies.

LaFollette asked if future Senate meetings should focus on discussions such as this, and received a very positive response from attendees.

Frank Friedman (CST) commented on John Nosek’s remarks: Although he remembers Temple before CATES, he noted that we should review periodically why we do certain things, and also review deans. He asked whether incoming deans are educated to the ways of Temple and why there are managerial differences across the university. Review would help to resolve this situation.

Scott Shall (TYL) who has been here for four years reported that, as tenure-track faculty, he considers CATEs are good for him. He added the general caution that in evaluations, we should focus on non-personality decisions.

Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 PM.

Submitted by
Margaret Devinney, Acting Secretary

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