Of Town Hall Meetings...

The President’s recent town hall meetings with faculty have been very nice affairs. I mean that in every way. They’ve been well planned and well publicized. They’ve covered important subjects and passed on information about athletics, the 20/20 plan, and sustainability to any faculty member who cared to attend (and an average of about sixty or seventy have done so). They’ve sometimes ended with choice beverages and especially fine hors d’oeuvres. I’ve enjoyed sharing space with the president and other administrators, the athletic staff and my colleagues. The barriers that separate professionals at any modern university seemed a little less stony on those days. It felt good.

But a “town hall meeting” is not a town meeting. The classic New England town meeting – still very much in operation – is an exercise in direct democracy. The people of a town gather together annually and actually make decisions – including laws.

It is also not the Faculty Senate, where the faculty’s elected representatives gather monthly. It seems that the recent profusion of town hall meet-

A Conversation With Pepón Osorio

By Jo-Anna J. Moore, Area Coordinator of Art Education
Former Chair, Art & Art Education Department, Tyler School of Art

Pepón Osorio was awarded a distinguished MacArthur Foundation Fellowship in 1999 for his internationally recognized installation art work bridging the gap between museums and communities. The Award earned him a place among a growing list of scholars and creative practitioners, now numbering 828 since the Fellowships were first awarded in 1981. From all that can be discerned, Pepón is the only MacArthur Fellow on the faculty at Temple University. In 2004, Acting Dean Hester Stinnett coaxed Pepón to join the full time faculty in the Art and Art Education Department at Tyler School of Art and he was hired as a tenured full professor in 2006. Pepón is now a distinguished Laura Carnell Professor of Community Art at Tyler, and he recently discussed with me his ideas about teaching and working at Temple University.

Professor Osorio’s own academic background includes an MA in Studio Arts from Columbia University Teachers College and before that, a BS in Sociology from Lehman College, CUNY. In his native Puerto Rico he studied at the Universidad Interamericana. At present, over forty books...
efficiencies. Some cuts have already been proposed by faculty members (e.g., let’s close this campus, let’s close that campus, let’s fire the highest paid administrators, let’s close this or that department, and so forth).

None of the faculty talk I have heard so far about cutting the budget utilizes budget data. That is astonishingly ironic and peculiar given that empiricism is supposed to prevail in universities.

On January 24, during a forum on the budget and then during a Faculty Senate meeting, I asked Administration representatives if they would send out a pdf file of the 2009-2010 “Budget Detail” so that faculty and others could properly inform themselves. I gather that is not going to happen. I next hoped that the *Faculty Herald* would publish the President’s and Provost’s areas of the “Budget Detail” in this issue. But I now understand that that is not going to happen either. I hope that someone will publish it soon because, as I said, the information it contains will be very helpful for people who wish to speak intelligently about the impending crisis.

I have tried to read the “Budget Detail” carefully, and I have created a draft spreadsheet that can be accessed by clicking here. It arranges expenditures from the University “Budget Detail” in columns to produce a number of snapshots that suggest where we are currently and, perhaps, what can or ought to be cut. I focused my attention on three topics. The first sheet focuses on the considerable amount of money allocated in the budget to food, travel, and entertainment as well as the even more considerable amount of money allocated to the loose category of “Other General Expenses.” The second sheet focuses on the amount of money allocated to non-faculty salaries. The third sheet focuses on the money allocated to instruction; it includes fulltime faculty, chair stipends, part time faculty, graduate student instructors-of-record, teaching assistants, and research assistants. In instructional compensation in the current budget totals some $201 million. Non-instructional compensation totals $89 million.

My spreadsheet is a draft. It may contain inaccuracies because I had to transpose a great many numbers from the “Budget Detail.” I may have missed some numbers or put some in inappropriate categories. I have checked it for accuracy a number of times. But, to repeat, it is a draft, not a finished product that has been reviewed by others.

The total Temple operating budget without the Hospital is about $868 million, so the President’s and Provost’s areas are a fraction of the whole. I have not tried to analyze the budgets of such big-ticket items as computing, finance, facilities, student housing, student life, and campus safety. I have, though, looked carefully at two major items that were out of the Provost’s and President’s areas. The two were printed at the end of the “Budget Detail.” One is titled “Executive Compensation,” the other is titled “University Contingency.”

I have developed opinions about budget cutting at Temple in these tough times. Here is a list of items I think we should look at closely if in fact a budget crisis becomes real:

- $5.3 million in food, travel, and entertainment (not including team travel and housing expenses in the budget of Intercollegiate Athletics).
- $8.7 million in “Other General Expenses.” As I understand the term, “Other General Expenses” gives flexibility to budget unit heads. Flexibility may be a great thing -- but not in a crisis.
- $319,486 allocated to “Team Holiday Living Expense” and $305,700 for “Administration overload stipend” in the “Intercollegiate Athletics” budget. That budget, incidentally, is $15,462,804, which is larger than the budget of all but four of Temple’s colleges. The colleges with larger budgets than “Intercollegiate Athletics” are Science and Technology, Business, Medicine, and Liberal Arts.
- $11 million in “Incentive Funds.” The $11 million fund can be found near the end of the “Budget Detail,” on the same page where “Technology Transfer” ends and “Graduate School” begins. There are also significant such funds in the Podiatric Medical Clinic and elsewhere. I have not incorporated these funds on my spreadsheet because I do not know how they were or will be dispersed.
- $3.7 million for consultants, of which $2 million is for “legal fees.” In a time of crisis, needless to say, the University cannot continue to pay outside vendors for services (such as union contract negotiations by outside lawyers) that it can provide with in-house talent.
- $2.2 million in “additional pay” within various non-faculty budgets.

- $30 million in “University Contingency” funds (one of the two items I have included from the end of the “Budget Detail”). I expect that the University will strongly maintain that it must keep such a contingency fund immune from cuts in order to satisfy outside financial agencies that it has funds available for contingencies. This sounds like circular reasoning to me.
- $10.5 million in “Executive Compensation.” I have no idea who is included in this budget item (the second of the two items I included from the end of the “Budget Detail”). I have no idea why students have so much of their tuition money diverted for expenses that have little if any connection to their educations. Here, between the lines, I am obviously claiming that administrative expenses should be kept to a minimum because administrators simply do not produce significant revenue.

I have a speech on the tip of my tongue. It is not a sweet speech. It does not have lofty ideas in it. It is an angry speech about how Temple (like most if not all large institutions) utilizes the tuition paid by its students and taxpayer money. It is sharp-tongued. It has some nasty language in it.

I will not make that speech now. Instead, I will end by inviting my readers to examine the documents I have provided with as much dispassion and skill as they can muster and then enter into an informed conversation about Temple’s short-term options for cutting its budget should that prove necessary as well as its longer-term options.

**TLC Conference Offers Perspectives on Learner-Centered Teaching**

**By Kime Lawson, Assistant Editor**

Over 130 faculty members attended the first Teaching and Learning Center event of the year on January 13th, entitled “How to Maximize Student Learning.” The conference featured Dr. Maryellen Weimer as its keynote speaker. Dr. Weimer is an Emeritus Professor of Teaching and Learning at Penn State and has a disciplinary background in communications. She is a nationally recognized expert in both the United States and Canada on the topic of learner-centered teaching. Weimer has offered her insights formally to faculty at over 400 colleges and universities, and has authored eight books about learner-centered teaching. She is also the editor of *The Teaching Professor* monthly newsletter.

Dr. Weimer’s keynote address, based on her influential book *Learner-Centered Teaching: Five Key Changes to Practice*, identified essential areas where learner-centered teachers should be willing to relinquish some specifically delineated sovereignty: “the teacher’s shifting role,” “power,” “content,” “responsibility” and “evaluation.”

According to Weimer, instructors can create class activities that inspire students to exercise more agency in the classroom and build their confidence as self-regulated learners. To facilitate learner-centered teaching, Weimer insisted that teachers should first de-center their own role in the classroom to make more room for student contributions.

One way to solicit more comments from students that Weimer suggested is to challenge them in class to create their own examples and summaries from the course content. Another main theme of learner-centered teaching is that instructors should share the dynamic of power in the classroom just a little. Weimer advised leaving it up to the students to make a few decisions of consequence, such as letting them generate possible test
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and catalogues are devoted to discussions of his distinctive art work. At least thirty-five one-person shows and hundreds of group exhibitions in Museums and Galleries, and also storefronts, department stores and homes, have featured Pepón Osorio’s highly structured and personalized installations, which always explore issues that blend community concerns, aesthetic choices, and a remarkable use of materials, media, and, sometimes, performance.

Osorio has always thought of himself as an educator, but Temple University/Tyler School of Art was the setting of his first formal teaching experience in higher education after almost a quarter-century as a practicing installation and community artist. He reports that he was attracted by the invitation to teach because, for a while, he had been thinking about a way to “translate his artistic method into pedagogy.” Pepón had a hunch that it might be good to “solidify his methodology” and to “connect to an institution.” In 2004, he had recently moved with his wife Merián Soto (a Temple University Associate Professor of Dance) and family from New York City. Taking the position at Temple was an opportunity to add to Tyler’s relatively new and growing Community Arts program.

Pepón spoke about what had been his growing interest in working with students and younger artists and he thought that Temple had an “intriguing student body.” He guessed that teaching at Temple might provide an opportunity to work with students who “would give back to their communities.” He was attracted by the location of Temple, in a “perfect urban setting” with a long tradition of ties to an urban working-class environment. Pepón is very pleased to have furthered the development of “Community Arts” here at Tyler, to help fill what he sees as “a gap in their art education” with a program that encourages students and young artists and members of the community to engage in the art-making process together. This was quite different from where he grew up, where there was little interaction between art practitioners and the community, and few opportunities to see art.

Professor Osorio described the first time that he actually saw an original piece of art work when he was eighteen years old in Puerto Rico. As a young man, he suddenly felt motivated one day to visit the Art Museum of Puerto Rico on his own and he viewed a large painting titled “El Velorio” (The Wake) by European-trained Puerto Rican artist Francisco Oller. The dramatically painted representation of a family around the body of a deceased child made an enormous impression on him. One of the figures reminded him of his grandfather, and Pepón recalls being struck with the awareness that one could experience a “spiritual connection” to art work, which had the potential to “connect on many levels” with viewers, and could give them access to what he calls the “codes” in an art work. Pepón was enlightened with the understanding that art-viewing and art-making can provide new possibilities for the people involved, a chance to learn what is in an artist’s mind and at the same time to discover what is in one’s own.

Professor Osorio loves working with Temple students. He experiences them as “very curious” although he knows that they may not always know what directions to go with that curiosity. He loves the way that students in Community Arts are willing to go to new places as art students and artists. He admires the fact that they have a lot of knowledge of the urban environment. The challenges or frustrations he experiences as a teacher usually involve differences in personalities, students who are “too full of themselves” and unable to make connections with
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others. He believes that it is critical in Community Arts to recognize that it is not about “going out there and ‘giving’ something to a community” but rather recognizing that one has the potential to “meet people half way,” to participate in an exchange of resources and knowledge with people in the community around an artistic activity. The connections in a Community Arts experience have the potential to help us learn more about ourselves along with learning about others. A willingness to “negotiate” is crucial to the process. It is vital to find a place of strength within yourself and to recognize the knowledge that you can find in a Community Arts experience that is reciprocally educational.

Professor Osorio believes that working with the families in the community helps remind our Temple students about the importance of art, art-making, and artifacts in people’s lives. He spoke glowingly about people working together in a process, and not just focusing on a product. This is why Pepón sees such a parallel between art and education. The works that are created in a collaborative Community Arts project are truly valued by the community. Pepón spoke about some artifacts made with beads, constructed in a workshop by Dr. Lisa Kay with community families and students as part of a project titled “In Loving Memory.” These objects were subsequently displayed in people’s homes in special places, revealing the reverence held by the family members for the work. Pepón spoke about the engagement of our students in this kind of rich process that helps them with future “creative blockages” and provides a whole range of new possibilities for settings in which to make and display art work.

The university has visions and missions for its students, but Pepón believes that the potential is much greater than simply training for careers. He sees the university fulfilling a role of bringing artistic experiences at an earlier age, outside of school, to many members of Philadelphia communities. He believes that our students can participate in a sustained engagement with the creative process, to foster more encounters with art, artists, art students, and community, to promote the incidents of creativity in which everyone should have access.

Professor Osorio concluded our discussion by talking about the moment when he learned that he had been selected as a MacArthur Fellow in 1999. He and his wife Merian had just decided to make a move from New York City. The Foundation’s nomination process is confidential, so he reported that he was totally surprised by the telephone call, and found it “incredible” until the caller activated the speaker phone and all the members of the panel in the room called out their “Congratulations!” to him. Pepón says that the most wonderful outcome, in addition to the financial award, has been the opportunity to spend time in workshops and residencies with other MacArthur Fellows: “to be in the company of scholars and artists, people with a ‘vision’!”

Pepón’s colleague, many of us feel likewise. Our Temple University and Tyler School of Art students and community are fortunate as well!
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questions or have a choice among multiple prompts for satisfying a written assignment.

Learner-centered teaching also requires a reorientation toward course content. Rather than striving to cover all of the remaining content in some Sisyphean gesture during the last five minutes of class, Weimer recommended having students use the content to shape and share their own summaries during that time. Pushing students to organize material on their own or in small groups could foster their greater feeling of involvement in the classroom. Promoting more student responsibility is also a key goal in learner-centered teaching. Weimer noted that an effective way to start promoting responsibility early in the semester is to forego the ritualistic reading of the syllabus on the first day, but then to quiz students on specific syllabus policies a couple of classes later. Doing so should prompt students to comprehend the policies on their own and to assure that there will be consequences for not learning the material. Weimer continually stressed making the syllabus the first learner-centered activity of the semester so that it could set the tone for the rest of the course.

Finally, Weimer argued that allowing students to have a miniscule role in the teacher’s evaluation of them can also facilitate a learner-centered approach. Having students determine their own class participation rubric or reviewing their peers in group projects could help them sharpen their own critical evaluation skills. All in all, Weimer asserted that the students of teachers utilizing learner-centered methods should experience deeper learning and gain a stronger sense of self-direction.

In the true spirit of learner-centered teaching, the rest of the day’s activities encouraged conference attendees to develop learner-centered strategies among themselves. At lunch, faculty from across disciplines mingled generously and shared their thoughts about Weimer’s address and what had worked in their own teaching experiences. At my table a professor from the Broadcasting Telecommunications and Mass Media department reported success with having students generate their own video content, and an English professor told me how peer evaluation had made her first-year writing students much more confident in editing their own work. I overheard a professor at another table recounting how learner-centered methods in one particular class had prompted the students to genuinely connect with their classmate who had a disability. After lunch, conference attendees split into six breakout sessions to discuss special topics and practice learner-centered methods. Judging from the number of professors who stayed to attend the sessions, I got the general feeling that most of the attendees found Dr. Weimer’s presentation to be thought-provoking and inspiring.

Learner-centered teaching has many risks and rewards, and there are also a number of misconceptions about it. These methods are by no means reinventing the chalkboard, or asking professors to never lecture again. Students ideally are still paying tuition to encounter the expertise expressed in the course content selected and produced by their professors. What Weimer is suggesting, along with a great deal of recent pedagogical research, is that if teachers manage portions of class time more patiently to include a range of feedback outlets for students, more students will engage the course material and be invested more deeply in learning. Teachers may encounter student resistance in a variety of forms, but probably most often from the ubiquitous Type-A student who constantly worries if student-generated content is faulty or if it is going to be on the test or not. Student-written evaluations are often the only quality control record for NTT faculty and “graduates” who work on per-semester contracts, increasing their temptation to try to be liked by spoon-feeding content to students and ultimately inflating grades. A significant number of the students I have known at Temple, however, have told me that the university’s trademark diversity drew them to attend here in the first place. Learner-centered teaching approaches can specifically augment students’ experience of that diversity in the classroom and more actively represent the mission of Temple University. Every roster and every teacher is different, but facilitating activities that allow your students to open up to you and to their peers can transform their college experience.
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Representative Senate Meeting
November 10, 2010
Minutes

Call to Order:

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

Guest: President Ann Weaver-Hart
President LaFollette welcomed President Ann Weaver Hart.

President Hart related the success of the Middle States review, the quality of the incoming freshman and transfer students, and how well she felt everything transpired at the beginning of the semester.

The high yield rate exceeded the number of students who actually arrived on campus. The total number of Temple Students is now 40,000 including TU Japan.

The attention that was paid to enrolling and attracting diversity in the incoming 2010 class of freshmen and transfer student resulted in the following statistics: 14% African American, 12% Asian, 4% Hispanic, 63% white and 7% other.

New agreements are being made with two-year institutions for seamless transfer of future incoming transfer students.

The four year and six year “time to graduation rate” has improved considerably and is above the national averages.

President Hart said that she appreciates the eight semester grids that help students to be able to graduate on time.

In order to reduce the “melt” rate from freshman year to sophomore year, the university is developing a number of processes that will help the most “at risk” students from dropping out. Ten new undergraduate advisors have been hired to be available to help students.

The university is trying to be responsive to returning veterans and helping to make programs affordable for them. There is now an officer in charge of Returning Veteran Recruitment in the Admissions Office.

Law Student and Pharmacy student pass rates were exceptional this past year. Over the last five years, over 300 tenure or tenure track faculty members have been hired. Eighty searches have been approved for 2011-2012.

President Hart mentioned a number of elements of the 20/20 Plan that will be further explicated at the Town Meeting taking place on November 17th.

She announced that over the next ten years, there will be 250 scholarships available to students from areas surrounding Temple University.

President Hart will be working with the Harrisburg state government to garner as much funding as possible for the 2011-2012 Temple Budget.

Guest: Interim Vice President and Provost, Richard Englert – “Dialogue with Dick.”

Provost Englert congratulated Jennifer Cromley from the College of Education for the Presidential Award she received. Only two of these eighty prestigious awards were given to Education Professors.

President Hart has asked that a committee be established to examine the “Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure.” She has requested the completion of a report by December 15th. She will then post the report on a website and invite comments from everyone by January 31st. Final guidelines will be issued by the middle of February. These guidelines will govern the next round of tenure and promotion cases to be considered.

Next week, the faculty senate leadership will receive the bylaw template that will be reviewed at a mini-retreat with the FSSC on November 17th. In the creation of the template, there has been a deliberate attempt to creatively develop a template that can be used by many schools and colleges. It contains some standardized language.

There is a new leadership team in the College of Education since Dean McGuire has resigned. Provost Englert was very impressed with the College of Education Town Meeting and his meetings individual faculty and staff.

Provost Englert thanked Tony Ranere and the members of CATA for their participation in recommending faculty to be considered for the dean search committees. He said that they did an excellent job.

There will be a sustainability pledge offered to campus employees to sign. The target is to gain 3000 signatures by Earth Day.

Professor Marina Angel (School of Law) made the statement that she feels that any appointments being made to committees on campus should come through the faculty senate. This comment was made in response to hearing that the faculty chosen for the new Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion Committee, were selected by President Hart and Provost Englert. Senator Angel feels that there is a “continuing pattern” of faculty being put on administration/faculty committees without the Faculty Senate nominating the faculty. She believes this pattern has to stop.

Professor Art Hochner (Business and Management) suggested that it would be good for a blog to be set up to comment upon the new suggested tenure and promotion guidelines, so that input could build upon what is written and everyone can be aware of the thoughts of others. Professor Hochner asked about the process of the acceptance of the bylaws templates. Provost Englert responded by saying that the bylaws must be approved by the Board of Trustees.

Approval of Minutes of 12 October 2010:
The minutes from the Representative Senate Faculty Meeting of October 12, 2010 were unanimously approved.

Old Business:

Professor Gregory Urwin’s (College of Liberal Arts) motion from the previous Representative Faculty Meeting was considered.

Professor Chares Jungreis suggested an amendment to the motion, including the phrase “whenever possible.”
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Secretary Roberta Sloan objected to the wording “whenever possible.”

Professor Urwin also objected to the wording “whenever possible.”

Professor Bill Woodward (Law School) suggested that the phrase “whenever possible” be eliminated from the proposed revision of the resolution and suggested adding instead, “Exceptions to this policy may be granted by the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, on occasion, by request.”

Professor Urwin accepted the friendly amendment of the rewording the resolution.

The following resolution passed:

2010-11-10 Temple University Faculty Representative Senate Meeting Resolution

“Resolved, Members of Temple University wishing to appear on the meeting agenda of the Temple Faculty Senate must provide the senate secretary or some other senate officer or function ary with the text or a summary of their remarks (and any accompanying PowerPoint presentation) at least two weeks before the meeting at which they wish to appear so that these materials can be posted on a Blackboard page (or some other appropriate Internet location) to which all Temple faculty will be granted access. The names and email 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 on the agenda. Exceptions to this policy may be granted by the Faculty Senate President or Steering Committee, as occasions demand.”

President’s Report: Paul LaFollette

President LaFollette reported that he enjoyed attending the two recent events centering on women’s issues. The first was a presentation by Nancy Hopkins and the other was the conference sponsored by the Committee on Research and Graduate Education; Ken Blank and Associate Dean of the Graduate School, Zebulon Kendrick.

The issue of the Temple Website has been discussed with each guest who has given presentations to the FSSC. There is general agreement that it can be a huge challenge to find useful and pertinent information quickly.

President LaFollette also reported that the university has hired a Vice-President of Branding and the FSSC is concerned that resources are being expended on form rather than content and the accessibility of that content.

Vice President’s Report: Paul LaFollette for Vice President Joan Shapiro

Vice President Shapiro asked President LaFollette to give her report since she was unable to be at the Representative Faculty Senate Meeting.

Elections for Committees requiring elected appointments will begin on Monday, November 15, 2010.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 2:58 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Roberta Sloan, Ph.D.
Faculty Senate 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
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