How Disability Figures into My Scholarship

By Jeremy Schipper, Associate Professor of Religion

“Considering how common illness is... it becomes strange indeed that [it] has not taken its place with love and battle and jealousy among the prime themes of literature” – Virginia Woolf, “On Being Ill.”

Recently, the editor of the Faculty Herald invited me to write a piece on how disability figures into my scholarship. As an associate professor of Hebrew Bible (sometimes called Old Testament) in the Department of Religion, a large component of my research agenda focuses on representations of disability in biblical and related texts from the ancient Near East (especially Mesopotamia). I have written several books and articles on disability in the ancient world (for a sampling, consult the bibliography below) and designed and taught courses on the body and biblical literature that include units on disability.

Prior to taking courses in the Department of Religion, many of my undergraduate students have some exposure to the texts that my research focuses on because they have read portions of the Hebrew Bible and the Epic of Gilgamesh in the required Mosaic I course. In that course, they investigate...
HLD: Saying that I was not communicative enough! I learned my lesson; I need to be more careful about process.

SN: I think you’re referring to our reaction to the changes to the academic calendar.

HLD: Yes. I am too much of a person who wants to get things done. Even though I believe I am always thinking of the benefit of the faculty. I know now that just thinking that it’s good for people is not enough.

SN: It’s an interesting thing. There’s both a symbolic and a substantive side. Faculty want to be included because they’re the faculty and think they should have a seat at the table. And then in many cases, there’s the sense that talking to the faculty may actually change the views of those involved in making the decisions.

HLD: That’s right.

SN: One thing that’s not going to elicit any pushback from the faculty, I think, is one of the reasons we’re meeting today, which is your directive on multi-year contracts for the non-tenure-track faculty. At the most recent Faculty Senate, you reported that you’ve told the Deans that you want 60% of NTT faculty on multi-year contracts, clarifying that this is restricted to teaching, not research, faculty. This should be welcome news to all of us, non-tenure-track and tenure track faculty alike. It’s something the Union has been pushing for a long time. It should also be welcome news to our students, since it should improve morale for so many of the instructors who teach them.

People actually applauded, if you remember, at the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, when you first told us of this. I think we all applaud you for the move. I do have some clarifying questions, if you don’t mind.

HLD: Sure.

SN: What is the nature of the directive to the Deans? That is, is this a goal or a mandate?

HLD: I would like to make it a mandate. It has been presented as a mandate to the Deans with the support of President Theobald. To have it done, I have asked all the Deans to provide a list of all the teaching NTTs with the duration of their contracts. And we will actually count the percentage. Of course, how to get to this mandate, whether we can do it immediately in a few months, that might be difficult, given that many people have already been issued contracts. But it is our goal to achieve this in the next fiscal year.

SN: And do you have in mind 60% overall, or 60% in each college and school?

HLD: My goal is to get every college to achieve 60%. On the other hand, there are some colleges that are very small, if they have only 5 NTTs, I cannot say that you have to reach this number because their circumstances may be so different. So if I could get 60% overall I would be very happy. But the goal is to have each college at that number, at least the larger colleges.

SN: I was thinking of my own college, CLA. I think Fox and CST are already over 50%, whereas CLA is very far from this, and Tyler as well.

HLD: We’ll work with the two deans on that. That will also require the department chairs to work on this. From my perspective, there are several considerations to keep in mind in employing NTTs.

Programs may change. For example, the recent change in the hiring of NTTs in African American Studies is due to programmatic change.

SN: The chair wanted to go in a different direction.

HLD: And the faculty. Not just the chair, but the faculty. As I understand it, the African American Studies faculty wanted to go in a different direction. So programmatic needs is one factor. The other factor is performance. Newer NTTs have not had the opportunity to demonstrate their success in the classroom, so they have to be on shorter-term contracts. Then the third one is that we may still need fiscal flexibility. If the state cuts us severely, we may have to make adjustments in staff/faculty. Those are the three factors. But when I look at this, really, from the humanistic point of view and from an employment point of view, if a person has demonstrated that he or she is a good teacher, even though you may have programmatic changes and a need for staffing flexibility, I don’t think you need to have 90% of the faculty on one-year contracts. My view is that 60% on longer-term contracts is something we can live with. You still have flexibility there.

SN: And the multi-year contracts will be staggered.

HLD: Right. I put myself in the shoes of these faculty members; “How can I live with year-by-year contracts?” Really, that’s not the right thing to do.

SN: I know somebody in CST who has been here for 20 years, and 18 of those years she’s been on one-year contracts. It’s very difficult. This is also about a shift in how NTTs are envisioned at Temple. When I came here in 2001, there was a six-year cap; and then we created Special Appointments Faculty; and now we have realized that these colleagues are so valuable that we have to think about a long-term arc to their careers.

HLD: They are valuable. Let me clarify that to make our NTTs more respected and better treated is something the Deans have worked since Provost Lisa’s time. At that time, we changed the titles and set up ranks.

Let me put this in a broader context. We have 39,000 students overall, but our tuition is low. So the resources available to us are not high. On the other hand, we have to compete with some of the strongest universities in the country. To even sustain what we have means that we need to have a strong reputation in academics. Everybody knows that a university like Temple has two missions—the discovery and dissemination of knowledge. Dissemination means teaching, discovery means scholarship. If we want to be true to this mission, then we really have to support in engaging in the discovery of knowledge, but as a university that lacks the resources many of our competitors have, we have to focus the resources available to those in research. When I came to CST, I found that it has a relatively small tenure track faculty. Our goal was to make sure that every one of them is supported like faculty at Penn or Harvard or Penn State or Pitt for that matter. Otherwise we can’t compete. For example, we nourish good people and they leave. Then we can never become who we need to be. Part of that support includes a reasonable teaching load. In science, for example, a typical load at top universities is one course per semester for faculty who guide graduate and post-doctoral students to do research.

But immediately you find that once you have the teaching assignment like the top universities, you don’t have enough people to cover the curriculum. So NTTs play a very important educational role, especially for foundational knowledge. There, newly-discovered knowledge takes years to filter into foundational courses. Therefore, NTTs focusing on teaching lower level courses can do that job very well. This is why when I looked at this, I said, we have to treat them better, with respect, with job security. Respect is signified by the title now being “professor of instruction, etc.” Security is what we’re looking at now.
How Might RCM Change Graduate Education at Temple?

By Kime Lawson, Assistant Editor

After the current fiscal year ends this July, Temple University will finally implement Responsibility Centered Management (RCM). The Faculty Herald has profiled this budgetary model three times in the past year and a half, in an opinion piece featuring the perspectives of four faculty members and in two interviews with President Neil Theobald and Provost Lung Dai. Not much has been said officially about how RCM will affect graduate studies at Temple, and I have heard a number of concerns from graduate students and faculty alike over the past few years in my own College of Liberal Arts and at meetings of the Faculty Senate about some recent trends in graduate funding being spread more thinly, so I spoke with C.F.O. Ken Kaiser, Assistant Vice President of Budget Jaison Kurichi, and Vice Provost Zeb Kendrick to address RCM's risks and to prognosticate the coming years of graduate studies at Temple under RCM.

Anticipation for RCM has been positive generally, as the system will de-centralize annual allocations from administrators to the Deans of individual schools and colleges. From there the Deans, ideally in cooperation with their faculty, will captain the collective educational destinies of their units forward in what Provost Dai has called "a virtuous circle," with this year's funds re-disbursed from 95% of the previous year's course tuition total. The idea is that Deans are better experts than administrators to judge where the money should go because Deans are closer to the educational pulse of faculty and students, which C.F.O. Ken Kaiser calls "aligning authority with accountability." After the startup, the schools and colleges must be self-reliant with little to no help from centralized contingency funds from the President's Office. In best cases this budgeting method will encourage the schools and colleges to produce innovative course offerings and programs of study to draw outstanding students and new faculty hires. Perhaps the worst risk in RCM is schools and colleges engaging competitively in administrative "sloving," or creating redundant course offerings within their own units to keep students from fulfilling requirements and spending tuition dollars in other schools. This problem, however, could be countered with some proposed centralized funding such as the Provost's Strategic Investment fund to encourage more interdisciplinary work.

Among faculty and graduate students alike I have overheard some concerns about how the new budgeting system could affect the overall operation of the Graduate School and graduate studies. Today's graduate students must be uniquely prepared by their programs to excel in a global context where the necessary training for interdisciplinary encounters is not stymied by departmental rivalries. The RCM model is designed primarily for undergraduate education, and the Graduate School itself is considered an "auxiliary unit" rather than a separate school or college in RCM. This potential narrowing and devaluing of Graduate Education could not come at a more inopportune time. The current state of graduate funding at Temple has barely recovered from the appropriation cuts that resulted from the recent recession. In many departments, and I am more aware of this trend in CLA, the number of graduate lines has diminished over the past decade and in some cases the funding for some lines is currently being split between multiple students. Fewer graduate students have been eligible for health insurance benefits, and some assistantships have been converted to externships. Splitting graduate student lines has also caused responsibilities to be spread more thinly. Graduate students without funding often have to work outside of higher education or teach at other universities, in addition to completing their studies on time, just to make ends meet because current "gradjunct" rules do not permit them to teach at Temple. A silo mentality or other possible problems under RCM could also hamper graduate funding and effectiveness, stifle interdisciplinary cooperation, or make graduate studies at Temple less attractive in other ways to the best potential students and faculty.

Ditch Your Textbook: Moving to OER and Alt-Textbooks

By Steven J. Bell, Associate University Librarian for Research & Instructional Services

There's a phenomenon that happens in the Library each semester during the first week of class. One question will be asked repeatedly by students who approach librarians for assistance: “Does the Library have a copy of my textbook?” We hear this question hundreds of times. It speaks to the effort Temple University students go to in order to acquire their textbooks in the most economical manner possible—free being the most desirable option.

I am reminded of a personal interaction with a student seeking his textbook for an environmental science course. I found a prior edition, but it was ten years out of date. I gave the student the news, sharing my regret that I was unable to find an edition he could use. To my surprise, the student was unexpectedly overjoyed. He claimed the book would suffice. This speaks volumes about the state of textbook costs. As educators, we may be aghast that a student would settle for a completely out-of-date edition, especially in the sciences, knowing well the negative impact it is likely to have on student learning. Yet, our students, in their pursuit of savings, are glad to accept what should be totally unacceptable.

This observation mirrors findings from a recent national survey about college textbook costs and use conducted by the Student Public Interest Research Group. The survey of 2,200 students from 150 institutions acknowledges that alternatives such as rental programs have helped, but that 65 percent of students had still opted against buying a book because it was too costly – and 94 percent of them believed their grade would suffer because of it. Another 48 percent of students said the cost of textbooks affected their decisions about course selection. At the same time, 82 percent of students said free online access to a textbook would help them do “significantly better” in a course. Beyond Our Control?

Temple faculty with whom I have spoken share concerns about textbook costs. Few feel comfortable knowing students spend significant sums on top of tuition and fees. There are worries that questionable student practices, such as sharing with other students or simply opting to do without the textbook, detract from learning. Others express guilt about requiring students to purchase a costly textbook, knowing they may cover only a third of the content. These revelations are accompanied by a resignation that textbook publishers are in control and there is little faculty can do. They can choose to take control and ditch the textbook. I know it is possible because our Alternate Textbook Project has allowed 27 faculty across the disciplines to do just that. Each has successfully compiled an alternate set of learning materials to save students money and improve learning.

How to Get Involved

The Alternate Textbook Project is an annual competitive award program. Faculty submit an application that describes the textbook they are ditching, the resources that will replace it, the anticipated savings from eliminating the commercial textbook, and other details. A team of TLTR2 (Teaching Learning and
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Technology Roundtable) members reviews the applications. Ten successful applicants receive an award of $1,000 to support their project. Participants submit a project evaluation that summarizes the outcomes. Faculty are not required to author a textbook; most instead develop their alternate textbook using existing open or library licensed content, and that can include chapters from open textbooks or library e-book collections. Faculty can partner with librarians to obtain assistance identifying appropriate content. Full details are found on the official site.

What Faculty Have to Say

Perhaps the best affirmation of the value of the AlternateTextbook Project comes from past participants. Here are a few excerpts from faculty evaluations of their projects:

I also found it liberating to assign readings myself, instead of having to follow a pre-set textbook. For example, I was free to select recently published or forthcoming articles, as well as emphasize themes that are often ignored or marginalized by texts seeking to maximize coverage.

I found the experience to be quite successful. As an instructor, I found that identifying high quality, accessible free-to-student readings was something of a challenge and more time consuming than selecting traditional textbooks.

I believe that students obtained as much from the set of readings that I put together for this course as students have obtained from traditional texts in other versions of the capstone that I have taught. Students were, on the whole, extremely enthusiastic about the Alternative Textbook Project.

Students who took the course previously indicated that based on conversations with peers who were currently in the course, the alternative textbook, course materials and delivery of the course content were significantly improved.

I suspect that the reason for the large increase in the percentage of students earning A's, and the concomitant decrease in students earning B's, C's and D's may be attributed to the students' easy access to texts without cost: in previous years, many students on restricted funding failed to purchase some or all of the required books.
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how these and other texts discuss the individual in human society with attention to themes such as journeys, self and others, community, and faith. Similar inquiries have helped biblical scholars gain a more critical and comprehensive understanding of the material in biblical and related ancient texts and of the cultures that produced this literature. Yet, only in the last decade or so have scholars shown a sustained interest in critically examining how representations of disability help to articulate these and other prominent themes in this literature despite the abundance of images of disability, which can be found in nearly every book of Hebrew Bible, not to mention the Code of Hammurabi, Hittite Laws, and the Egyptian Instruction of Amenemope. To modify slightly my earlier quotation of Virginia Woolf, one might say that considering how common disability is in the Bible, it becomes strange indeed that it has not taken its place among the prime research interests within biblical scholarship. Two possible and somewhat related reasons for the neglect of critical examinations of disability by biblical scholars include: 1) its overrepresentation in literature and 2) the type of historical information that biblical scholars often search for when studying this literature.

Regarding the first reason, disability imagery represents such a wide variety of experiences and social conditions that it becomes easy to assume that it must almost always represent something other than an experience of disability. The meanings mapped onto disability extend far beyond descriptions of people with disabilities and their experiences. For example, a passage in Isaiah 53 that is referenced frequently throughout later Jewish and Christian literature describes a figure identified only as the “servant” with language and imagery that are typically used to describe persons with various disabilities and diseases in other texts. Yet, although scholars often acknowledge the nature of these descriptions, they interpret the servant as representing otherwise non-disabled messianic figures, prophets, kings or a collective experiences of imprisonment and exile rather than as describing a person with a disability. The lack of scholarship on disability may not result from limited representation of disability in the Bible but from the limitation of what disability can represent in the Bible and related ancient literature. Ironically, since disability imagery is often assumed to be symbolic of something other than a disability, scholars have not devoted much attention to disability as a subject of study in its own right despite the ubiquity of this imagery.

Regarding the second reason, biblical scholars often prioritize information that allows for historical reconstructions of the lived experiences of individuals or communities. Yet, since scholars often interpret disability imagery as symbolizing something other than disability, images of disability in biblical and related ancient literature rarely, if ever, serve as reliable records from which to reconstruct lived experience. We learn very little about the lives of people with disabilities in the ancient Near East from these texts. Thus, scholars have often neglected representations of disability in their historical reconstructions of the cultures that produced the Bible and related literature.
Temple as a Public Good?

Editorial continued from page 1

sure that Temple is not turned into a glorified summer camp as we spend on the amenities necessary to attract and retain students.

But I want to focus here on the slogan’s middle word, “public.” This is more than a savvy way of differentiating us from our wealthier private neighbor bustling on the other side of the Schuylkill. For it is the public that to a significant degree validates our research, teaching, and service. And “public” also names what is most under threat right now, at Temple and at public colleges and universities across the U. S. The data is probably depressingly familiar. There has been a massive disinvestment in public higher education in this country over the past few decades. For the state-by-state drop from 2006-11, see this chart; you’ll notice that Pennsylvania is at twice the U. S. average of -12.5%, and here’s a graph of the decline across the U. S. since 1990-91. If we look back further, the past may seem utopic; this issue’s Wayback Machine from April of 1995 frames on the front page over the state’s parsimonious appropriation, and the author had good cause to do so. And yet we find out in that same issue that the appropriation that year was $144 million. Our appropriation for fiscal year 2014, according to Temple’s Budget Office, was $146.4 million; Governor Corbett has with characteristic generosity and foresight proposed an identical number for this year, just as he did for the two years prior to 2014, and this after a 20% cut that fell far short of the 50% he sought. Lest you think that this $146 million represents an increase over 1995’s $144 million, albeit a minimal one, we have to remember to adjust for inflation. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics’ inflation calculator, $144 million in 1995 would be equivalent to $223 million now. It is no surprise, then, that state support has dwindled to 12% of our operating budget; the percentage for Penn State is half that, which raises the question at what point state universities cease to be public universities, at least in terms of fiscal support.

Of course, funding reflects values, and the turn away from seeing education as a public good is part of a larger skepticism toward the public as such afflicting our elected leaders and a large swath of the electorate, from public education on the primary and secondary levels to public assistance to the poor to public lands that have been reduced to mineral rights and natural gas reservoirs to be sold on the cheap. Or, as the late Maggie Thatcher famously put it, “There is no such thing as society.” Calculated hyperbole, perhaps. But nonetheless revealing of a corrosive worldview that devalues the civic mindedness responsible for, among other accomplishments, the founding of public universities that are the equal of the best private ones but more accessible. For even if Harvard, Stanford, et. al. are committed to making it possible for all their admits to afford their brutal price tag, they simply don’t have enough seats to educate the tide of students who seek and deserve a great university.

But if we faculty are to persuade others that colleges and universities, including Philadelphia’s Public University, deserve public support, we need to remind the public of why we’re valuable. We need to point out that among the people that are Temple Made are thousands of doctors, lawyers, teachers, and other professionals who are the lifeblood of the region (a line I shamelessly steal from Chip Jungrleis, Vice President-elect of the Faculty Senate). We need to highlight the public benefits that accrue from our research and teaching, not only new cancer drugs but also literacy programs, better urban planning, and public artworks. We must also work on making a trickier argument, which is that there is often no telling where our research and teaching may lead, that facile input/output equations risk squeezing out an irreplaceable element of what makes universities valuable. I wonder if we might not adapt Adam Smith’s Invisible Hand to argue that in getting paid for pursuing our intellectual passions and in giving students the freedom to the same, we may well produce public benefits. And for those who might object that Smith argued against government intervention in the economy, I would urge them to not stop reading The Wealth of Nations before Book V. There, Smith argues for the necessity of the state to fund schools. Lacking this, those subject to the repetitive and narrow occupations that accompany the division of labor that makes possible the wealth of nations will be rendered unfit to be citizens. And he would have extended his argument to include universities had he lived to see the importance of post-secondary education to a modern economy and state.

Finally, we need to acknowledge that a large portion of the public and thus of our potential students, is being crushed by student debt, made worse by an exploitative loan industry (including the quasi-federal Sallie Mae) that has occupied the vacuum left by public disinvestment. This has led to some fundamental doubts about the value of a college education and pressured legislators and others to find easy solutions to a complex problem; see the fondness by governors in Texas, Florida, and Wisconsin for the $10,000 B. A. (hey presto!). President Theobald has rightly announced limiting student debt as a key priority, though I can foresee potential conflicts as the imperative to keep costs low may conflict with our rightful demand to be properly compensated. But we might also avoid such conflicts by promulgating and supporting plans that direct more resources or re-direct existing resources more efficiently to public universities. One of them, just released by Profs. Sara Goldrick-Rab and Nancy Kendall (Wisconsin-Madison), offers a blueprint for making the first two years of public post-secondary education free with no increase in the amount currently spent. We might also draw on feisty defenses of the public university and exposés of attempts to undermine it— for instance, Christopher Newfield’s and Michael Meranze’s website, Remaking the Public University. These are some of the resources we might bring to this crucial discussion. If “Philadelphia’s Public University” is to be more than a slogan, we must secure the support of the public we serve.
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Nevertheless, while often underappreciated, the critical study of these representations may help us better understand the ways in which certain segments of these cultures conceptualized their society and their world. For example, a lot of information about the Israelite priesthood and about the monarchy comes from the books of Leviticus and Samuel respectively. Some of the Bible’s most extensive use of disability imagery occurs in these books’ discussions of these two very significant social institutions. In this sense, the critical study of the use of disability imagery in these books allows for more comprehensive reconstructions of how certain segments of the cultures understood their society even if the imagery does not provide realistic depictions of the lived experiences of people with disabilities.

In university culture, we often think of disability as relevant only to matters of accommodations and services for our students, staff, and faculty with disabilities instead of an important aspect of identity and diversity on campus. Nevertheless, disability is not only related to very important matters, but also to critically understanding our notions of the self, others, and community as we engage both the people and the texts that play a fundamental role in a liberal arts education at Temple University.

For further discussion and bibliography consult:

Taking Steps Toward Budget Transparency

Rahdert continued from page 1

“held harmless” during the transition to the new system, meaning that their budget allocations would equal what they had received under the old budget process. Another governing premise was that a substantial fund would remain with the President and Provost, and would be distributed to schools, colleges, and other budget units in a strategic fashion designed to promote and support new initiatives.

During the Fall 2013 semester, the CFO’s office provided training on the operation of the new system to administrators, staff, and faculty members responsible for budget management throughout the University. During the Spring 2014 semester, each budget unit was asked to submit financial reports and proposals, which were presented to a set of “budget conference committees.” Units asking for additional new funds were asked to explain and justify their requests to these committees, which have included representatives from the CFO’s office, the Provost’s office, the Council of Deans, and faculty. I was among the faculty members who were recruited for this work. It was time consuming, but also stimulating; I think it is probably fair to say that I learned more in these meetings about the financial workings of the University’s individual budget units than I had been able to learn in my previous thirty years on the faculty.

From the outset, one of the central aims of the transition to the new budget model has been to achieve greater budget transparency. In particular, it has been understood that at all levels of the process faculty participation in budget development and assessment will be a critical component for the success of the enterprise. I have been personally impressed at how open CFO Kaiser and his staff have been to including faculty members in the process in meaningful ways. Our input has been solicited at every stage, our ideas and concerns have been considered and addressed, and on many occasions our suggestions have been implemented. In my judgment, a spirit of true collegiality and common purpose has been pervasive – a very promising start to what I hope and trust will prove ultimately to be a very successful enterprise.

But the planning and structural work that has been done so far, important as it is, is just the beginning. The real ongoing work of RCM budget development and implementation must occur at the school/college level. To make that happen, we need Deans and college administrators who are as open to sharing budget information and responsibility with their faculty members as the CFO and his office have been, and we need faculty members who are willing to undertake the time and effort to become knowledgeable monitors, advisers and stewards regarding their school/college’s budgetary affairs. All of us need to develop basic college budget proficiency. Some of us need to press further and acquire true budgetary fluency. We must earn our seat at the budget table.

Transparency on budgetary matters has not been the norm at Temple, to say the least, and I anticipate that there will be some resistance in some schools and colleges to the idea that faculty should have a meaningful role in setting budget priorities or advising on budget issues. Sharing that concern, the Faculty Senate’s Budget Review committee proposed, and the Faculty Senate Steering committee recently adopted, the following resolution:

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate Steering Committee, in response to a resolution from the Faculty Senate Budget Review Committee, approves and will transmit to President Theobald, and urge him to endorse, the following practices for budget advisory committees of the schools and colleges:

Each school and college shall have a Budget Advisory Committee, at least some of whose members should be elected, which should receive full and detailed information about the school/college budget, and should meet regularly with the Dean and other responsible members of the administration to address budgetary matters. Matters within the committee’s purview should include, but not be limited to, tuition revenue, other program-based sources of revenue, external funding, expenditures for scholarships, assistantships, and other forms of student financial support, expenditures for various academic departments and programs, expenditures for student services, library and technology expenses, special projects, other administrative expenses, capital expenses, investment income, and other items. Committee members in college governance. Exactly how these principles get implemented will naturally vary from college to college, as each unit has its own distinct style of shared governance. But these basic principles represent the minimum that is necessary to ensure that the RCM system is truly transparent at the school and college level. I hope that every dean and every faculty collegial assembly will take active steps to see that these principles are fully implemented.

How Might RCM Change Graduate Education at Temple?
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Addressing the issue of siloing, perhaps RCM’s most exploitable flaw, CFO Kaiser and Vice Provost Kendrick each said that the Office of the Provost would act as a watchdog for course duplications through a website called Temple Review of Academic Programs and Courses (TRAC). When graduate faculty propose new courses, they must post their proposal to the TRAC website for review by the Provost’s Office and the Board of Trustees. If the Provost’s Office notes any redundancies or duplications in the course descriptions, they will ask the faculty to change the course. TRAC should offer some centralized oversight to prevent siloing, and similar oversight will decide how the tuition earned from cross-listed courses will be allocated. In addition to TRAC, regularly scheduled reviews of Deans and programs and are also intended to maintain the accountability of each school and college along with a university-wide review of RCM after its third year of implementation.

Another possible outcome of RCM to graduate education mentioned by each respondent is the outgrowth of existing and new Master’s degree programs across the university. More tuition drawn from Master’s students could give departments more freedom to “right size” or grow Ph.D. programs in congruence with their respective job markets. Zeb Kendrick noted that “Recently established innovative and interdisciplinary master’s degree programs in Biotechnology, Engineering Management, and Globalization and Development Communication are ... to be approved by the Board of Trustees in the near future.” A job market surely exists for researchers from competitive science Master’s programs, but fewer employment opportunities exist for students who only complete a Master’s degree instead of a Ph.D. from most any department in the College of Liberal Arts. Market outcomes could possibly end up strengthening some graduate programs at the expense of others. Marketing, faculty resources and increased administration for new
An Interview with Provost Hai-Lung Dai at the End of His First Year
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SN: It’s interesting. In CLA, one of the amazing things to me is that I have colleagues whose teaching load is twice mine but are still publishing. As you know, research works differently in the humanities. The procedures and the resources you need are different; you don’t need a lab and don’t need grants.

Another question: Does the teaching faculty include those on the clinical track?

HLD: I’m not sure. They’re called clinical because they are performing a clinical function. There may be obligations to bring in income. When you open up a clinic yourself, you’re on a daily contract.

SN: Right, you can put yourself on a five-year contract...

HLD: But if nobody comes to your clinic, you’re finished. That’s why I exclude research faculty. If the grant support is not there, then...

SN: I’m also curious what response have you received thus far from the deans on this directive if you can say. I know this may be a sensitive question.

HLD: I think the deans want to do this. When we discussed this, they fully embraced it. The CLA Dean, the Dean of the Center for the Arts, they want to embrace this.

SN: You’re not getting a lot of pushback.

---

“Everybody knows that a university like Temple has two missions—the discovery and dissemination of knowledge. Dissemination means teaching, discovery means scholarship. If we want to be true to this mission, then we really have to support in engaging in the discovery of knowledge, but as a university that lacks the resources many of our competitors have, we have to focus the resources available to those in research.” - Provost Hai-Lung Dai

HLD: No. It will be a lot of work for some Deans. They’ll need to look over their NTTs and decide which ones will be on multi-year contracts.

SN: A lot of work and a concern you’ve already mentioned about flexibility. But it’s great to hear that they’re on board.

Tenure and Promotion

SN: Tenure and Promotion has been a topic of some discussion between you and the FSSC and the Faculty Senate. One thing that has emerged at the FSSC is that the procedures that were put into place after the committee that Ann Hart had convened don’t seem any longer to be in the Temple Policies posted on the web. Does that hint at changes that are coming?

HLD: As I understand it, the policies website is maintained by the University Secretary and only contains policies approved by the Board of Trustees. President Hart’s guidelines are posted on the website of the Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Diane Maleson. I always follow the procedure. The only change we made was the number of letters.

SN: And that will be promulgated widely in writing?

HLD: Yes.

SN: Do you have the sense that there are other changes in promotion and tenure coming down the pike? This speaks to broader questions having to do with your vision of the faculty, particularly the tenure track faculty. How do they best prove their value? In what areas do we need to make heavier investments? Decisions about tenure and promotion are the most consequen-

tial expression of what we think our tenure track faculty should be doing.

HLD: I would say that we all work toward the goal of trying to have the best performance in the discovery of knowledge and teaching. To me, the procedure is not problematic. For example, take the debate over health care reform. Some people say it’s good, some people say it’s bad. But whether you say it’s good or bad, for the people who say it’s good, you have to implement it well. I don’t find that our tenure procedure is problematic; if you look around at other universities, it’s pretty much the same procedure. But at each stage, when you consider the candidate, how do you apply a complicated standard that is summarized in just a few words.

SN: It comes down to what do we mean by “excellent.”

HLD: We are always looking for excellence as a way to demonstrate outstanding performance and continuing promise of outstanding performance. This is the reason we went from 5 letters to 8. If we want to compete with places like Pittsburgh or Penn State or Indiana, we should adopt similar practices. We shouldn’t be shy. If we have people doing great work, we should let people know. At my prior institution, when I came up for early promotion and tenure, they wanted 8 letters. My department went for 15 letters, and all 15 had to come back saying, “This person is stellar.” I’m bragging now.

SN: Well, you have the track record to back it up.

HLD: We, President Theobald and I, don’t think 8 is an unduly large number. Many institutions use this number. So if the person is great, we want the world to know. We want 8 people in the field to know we have these great people. If you tell us he’s great, then we’ll promote the person. But I’d like to clarify that if there are sometimes timing or field-specific reasons, we will consider exceptions for fewer number of letters.

SN: The faculty I’ve spoken to they don’t necessarily object to 8 letters. One worry is about very highly specialized fields where there are only so many people qualified to judge. As long as the chairs of the committees and the candidates themselves have notice about what the standards are, as long as the rules aren’t changed in the middle of the game and the decisions of departments and colleges are given due weight.

HLD: The letters we send to the reviewers are very clear: “Tell us what great things this person has done. What impact has this person made in the intellectual community? Would you tenure this person at your institution and should he or she be tenured at Temple?” Right now, I’ve been asked to review candidates at institutions of the highest-quality in the country. These letters ask me to rank candidates next to people who have been there for 15-20 years. We’re not, and will not, be doing this at Temple. I would encourage our faculty to think that tenure is a tremendous privilege for any profession, and to realize that tenured positions are very valuable at Temple. Altogether, including the medical school, we have only 900 tenure track faculty. This is a terribly small number for 39,000 students.

SN: And all the research that must get done.

HLD: Really, you need the best people you can get.

SN: And when you tenure someone you’re marrying for life. The person might go to another institution, but they might be here for 40 years.

HLD: Each morning when I come in to work, I’m always thinking: “What do we need to do to make Temple prosper?” I’m not joking that I view my job is to support the president by keeping the printing machine going to pay faculty. Look at our neighbor, St. Joe’s, it is in a fiscal bind. Why? Because they don’t have enough students. One number we should watch is that the number of high school students in America is decreasing. The other number I saw is that the average spending on college education by each family
dropped by 10% from 2010 to 2013, from $23,000 to $21,000. We’re talking about tougher competition, and so we have to use our resources wisely to improve our quality and our reputation.

SN: So you’re saying that in a constrained environment like this, making a
decision about tenure is all the more consequential.

HLD: Yes. We have to ask: Will this person improve the quality of the
department?

SN: A final question on this. When discussions came up about this last year,
a question was raised about tenuring rates in comparison to other institutions. Do you have a number in mind?

HLD: I don’t have a number in mind at all. If you look at CST for the five
years I was dean, we tenured a lot of people. There was a case where the
college committee voted unanimously against this person, but I looked over
his materials and thought, “This person is going to be great. The college
committee misjudged him.” So I overturned the college committee. He was
tenured; he’s doing great.

SN: You’ve tenured lots of people in CST, and they’re all doing well.

HLD: Yes. When I have evidence that this person is going to make it, I will
support the case. There is no fixed rate. The only reason I mentioned the
rate in Faculty Senate is that if you really look at the number of cases that
were actually turned down in the TAUP schools, there were only 2. If you
look at this number against the overall rate of those who were granted tenure,
it’s really not high.

SN: The sense was that in addition to the 2 people from the TAUP schools
there were also people from the Law School and then there are people who
were encouraged to withdraw. That does happen sometimes, and it is true
that being turned down for tenure is seen as a black mark. But the faculty
who raised objections and questions, both in TAUP schools and out, had
more than 2 cases in mind.

HLD: The total tenure denials last year including both TAUP and non-TAUP
schools were 3. That is still a proportionally low number compared to those
who were granted tenure. And, no one is ever encouraged to withdraw.
Tenure candidates are made aware of options – including the possibility of
withdrawal – all the way along the process. It is always the candidate’s deci-
sion whether to withdraw or stand for tenure.

SN: Why can’t Engineering teach First Year Writing?

HLD: Right. We now have a committee to advise me whether an academic
program proposal is reasonable or not reasonable. But this is not a complete
safety net. I have asked Peter Jones to empower the General Education Ex-
ecutive Committee, to look not just at the content but to see whether the
teachers are really appropriate. In the past, if you set up the content then
anybody might say, I can teach this content.

SN: That’s good to hear. If we’re looking at steady-state undergraduate
enrollment for the next decade, as President Theobald has projected and in
most colleges—not just in my home college, though it’s more pronounced
there—revenue is so heavily dependent on credit-hour generation, you’ve got
a closed system. So while there are other ways to grow through Master’s
programs, development, and indirect cost recovery through grants, you can
see that people will think that the only way they can prosper is at the expense
of some other college. We want this system to produce innovation and com-
mitment to quality but not at the expense of each other.

HLD: Yes.

SN: I have a question about the Honors program. We’ve steered new re-
sources to the Honors program. As Senior Vice Provost Jones has said, in
four years, we’ll have a Haverford inside Temple.

HLD: Haverford plus Swarthmore [laughs].

SN: [laughs] Right. My concern is that of course class sizes in Honors are
for good reasons very low. Now, colleges certainly have incentives to offer
Honors classes. These are well-prepared and eager students. If they end up
majoring in your department, you get the pay-off there. But if one looks at it
from the perspective of de-centralized budgeting, it comes with a heavy cost
because the classes are small. So I’m wondering if your office has been
thinking about giving incentives to the colleges and schools to offer honors
classes.

HLD: How to support the Honors program is very important and sometimes
a mind-boggling issue. But we do have a plan. Last year we had a substan-
tial increase in Honors students. This cohort is in its freshman year. Our
first job was to look structurally at how to give proper support for this large
cohort’s first year, particularly at how to provide research opportunities for
their summer scholarships and at advising. Right now, the overall size is not
that much bigger in Honors. It’s an increase of only 200. But three years
from now, we’ll approach doubling the size. During this period, we will find
a way to support the Honors students. There are several ways to do this. We
could do what you suggested, which is to provide incentives to the colleges
and schools. Another model is to do what Penn State and many other colleg-
es do, which is to have an Honors College. Once it becomes its own college,
it has independent operations.

SN: One other thing about Honors. At the last Faculty Senate meeting, Joe
Schwartz from Political Science suggested that when we’re admitting stu-
dents to the program, we might want to look a little more broadly than the
SAT, in part because of how the SAT is keyed to socio-economic status. It
was pointed out to him that even if a student is not initially admitted to the
Honors program, a faculty member can contact the program and say, “Hey, I
have this really promising student in my class and wonder if she could be
considered for Honors.” But you seemed interested at least in contemplating
Joe’s suggestion. Is that right?

HLD: Joe’s question speaks to a larger issue. As an educator myself, I see
different types of students. You don’t understand physical chemistry but you
can memorize the entire textbook and do well on the exam. This person
might well be admitted to Honors because he tests well. But I don’t think
this student will achieve the goal of the Honors program, to foster independ-
ent thinkers and leaders. This is a serious educational problem. If we can find ways to make the selection process produce outcomes more in line with the goals of the program, I would certainly support that.

My daughter is about to go to college. She’s a junior. I talk to her about educational value all the time. I gave a speech to all of the prospective Honors students this past Sunday, and I said that choosing a university should involve four factors: peers, faculty, reputation, and affordability. For the Honors program you have great peers, especially with the rising standards and number of students in the program. As I said, Haverford plus Swarthmore at Temple. The faculty is excellent. But my daughter asked me, “Should I apply to Georgetown?” I replied: “Why apply to Georgetown? Come to Temple; we have better faculty.” But then we get to reputation. That’s what we have to work on. The reason Temple is Temple is that we stayed true to our founder’s mission. We want to provide access to an excellent education to students who might not have that opportunity otherwise. Yet because we want to provide that access, we are punished in terms of our reputation. I say this not to suggest that we should abandon our mission but that we should be smart about this. I also said that reputation, in the end, isn’t worth much. Ask yourself: Who are the people who really made transformative changes in society. In retail, it’s Sam Walton. Did he ever go to college? I’m not sure. Then, Steve Jobs, Bill Gates, Mark Zuckerberg were all drop outs. I’m not saying students should drop out. But the point is a good education is not just reputation. I even said, “Look at the best presidents in the past decades - the present president excluded, since he will be judged in the future. There is a survey of history professors, and Ronald Reagan was ranked on top. Do you know where he went to college?”

HLD: [laughs]: You are the only person who seems to know that. I was trying to make the point, just come for a good education. We do want the Honors program to be accessible just as the university is accessible. I know the goal, but how do you get there? How do you do that. Joe and other people can suggest ideas and then I’ll have a discussion with Ruth [Ost] or Peter [Jones] or Bill Black [Director of Enrollment] and they’ll see whether it’s feasible.

SN: We have the Honors Oversight Committee as well.

Wrapping Up
SN: My final question: You’ve been the Provost for a year, longer than that if we count your service as Interim Provost. What has been the most surprising thing about the job?

HLD: I would say that in general because Temple is unionized I had this impression that things had to be very confrontational with TAUP. One surprise is that’s not the case and doesn’t have to be the case.

The other part, and we touched on this a bit: I thought I acted with good intentions and had given sufficient thought to some of the decisions I made. And I was criticized by the Faculty Senate leadership for not consulting or communicating enough. That was the unhappy surprise. On this, I would ask my colleagues to give me a break. When you’re planning things in academia so often you have to wait two or three years. I know that. But I’m impatient. I want to get things done. People should know that I want to be inclusive. To go back to the Academic Calendar, I talked to my staff and a few faculty members and asked them, “Do you think we should have the whole Thanksgiving week off?” And they all thought it was a great idea.

SN: Temple is a big ship to steer. It has a lot of moving parts and it’s enormous. You are the Chief Academic Officer; you set a course for us. It’s true of deans and chairs. But if you don’t get buy-ins things actually end up not getting done as efficiently as they need to be.

HLD: Talking about efficiency reminds me of another surprise: President Theobald and I have both been surprised by this. We have found sometimes that when we ask, “Why are we doing this?” It turned out to be an internal rule we’ve set up at one point that for some reason no longer exists, and we’re simply following this rule no matter if the original intent is outdated or it doesn’t make sense for some other reason. We constrain ourselves needlessly. But once we take off that constraint, things can function much better.

SN: That reminds me of a joke. I was a member of Baltimore Hebrew Congregation in grad school, and it’s a very old synagogue, and so a joke I heard from more than one congregant went like this: “How many BHC members does it take to change a light bulb?” “What?! My great-great-grandfather donated that light bulb, and you want to change it?!”

[Both laugh]

Well, I’d love to continue this, but I have to go teach, and you’ve already been extremely generous with your very valuable time. Thanks so much for this conversation.

How Might RCM Change Graduate Education at Temple?

Lawson continued from page 6

Master’s program start-ups could also end up costing in the long run. An argument for downsizing liberal arts Ph.D. programs has been that it is unethical to send more students into a glutted job market, but bloated Master’s programs will not do these students any favors either.

Most of all, according to Ken Kaiser, RCM could be “more about changing Temple’s culture.” While this might be great for administrators and accountability, a broader concern I have is how RCM could shape the culture of incoming graduate students. Since RCM is largely tuition-driven, the new budget may prompt programs to select fewer students who have financial need. I would hate to see a set of less diverse graduate students at Temple as a result of the new budgetary system. But one quirk of RCM is that its function and success lie with the people who manage it, so its outcomes can be as diverse as the leaders at the helm. Let’s hope Temple’s culture can change without compromising its mission both as a research university and as a place that realizes Russell Conwell’s vision of expanding educational access.

♦
By Steve Newman, Editor

For this issue, I have selected two items for The Wayback Machine. The first, from April 11, 1995, speaks to my editorial on declining state funding; it attests to the deep roots and long history of this problem, and it is depressing to consider that if adjusted for inflation, the $146 million we’re likely to receive this year is 35% less than the amount we received in 1995. And our budget and student population have by no means decreased since that time.

Another profound change over the past few decades is the decline in the percentage of tenure-track faculty and concomitant rise in the percentage of full-time non-tenure-track faculty. It is good news that Provost Dai has, as reported in my interview, directed the Deans to offer 60% of these valuable colleagues the multi-year contracts they have long deserved and TAUP has long argued for. But even if this mandate is realized, there is no denying that the decrease in the percentage of tenure-track faculty has meant an overall decrease in faculty compensation, benefits, job security, shared governance, and even perhaps academic freedom. It is for this reason that the Faculty Senate in the Fall of 1999 passed a resolution on the need to increase tenure-track hiring, and Marina Angel contributed a column outlining her concerns on this issue. I wonder what all of our faculty—tenure-track, full-time non-tenure-track, and part-time—think about this situation now and what should be done about it. I invite them to send letters on this (or any other Temple-related topic) to the Editor at snewman@temple.edu.
Representative Faculty Senate Minutes, February 18, 2014

Attendance:
Representative senators and officers: 43
Ex-officio: 0
Faculty, administrators, and guests: 6

Call to Order:
The meeting was called to order at 1:47 PM

Approval of Minutes:
The minutes from the November 7, 2013 meeting were approved as distribu-
ed.

The minutes from the January 27, 2014 meeting were approved as distribut-
ed.

President’s Report, President Rahdert:
Jim Creedon has asked the FSSC to name a few faculty members to serve on
an ad hoc committee for the purpose of reviewing Temple’s weather closing
policies.

The FSSC named faculty members Matt Miller, Fabienne Darling-Wolf, and
Michael Jackson. The committee will also include administrators and stu-
dents.

Ken Kaiser has created a system of budget conference committees to meet
with various budget units. Those meetings are underway. Each conference
committee includes two faculty members. The committees hear the proposal
from the unit, ask questions about it, and then rate the proposal on a matrix of
different criteria. One criterion for schools and colleges is whether and how
faculty members have been engaged in considering the budget proposal.
Most of the faculty members on these conference committees have come from
the Senate Budget Review Committee.

Dean review committees have been announced for all three deans under
review. All three have significant faculty representation. They are beginning
to do their work.

The FSSC met with representatives of TU Student Government and dis-
sabled some of their interests. These include:

- Access to information about courses. They would like to expand
  beyond the eSFF materials now available to them and would like
  to be able easily to find things like syllabi and course materials
  for courses they are considering. The FSSC has suggested similar
  ideas. The students are working with Peter Jones’ office to see
  what can be done along these lines.
- Developing an honor code that would address academic integrity.
  They have requested Peter Jones create a committee of students,
  administrators, and faculty to explore this idea. He is creating
  such a committee. If you are interested in serving on that commit-
tee, let Rahdert know.
- Improving campus and building safety, and developing a more uni-
fied TUAlert system.
- Enhancing summer course offerings, in particular on-line summer
  courses.

The FSSC also met with Board of Trustees member Judge Theodore McKee,
chairman of the Academic Affairs Subcommittee of the Board. We had a
very positive discussion about how to improve relations between the faculty
and the board.

The FSSC has meetings scheduled with:

- Karen Clarke, VP Strategic Marketing
- Jim Creedon, Senior VP Facilities
- Michele Masucci, Senior VP Research
- Ken Kaiser, CFO

Vice President’s Report, Tricia Jones:
Elections are rapidly approaching. We have five elected committees. All
will need some new members. She will soon be sending out a message to the
faculty detailing the needs and asking for nominations.

- EPPC needs 3 new members.
- Personnel needs 1 who must be tenured.
- RPPC needs 2.
- Honors Oversight Committee needs 2.
- UTPAC needs 5 who must be tenured full professors.

These are essential committees.

We will also be putting out calls for appointed committees.
The deadline for nomination to the elected committees is Feb. 28, 2014.
We need a statement of interest and a CV.

The election will happen toward the end of March.

Nominating Committee Report – Joan Shapiro
It is the job of the past president of the Senate to chair the nominating com-
mitee. This committee consists of Karen Turner, and Michael Jackson. We
want to encourage those of you who are interested in running for Senate
office to do so. Attached to today’s minutes is a nominating petition. If you
wish to run for President, Vice President, or Secretary, please read the in-
structions on this petition. The information is also available on the web site.
You will need six signatures of members of the University Senate. These
can be electronic signatures submitted via email to senate2@temple.edu. The
deadline is Feb. 28, 2014. The election will take place from March 31
through April 7, 2014.

Discussion
Rahdert announced that we have no visitors today, and proposes that we
spend our time discussing what business the Senate should be pursuing this
spring.

Some things on the FSSC’s agenda are:

- The process used to reach the decision about our athletic programs.
  We are planning on expressing some thoughts about how this
  process could be made better in future cases.
- The budget and the transition to the new budgeting system. We will
  be collecting information about how the system will be working
  and is working.
- Research policies and procedures. There will be fundamental chang-
es in the ways in which Temple grant support is managed. We
  will be meeting with University personnel to try to work through
  these changes.
- The development of the Master Plan. We want to be sure that before
  it is finalized, faculty have a meaningful opportunity to comment
  on it.
- Monitoring developments in on-line education.
- Following up with the Academic Programs Advisory Committee.
- Working with the President and Provost on the Fly in Four program.
- Discussing the role of the Academic Programs Advisory Committee.
- Revising and strengthening the committee structure of the Faculty
  Senate.

These are issues on our agenda, but the FSSC would like to hear what other
issues are important to the Senate membership.

Art Hochner, FSBM:
For years, we in the Senate have tried to get a copy of the budget from the
administration. The document housed in the library is dense and difficult,
and on paper rather than machine readable. RCM is supposed to make the
budget more transparent. Is this the transparency of invisibility? We should
all be able to see it.

Minutes continued on page 12
Also, in the budget process in the colleges, the faculty should have representatives on the collegial budget committee that are chosen by the faculty, not by the dean. In at least some colleges, perhaps most, this is not happening. We should not call it “faculty participation” when all that has happened is that a dean has asked a couple faculty members who happen to agree with him or her to be on the budget committee.

We need to press on this issue. The President and the Provost should insist on this. They should also facilitate the ability of schools and colleges to revise their bylaws by removing the restriction that all bylaws changes have to be approved by the dean.

There has been a lot of discussion in this body about tenure procedures and standards. The Senate and the UTPAC should consider what needs to be done to strengthen the tenure process. It is very unfair to change the standards after a person has been hired.

Michael Sachs, CHPSW: The FSSC does have a subcommittee which is looking into the various ways in which schools and colleges have constituted their budget review committees. Last year the Provost either recommended or required that all colleges have budget review committees. His college had its first meeting with their dean the other day, and he was surprised to learn that from his dean’s perspective, they are an advisory committee rather than a budget review committee. They would be happy to hear ideas about initiatives that faculty might want to present to tap into the Provost’s pot of money, but that the idea that the committee would actually review the college budget was not going to happen.

Steve Newman, CLA & Editor, Faculty Herald: When we have addressed President Theobald asking for a directive to deans as to how budget committees should be constituted and function, he has demurred, saying that he does not feel that it is his role to reach down into the functioning of individual colleges. We have also requested from him a list of best practices. He has said in the past that in his experience, real faculty involvement is key to the process. We could, perhaps, profitably follow up on this request for best practices before these systems become too entrenched.

James Korsh, CST: There have been a lot of serious decisions made at the University recently. Examples include the emphasis on research which has extended way beyond what it used to be, the increasing use of NTT’s and adjunct faculty. All of these issues have impact on the quality of education that we deliver. Not only have we as faculty had input on these matters. We have not put forth our opinions. It is time for us to do so. We have not gotten a response from the President about best practices for the budget review committees. We have gotten no response on the matter of collegial assembly guidelines. The Senate passed a resolution about principles for collegial assembly bylaws and we have had no real response or support from the administration. We need to keep bringing these matters up to the administration.

Jeffrey Solow, BCMD: His college submitted revised bylaws for their collegial assembly in 2011. They have never gotten any response back from the Provost’s office.

Karen Turner, SMC: We would like to see organizational charts. Since under RCM we are paying for the administration, it would be nice to see what we are paying for. We have been talking in the FSSC about how to engage more of our faculty in the Faculty Senate. We would love to hear ideas from those who are not part of the FSSC as to how to continue the culture of faculty leadership. President Rahdert commented that during the several years that he has been active on FSSC, he has observed that the membership of the FSSC changes very slowly. We have a hard time finding new people.

Paul LaFollette, CST & Senate Secretary: He expressed frustration over the past few years in attempting to engage in meaningful collaboration with the administration. Six or seven years ago there seemed to be a reasonable willingness on the part of the administration. One of the very positive things we did was when the administration and the Senate leadership worked together to establish President Hart’s P&T Guidelines. This was a very open and engaging process. But, since that time, I have seen what appears to be an attempt to make us feel involved while the administration goes on its way doing what it intends to do and making us feel like we don’t exist. He does not have a solution, but hopes that we can at least keep the administration aware of the fact that the wool is not pulled over our eyes, and that these pretend collaborations that have no meaning behind them, that these decisions that get made and then brought to us after they have been made, is not something that we are prepared to accept as shared governance.

Joseph Schwartz, CLA: If he had to choose two issues for the Senate and the University has to grapple with, he would first re-affirm the fact that governance is in crisis. Second, we have not honestly grappled with the changing nature of the academic faculty. In 1988, 80% of our seats were taught by tenurable faculty. Now, it is likely closer to 50%, but we don’t know. We are not given the data about which and how many of our courses are taught by contingent faculty. We need to ask whether the kinds of teaching loads imposed upon those who are teaching mathematics skills or writing skills are too large to allow the kind of excellence that our undergraduates deserve. Finally, we need to get a handle on the finances. We could make an argument that an under-endowed Temple and the decreasing support from the state, that we must be much more aggressive about saying that if the state does not finance higher education, students will get poor education. We need to take some leadership on this. Finally, our graduate students are teaching far too much.

Mary Conran, FSBM: She is an NTT who feels that her teaching is not poor, but takes pride in her teaching, and that she is assessed on the basis of the quality of her teaching. She rejects the notion that the increase in NTT’s means a decline in educational quality. She agrees that we need to hold all faculty who teach to standards, but we also need to understand the realities and the roles that our various kinds of faculty play.

Joseph Schwartz,: He does not disagree with most of what the previous person said. The director of IH is in charge of 47 NTT’s. They mostly start at $45,000 per year. Many started at $30,000 just a few years ago. There are too many people here who do not have a career track, who do not have security, and whose salaries may top out at $65,000 after 20 years of service. High school teachers are debased and unappreciated, but they have more respect and better career tracks than most of our NTT’s. There have been NTT’s in his college who have been dismissed after 15 years of excellent teaching. We don’t reward people for teaching, there is no incentive for TT faculty to do quality teaching and service. We have a crisis of pedagogical engagement and a crisis of service. Unless we increase merit for teaching and service, the crisis will continue.

Steve Newman: As one of the few people here under 50, he wants to remind us that this is a legislative and deliberative body. If we wish to engage some of our younger faculty, we need to continue to do what we have been doing. The FSSC has for some time been asking for real dean’s reviews. After working on this for several years, we finally got it. We got it in part because it is something that our new President wants. We have been pushing on budget committees, we have been pushing and we have made some progress. The same is true about online education guidelines. We need to start thinking in legislative terms, need to become bolder and do more. This could help to engage younger faculty. If our legislation has no effect, then we need to get louder.
Rahdert next asked the question, whether the Senate should, as it has in the past couple years, try to sponsor or co-sponsor a symposium this spring? If so, what would be an appropriate topic? If you have ideas mention them now or email Rahdert later.

One of the things we have talked about in the FSSC is the appropriate balance among the various levels of faculty – TT, NTT, adjunct, and graduate students.

Art Hochner:
He has sent letters to Temple asking how many courses in different categories are taught by TT, NTT, and adjunct faculty. He received a response that we are not entitled to that information under our collective bargaining agreement nor under the state’s open records law. They did not answer, and they did not want to answer.

Perhaps if such a request came from the Senate there would be a better response. But generally Temple has been very reticent to share this kind of information.

He does not understand why Temple does not want to share, but the answer “we do not have to” is not a good enough answer.

Julie Phillips, Associate Director:
The GenEd department has always been willing and happy to give information about GenEd teachers with the Senate.

Michael Sachs:
One of his pet peeves is that the administration has put up barriers to what some NTT’s can do. Some are not allowed to do service. Others are not allowed to get credit for scholarship. We need to be discussing these issues.

Old Business:
None

New Business:
None

Adjournment:
The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 PM

Paul S. LaFollette, Jr.
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

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 Steve Newman at snewman@temple.edu.